

PRESBYTERIANS AND POLY-GAMY.

SALT LAKE CITY,

Oct. 1, 1879.

Editors Deseret News:

In my previous letters, I pretty well canvassed the Old Testament upon the important subject of plurality of wives, but allow me to make two more references before proceeding to the consideration of the New Testament. Ruth, the Moabitess, is often held up by preachers of various denominations, as an example of duty and piety and devotion. Early made a widow, she left her own country and people to go with her mother-in-law, Naomi, into the land of Judah. Ruth there found Boaz, a kinsman of her father-in-law, who did unto her the part of a near kinsman according to the law of Moses, and took her to wife. On making this contract of marriage with Ruth, before the assembled elders in the gate, to raise up seed to the name of her former husband, Mahlon, "All the people that were in the gate, and the elders, said, We are witnesses. The Lord make the woman that is to come into thine house like Rachel and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel." Ruth iv, 11. This does not look as if the people of Judah, in the days of Boaz and Ruth, were ashamed of the polygamic relations of their father Jacob, or they would not have called upon the Lord to bless Ruth and make her like Rachel and Leah, "which two did build the house of Israel," polygamous wives though they were.

I will now recur to Father Abraham for a little while. At a certain time he went to Gerar and sojourned there. Sarah, his wife, was also his half sister, and she passed among the people there as his sister. "And Abimelech, King of Gerar, sent and took Sarah," with the intention of making her his wife. "But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold, thou art but a dead man, for the woman which thou hast taken: for she is a man's wife. But Abimelech had not come near her: and he said, Lord, wilt thou slay also a righteous nation? Said he not unto me, she is my sister? and she, even she herself said, he is my brother: in the integrity of my heart and innocency of my hands have I done this. And God said unto him in a dream, yea, I know thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her. Now, therefore, restore the man his wife; for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live: and if thou restore her not, know thou that thou shalt surely die, thou and all that are thine." Gen. xx, 3-7. Abimelech arose early next morning and had an explanation with Abraham, restoring Sarah to him. "So Abraham prayed unto God: and God healed Abimelech, and his wife, and his maid-servants; and they bare children. For the Lord had fast closed up all the wombs of the house of Abimelech, because of Sarah, Abraham's wife." (see verses 17, 18.)

I may notice a few prominent things connected with this affair. Abimelech was a married man, a king, and, as customary in oriental countries, evidently a polygamist. Yet he took another woman, even Sarah, with the view of making her his wife. He did this in the innocence and integrity of his heart, and the Lord acknowledged that he had done so. The Lord did not censure him for being a polygamist, not in the least, far from it, nor for wanting to take yet another wife, but confessed that he was innocent therein, yea, even in taking Sarah. Yet the Lord would not let him innocently commit adultery and defile Sarah, but warned him of his situation and his danger, withholding fruitfulness from his wives and his household and threatening him with death if he did not return Sarah untouched to her husband. When Sarah was restored to Abraham, the Lord removed his afflicted hand from Abimelech's family; at the solicitation of Abraham. The Lord declared Abimelech was innocent in his polygamy, actual and intended, but gave him very plainly to understand that death would be the prompt penalty of even a conscious attempt to commit adultery with Sarah. How differently the Saratoga Presbyterian convclave would have acted toward Abimelech. They would rather have

forgiven adultery than polygamy in him, the latter being in their estimation the greater crime, the "champion vice." But the Lord's thoughts are not their thoughts, neither are their ways his ways. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than their ways, and His thoughts than their thoughts, even in regard to this matter of marriage, plural marriage, concerning which they have made themselves so gratuitously and foolishly officious.

I will now pass on and look into the New Testament and consider what it may have to say upon this important and highly interesting subject. Many people, who admit that in ancient Israel plurality of wives was not uncommon, and that there is no condemnation thereof in the Old Testament, urge that the practice was abolished in the Christian dispensation. If it was so, I have not read any account of that abolishment. If Jesus and his Apostles had condemned plurality of wives as sinful, as criminal, as equivalent to adultery, they would not only have condemned the ancient and honorable and common marriage custom of Judah and Israel, and the divinely inspired regulative matrimonial provisions in the law of Moses, but they would also have proclaimed that our Lord and Savior, who came through David and Bathsheba and Solomon, was not of the lawful lineage of David, but a spurious offspring as regards legitimacy, and an adulterous offspring as regards moral parity, which I for one am not ready to concede.

