

found in the Hebrew but eight times. Now, we have not been favored with these authorities we have had no access to them. Here in these mountain wilds it is very difficult to get books. In each passage they refer to inanimate objects; that is, in each of the eight places where the words are found. We have searched for them in the Hebrew and can refer you to each passage where they occur. And each time they refer to objects joined together, such as wings, loops, curtains, &c., and signify coupling together. The gentleman reads the passage "Thou shalt not take one wife to another," and understands it as involving the likeness of one thing to another, which is correct. But does the language forbid, as the margin expresses it, the taking of one wife to another? No: We have the privilege according to the rules or articles of debate, which have been read this afternoon, to apply to the original Hebrew. What are the Hebrew words—the original—that are used, *Veishahel-ahotah lo tikkah*; this when literally translated and transposed is "neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister," *veishah* being translated by King James' translators "a wife," *el-ahotah* being translated "to her sister;" *lo* is translated "neither;" while *tikkah* is translated by King James' translators "shalt thou take." They have certainly given a literal translation. Appeal to the Hebrew and you will find the word *ishah* occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "wife." The word *ahotah* translated by King James' translators "a sister," occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "sister." But are these the only translations—the only renderings? *ishah*, when it is followed by *ahot* has another rendering. That is when "wife" is followed by "sister" there is another rendering.

Translators have no right to give a double translation to the same Hebrew word, in the same phrase; if they translate *veishah* one they are not at liberty to translate the same word in the same phrase over again and call it *wife*. This Dr. Edwards, or some other monogamist has done, and inserted this false translation in the margin. What object such translator had in deceiving the public must be best known to himself; he probably was actuated by a zeal to find some law against polygamy, and concluded to manufacture the word "*wife*" and place it in the margin, without any original Hebrew word to represent it. *Ahot*, when standing alone, is rendered *sister*; when preceded by *ishah*, is rendered *another*. The suffix *ah*, attached to *ahot*, is translated "*her*," both together (*ahot-ah*) are rendered "*her sister*," that is, *sister's sister*; when *ahot* is rendered "*another*," its suffix *ah* represents "*her*" or more properly the noun *sister* for which it stands. The phrase will then read: *Veishah (one) el-ahotah (sister to another) lo (neither) tikkah (shalt thou take) which, when transposed, reads thus: Neither shalt thou take one sister to another.* This form of translation agrees with the rendering given to the same Hebrew words or phrase in the seven other passages of Scripture, referred to by Dr. Newman and Dr. Edwards. (See Exodus xxvi, 3, 5; Ezekiel i, 9, 11, 23; also iii, 13.)

It will be seen that the latter form of translation gives precisely the same idea, as that given by the English translators in the text. It also agrees with the twelve preceding verses of the law, prohibiting intermarriages among blood relations, and forms a part and parcel of the same code, while the word "*wife*" inserted in the margin is not, and cannot, by any possible rule of interpretation, be extorted from the original in connection with the second form of translation.

Why should King James' literal translation "*wife*" and "*sister*" be set aside for "*one to another*?" Because they saw a necessity for it. There is this difference; in all the other seven passages where the words *Veishah el-ahotah* occur, there is a noun in the nominative case preceding them, denoting something to be coupled together. Exodus 26th chapter, 3rd verse contains *ishah elahotah* twice, signifying to couple together the curtains one to another, the same words being used that are used in this text. Go to the fifth verse of the same chapter, and there we have the loops of the curtains joined together one to another, the noun in the nominative case being expressed. Next go to Ezekiel, 1st chapter, 9th, 11th and 23d verses; and these three passages give the rendering of these same words, coupling the wings of the cherubim one to another. Then go again to the 3d chapter of Ezekiel and 13th verse, and the wings of the living creatures were joined together one to another. But in the text under consideration no such noun in the nominative case occurs; and hence the English translators concluded to give each word its literal translation.

The law was given to prevent quarrels which are apt to arise among blood relations. We might look for quarrels on the other side between women who were not related by blood; but what are the facts in relation to quarrels between blood relations? Go back to Cain and Abel. Who was it spilled the blood of Abel? It was a blood relation, his brother. Who was it that cast Joseph into the pit to perish with hunger, and afterwards dragged him forth from his den and sold him as a slave to persons trading through the country? It was blood relations. Who slew the seventy sons of Gideon upon one stone? It was one of their own brothers that hired men to do it. Who was it that rebelled against King David and caused him with all his wives and household, excepting ten concubines, to flee out of Jerusalem? It was his blood-relation, his own son Absa-

lom. Who quarreled in the family of Jacob? Did Bilhah quarrel with Zilpah? No. Did Leah quarrel with Bilhah or Zilpah? No such thing is recorded. Did Rachel quarrel with either of the hand-maidens? There is not a word concerning the matter. The little, petty difficulties occurred between the two sisters, blood relations, Rachel and Leah. And this law was probably given to prevent such vexations between blood relations—between sister and sister.

Having effectually proved the marginal reading to be false, I will now defy not only the learned gentleman, but all the world of Hebrew scholars, to find any word in the original to be translated "*wife*" if *ishah* be first translated "*one*." (The speaker was here informed he had only fifteen minutes left.)