John the Baptist lost his head for speaking against Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee, who had committed adultery in taking Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, she having divorced herself from Philip, for the purpose of marrying Herod. It was a common thing in the time of the Cæsars for Romans to take other men's wives, several of them, one after another, marriage and divorce and marriage again, alternating in a most corrupt and shameful manner. For the Roman law, and after it the Roman Catholic and Protestant laws, contrary to the Jewish and Israelitish laws, only permitted one wife at a time to one man. So that when a married Roman took a fancy to another wife and was determined to have her, he was under the necessity of first divorcing or in some other way being released from the wife he had. There was no limit to the number of wives he could have had successively, provided he got well rid of one before he took the next. Henry VIII of England, who was first a Catholic and afterwards a Protestant, had six wives, but he was at especial pains to get rid of one wife before he married another. Two of them he divorced, two he beheaded, one died in child-bed, and the last survived him as his widow. I suppose the Saratoga Presbyterian convclave, being Protestant, could much sooner have tolerated bluff King Hal's course in regard to getting rid of his wives when his fancy was filled with another charmer, than they could have tolerated his having a plurality at the same time, according to Biblical precedent.

In the days of Jesus, notwithstanding the lawful and divinely authorized prevalence of polygamy, there was a tendency in some sects and parties and persons, such as the Essenes, among the Jews towards the celibatic (excuse me for coining a word) asceticism which followed largely in the early ages of the primitive Christian church, after the time of the Apostles, and which was part of the great apostasy or "falling away" which St. Paul predicted. Others of the Jews and the Israelites in the time of Christ, like Herod Antipas with the ambitious and wicked Herodias and his faithful Arab wife whom Herodias supplanted, had fallen away from simultaneous to successive polygamy. Herod and Herodias were Jews, and she became his final ruin. She thought he would become a king, like his father, and she a queen; but he was finally banished into Gaul, and she went with him. Others were inclined to disfavor marriage, though willing to enjoy illegitimately the privileges and pleasures rightfully appertaining to that holy estate. Remember the answer of the Savior to the woman of Samaria; "Thou hast well said, I have no husband; for thou hast had five husbands, and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband: in that saidst thou truly." John iv, 17, 18.

Apparently it was this demoral-

izing and disgraceful practice of divorce and marriage to others that Jesus reprobated when he said, "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away, doth commit adultery." Matt. xix, 9; v. 31, 32. Mark x, 2-12. Luke xvi, 18. This was evidently something like the doctrine which John the Baptist had preached to Herod, and for which John was imprisoned and executed—similar doctrine as to the guilt of adultery incurred, even according to the prevailing Jewish law. "For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife." Mark vi, 18. Matt. xiv, 4. John did not tell him it was not lawful for him to take another wife, Oh, no. John knew the law better than that.

The whole gist of this question considered by Jesus was evidently the matter of divorce and subsequent marriage of the divorced parties. The question of the Pharisees to him was not one of plurality of wives, but they "came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" Matt. xix, 3. Their object was to trip him in a quibble or technicality of the Mosaic law upon divorce for trifling causes. Jesus did not suffer himself to be so caught. He told them what the perfect law of God was, that under it a man could divorce his wife for fornication or adultery alone; that whoever divorced his wife for a less cause, and married another, was guilty of adultery before God; that whosoever married such divorced woman was guilty of adultery, as also was she; and that the husband who divorced her without sufficient reason was the guilty cause of all the consequent adultery committed by the three. Such was the original and perfect law of God, though for certain reasons divorce for minor causes was allowed by the law of Moses, as Jesus said, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." See verse 8. Truly, who could ever imagine a divorce between Father Adam and Mother Eve? It is an idea that shocks all notions of propriety, of probability and almost of possibility.

From this incident of Jesus with the Pharisees concerning marriage and divorce we may reasonably infer that the mind of our Savior ran in this manner upon the subject—"The original and perfect law of God permits divorce for adulterous unfaithfulness to the marriage covenant only. A man cannot put away his wife for less cause, especially to marry another, without being guilty of adultery. The law, Mosaic and anti-Mosaic, provides for plurality of wives, and such is the present but long established custom. Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. Therefore, if a man wishes to take another wife, let him take her lawfully and honorably, but still keep the wife he already has, for he cannot put her away without committing sin himself, nor without causing her to commit sin, for the law of God does not contemplate a woman passing away her existence unattached to any man." This would have been perfectly in accordance with scripture and analogy, for the Bible tells us that the woman was made specially and expressly for the man, to be an helpmeet for him, and that her desire should be to her husband, which is the universal case, though some of the husbands, as husbands go now-a-days, are not greatly to be desired by any woman. As to divorce, the old prophet says, "The Lord hath been witness between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: yet is she thy companion, and the wife of thy covenant. * * * Therefore take heed to your spirit, and let none deal treacherously against the wife of his youth. For the Lord, the God of Israel, saith, that he hateth putting away." Mal. ii, 14, 15, 16. But I can nowhere find, either in the Old Testament or the New, a single expression, or even faint intimation, that the Lord, the God of Israel, hates marriage, whether it be monogamic or polygamic.

Napoleon the First, sometimes called the Great, divorced his devoted wife, the "good Josephine," as the French people admiringly called her. This he did, because, bearing him no children she stood

in the way of his towering and unscrupulous ambition. He then married the Archduchess Maria Louisa, of Austria, but the offspring he had by her did not profit him much. Napoleon's star was not long in the ascendant after his divorce of Josephine. He and his nephew, Napoleon III, died dethroned and in exile, and the son of the latter, the claimant of the imperial throne of France, has just ended his days in exile, untimely and wretchedly, in South Africa, at the hands of the cruel Zulus, scarcely leaving an imperial claimant of the Buonaparte stock. If the first Napoleon was of any religion, he was a Roman Catholic, and that religion approves neither of divorce nor of polygamy, nor permits it ordinarily. But if he had desired posterity, which most men do, especially those in royal or imperial positions, there were sufficient examples in Scripture to pattern after in taking another wife without divorcing Josephine, or committing sin, and the offspring of the second wife, the first being barren, could have been his heir without doing violence to Scripture principles. But in divorcing one wife in order to take another, which he confessedly did, he became decidedly a violator of Scripture principles, for he made himself an adulterer, and thus came under the express condemnation of Jesus, which he would not have done had he married Maria Louisa polygamously, that is, without divorcing Josephine, but still retaining her as his wife, for the Lord hateth "putting away," but he graciously permits polygamy. It may be said that the laws of France and Austria would not have allowed Napoleon to so enter into a polygamous marriage. I cannot help that. Nations should make their laws in conformity with the law of God. It cannot be expected that the divine laws shall be mutilated to suit the divers whims and eccentricities of the various nationalities nor even the various conflicting religions in the world.

But, to return. Again I may say that though John the Baptist and Jesus were unsparing in their denunciations of adultery and divers other crimes, yet neither of those illustrious teachers uttered a word, so far as the sacred record shows, in reprobation of a man having two or more wives at the same time, for it was lawful, customary and honorable, and opportunities existed around, which were ever and anon taken advantage of. Herod the Great, father of Herod Antipas, had nine wives at the same time. Josephus, "the learned and authentic Jewish historian," in relating these things, says, "For it is the ancient practice among us to have many wives at the same time." Antiq. Jews, book xvii, chap. i. Yet the polygamy of Herod the Great and of others was not denounced by John the Baptist, as the adultery of Herod Antipas and Herodias was. In fact, not one undeniable denunciation of plurality of wives can be found in the Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, though there is no lack of denunciations of the abuse of marriage, whether monogamic or polygamic. JACOB.

Correspondence.

Closing Series of a Mission.

SALT LAKE CITY,

Sept. 29, 1879.