I am informed I have only fifteen minutes. I was not aware I had spoken a quarter of the time. I shall have to leave this subject and proceed to another.

The next subject to which I shall call your attention is in regard to the general or unlimited language of the laws given in the various passages which I have quoted. If a man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other, is the language of these passages. Will any person pretend to say that a married man is not a man? And if a married person is a man, it proves that the law is applicable to married men, and if so it rests with my learned friend to prove that it is limited. Moreover, the passage from the margin in Leviticus was quoted by Dr. Newman as a great fundamental law by which all the other passages were to be overturned. But it has failed; and, therefore, the other passages quoted by me, stand good unless something else can be found by the learned gentleman to support his forlorn hope.

Perhaps we may hear quoted in the answer to my remarks the passage that the future king of Israel was not to multiply wives to himself. That was the law. The word multiply is construed by those opposed to polygamy to mean that twice one make two, and hence that he was not to multiply wives, or in other words, that he was not to take two. But the command was also given that the future king of Israel was not to multiply horses any more than wives. Twice one make two again. Was the future king of Israel not to have more than one horse? The idea is ridiculous! The future king of Israel was not to multiply them; not to have them in multitude that is, only to take such a number as God saw proper to give them.

We might next refer you to the uncle of Ruth's dead husband, old Boaz, who represented himself as not being the nearest kin. There was another nearer who had the Divine right to take her, and this other happened to be the brother of Boaz, perhaps a little older. Josephus tells us, according to the learned gentleman, that this oldest brother was a married man. Suppose we admit it. Did Boaz not know his brother was married when he represented him as the nearest of kin and had the right before him? And even the brother acknowledges his right, and says to Boaz: "Redeem thou my right to thyself." He had the right to marry her. This, then, we arrive at by the assistance of Josephus; and it proves that married men were required to comply with the law. I have no further time to remark on this passage; I wish now to examine a passage that is contained in Matthew, in regard to divorces, and also in Malachi, on the same subject, Malachi, or the Lord by the mouth of Malachi, informs the people that the Lord hated putting away. He gave the reason why a wife should not be put away. Not a word against polygamy in either passage.

But there is certain reasoning introduced to show that a wife should not be put away. In the beginning the Lord made one, that is a wife for Adam that he might not be alone. Woman was given to man for a companion, that he might protect her, and for other holy purposes, but not to be put away for trivial causes; and it was cause of condemnation in those days for a man to put away his wife. But there is not a word in Malachi condemnatory of a man marrying more than one wife. Jesus also gives the law respecting divorces, that they should not put away their wives for any other cause than that of fornication; and he that took a wife that was put away would commit adultery. Jesus says, in the 5th chapter, that he that putteth away his wife for any other cause than fornication causes her to commit adultery. Then the husband is a guilty accomplice, and if he puts away his wife unjustly he is guilty of adultery himself, the same as a confederate in murder is himself a murderer. As an adulterer he has no right to take another wife; he has not the right to take even one wife. His right is to be stoned to death; to suffer the penalty of death for his sin of adultery. Consequently, if he has no right to even life itself he has no right to a wife. But the case of such a man, who has become an adulterer by putting away his wife, and has no right to marry another, has no application, nor has the argument drawn from it any application, to the man who keeps his wife and takes another. The law referred to by my learned opponent, in Leviticus 18 and 18, shows that polygamy was in existence, but was to be kept within the circle of those who were not blood relations.

Concerning the phrase, "*duty of marriage*," occurring in the passage, "If a man take another wife, her food, her raiment and her duty of marriage shall be not diminished." The condition here referred to is sometimes more than mere betrothal. It

is something showing that the individual has been not merely previously betrothed, but is actually in the married state, and the duty of marriage is clearly expressed. What is the meaning of the original word? It does not mean dwelling nor refuge as asserted in the *New York Herald* by Dr. Newman. Four passages are quoted by him in which the Hebrew word for dwelling occurs, but the word translated "*duty*" of marriage, is entirely a distinct word from that used in the four passages referred to. Does not the learned Dr. know the difference between two Hebrew words? Or what was his object in referring to a word elsewhere in the Scripture that does not even occur in the text under consideration? In a Hebrew and English Lexicon, (published by Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M., Prof of Sacred Liter. in the Theology School in Yale College,) page 160, it refers to this very Hebrew word and to the very passage, Ex. xxxi: 10, and translates it thus:—"cohabitation,"—"duty of marriage." "*Duty of marriage*," then is "*cohabitation*;" thus God commands a man who takes another wife, not to diminish the duty of cohabitation with the first. Would God command undiminished "*cohabitation*" with a woman merely betrothed and not married?

While I have a few moments left let me refer you to Hosea. I wish all of you when you go home, to read the second chapter of Hosea, and you will find with regard to Hosea's having divorced his first wife because of her whoredoms, that no such thing is recorded as stated by Mr. Newman yesterday. The Lord tells Hosea to go and speak to his brethren, (not to his son); to his sisters, (not his daughter,) of the house of Israel, and tell them what the Lord will do; that he may not acknowledge them any longer as a wife. Hosea bore the word of the Lord to Israel whom his own two wives represented, saying that their whoredoms, their wickedness and idolatries had kindled the anger of the Lord against them.