Editors Deseret News:

I again resume my pen in order to give you a few items respecting my late mission. Bro. Daniel Stuart and myself, having been released to return home, on the 21st of July, we bid adieu to Pres. J. Argyle and the saints and friends of the Tennessee Conference, and took cars for St. Louis, where we arrived on the 23d, and spent a few days in visiting the Saints and in administering to the sick. On the 27th, we attended a meeting of the Saints there and addressed them, impressing upon them the great necessity of gathering with the body of the Church. At this point, Bro. Stuart parted with me to visit relatives in Iowa, while I made my way by steamer up the Mississippi to visit the Saints of Illinois and Iowa, some of whom Bro. N. Madison and I had baptized during the early part of our mission. Found the most of them in the enjoyment of the spirit of the gospel. Some had emigrated, and others were desirous of doing so as soon as cir-

cumstances would permit. On August 10th, I met with the Saints of the Pittsburg branch, presided over by Bro. Wm. Emerick, and instructed them. They are a good people and have the spirit of the gathering, and will do so as soon as they can dispose of their property.

Passing on to Des Moines, the capital of Iowa, I was kindly entertained by Sister D. Reese and others. By desire of some of the citizens, on August 17th I delivered an address on the restoration of the gospel, to an intelligent and attentive audience. The Lord was with me on the occasion and after the meeting several gentlemen and ladies came up and shook me warmly by the hand, and expressed themselves as being well pleased with what they had heard. A Mr. L. D. Berry who is believing, invited me home from the meeting and paid my expenses at the hotel. He is a good mechanic, and a man of liberal views, and will soon identify himself with our people. Passing on to Council Bluffs and Omaha, I visited the few saints of those places, partook of their hospitality, and in return imparted to them words of counsel and encouragement.

At Omaha being rather short of means and feeling impressed with the necessity of economizing as much as possible, I concluded to try the experiment of crossing the plains without purse or scrip; (having only \$1.20 in hand), preaching my way through, trusting in the Lord to open up my way from place to place. Spending my \$1.20 for a ticket to Fremont, (half fare), I boarded the train on the 23d of August, and started for the west. A pleasant ride of 47 miles brought me to the above place, where I was made welcome by Bro. Lars Olsen and wife. Here on the 24th I addressed a good audience and found and made a few friends. Passing over the Platte river, I was kindly entertained by Bro. J. T. Mowery, one of the Mormon Battalion boys; he is preparing to return to Utah with his family in the spring. I also visited a Bro. Joseph Wall, who has sold out and will emigrate this fall. Here I had the pleasure of meeting Bro. W. H. Newman; he is a zealous, good man, and is doing all he can to disseminate the truth. Passing on by rail still further west, on August 31st, I had the pleasure of speaking to a respectable audience at Columbus. Sept. 5th I also addressed the citizens of North Platte, and was the means of removing some prejudice from the minds of the people. Passing on still further I found in almost every village a few persons who had once been connected with our Church. Some few were bitter apostates, while others still retained a portion of the spirit of the gospel, and were anxious to get back again into the gospel net. Arriving at Rawlins, Wyoming, by request of some of the citizens I consented to deliver an address in the Court House on the evening of the 12th inst. At the hour appointed I found the house well filled. Taking a text from the 16th of Mark, I thought of speaking on the first principles of the gospel; but was led to speak on the early settlement by our people in the Rocky Mountains, and of the trials and persecutions we had endured from time to time for the gospel's sake. After speaking 20 minutes or more, two young men left the room and going to the door they bellowed and yelled like demons. I applied to the peaceable citizens present to try and check them; but they did not have the courage or will to do so. In a few moments they were joined by others outside of the building when passing around to a side window they began throwing eggs at me, when I ceased speaking and dismissed the meeting by prayer. While praying I was struck on the side of my face and arm with eggs. At close of the meeting a Mr. Samuel Morgan invited me to his hotel to partake of his hospitality. While on the way to the hotel we were followed by a mob of 12 or 15 men, who pelted me with eggs till our arrival, they even pressed themselves on to the portico and used very abusive language, declared they would have no more preaching of "Mormonism" in that town; threatened that if I did not leave the place forthwith they would use me still more severely, and talked glibly of shooting, hanging, etc. In reply I told them that I was an American citizen, and that I should not leave town till I got ready to do so. In justice to the people of Rawlins, I