Having discussed the subject so far I leave it now with all candid persons to judge. Here is the law of God; here is the command of the Most High, general in its nature, not limited, nor can it be proved to be so. There is no law against it, but it stands as immovable as the Rock of Ages, and will stand when all things on the earth and the earth itself shall pass away.

#### DR. J. P. NEWMAN SAID:

RESPECTED UMPIRES, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I had heard, prior to my coming to your city that my distinguished opponent was eminent in mathematics, and certainly his display to-day confirms that reputation. Unfortunately, however, he is incorrect in his statements. First, he assumes that the slaying of all the male children of the Hebrews was continued through eighty years; but he has failed to produce the proof. To do this was his starting point. He assumes it; where is the proof, either in the Bible or in Josephus? And until he can prove that the destruction of the male children went on for eighty years. I say this argument has no more foundation than a vision. Then he makes another blunder; the 303,550, the number of men above twenty years of age, mentioned in this case, were men to go to war; they were not the total population of the Jewish nation, and yet my mathematical friend stands up here to-day and declares that the whole male population above twenty years of age consisted of 303,550, whereas it is a fact that this number did not include all the males.

Then again the 22,273 first born do not represent the number of families in Israel at that time, for many of the first born were dead. These are the blunders the gentleman has made to-day, and I challenge him to produce the contrary and prove that he is not guilty of these numerical blunders. Then he denies the assertion made yesterday that there could not be brought forward more than one or two instances of polygamy in the history of Israel from the time the Hebrews left Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. Has he disproved that? He has attempted to prove it by a mathematical problem, which problem is based on error: his premises are wrong, therefore his conclusions are false. Why didn't he turn to King James' translation? I will help him to one polygamist, that is Caleb. Why didn't he start with old Caleb and go down and give us name after name and date after date of the polygamists recorded in the history of the Jews while they were in the wilderness? Ladies and gentlemen, he had none to give, and therefore the assertion made yesterday is true, that during the sojourn of the children of Israel in the wilderness there is but one instance of polygamy recorded.

Now we come to the law that I laid down yesterday—"Neither shalt thou take one wife to another." I reaffirm that the translation in the margin is perfect to a word. He labors to show that God does not mean what He says. That phrase, "*one wife to another*," may be equally rendered one woman to another, or one wife to her sister. The very same phrase is used in the other seven passages named by Dr. Dwight. For example Exodus 26, 3, Ezekiel 1, 9, etc. He admits the translation in these passages to be correct. If it is correct in these passages, why is it not correct in the other? His very admission knocks to pieces his argument. Why then does he labor to create the impression that the Hebrew *ishah* means woman, or wife? What is the object of the travail of his soul? The word *ahot*, he contends, means sister; but sister itself, is a word which means a specific relation, and a generic relation. Every woman is sister to every other woman,

and I challenge the gentleman to meet me on paper at any time, in the newspapers of your city or elsewhere upon the Hebrew of this text. I reaffirm it, reaffirm it in the hearing of this learned gentleman, reaffirm it in the hearing of these Hebraists, that as it is said in the margin is the true rendering, namely "neither shalt thou take one wife to another." But supposing that is incorrect, permit me, before I pass on, to remind you of this fact, he refers, I think, in his first speech to the "*margin*;" the "*margin*" was correct then and there, but it is not here. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways: correct when he wants to quote from the "*margin*;" but not when I want to do so. He quoted from the margin, and I followed his illustrious example.

And now, my friends, supposing that the text means just what he says, namely "neither shalt thou take a wife unto her sister to vex her;" supposing that is the rendering, and he asserts it is and he is a Hebraist, I argued and brought the proof yesterday that this law of Moses is not kept by the Mormons, in other words there are men in your very midst who have married sisters. Where was the gentleman's solemn denunciation of the violation of God's law? Why did he not lift his voice and vindicate the divine law? But not a solitary word of disapproval is uttered! Yesterday he pronounced a curse—"cursed is he that confirms not to the words of this law, to do them." Does not the curse rest upon him and upon his people. I gave him the liberty to choose whether this text condemned polygamy, or whether it condemned a man for marrying two sisters; he must take his choice, the horns of the dilemma are before him. For the sake of saving polygamy he stands up here, in the presence of Almighty God and His holy angels, and before this intelligent congregation he admits that in this church, and with this people, God's holy law is set at defiance. What respect, therefore, can we have for the gentleman's argument, drawn from the teachings of Moses, in support of polygamy?

He refers us to the multiplication of horses. I suppose a king may have one horse or two, there is no special rule; but there is a special rule as to the number of wives. Neither shall the king multiply wives. God, in the beginning, gave the first man one wife, and Christ and Paul sustain that law as binding upon us. And now supposing that that is not accepted as a law, what then? Why there is no limit to the number of wives, none at all. How many shall a man have? Seven, twenty, fifty, sixty, a hundred? Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife he shall have a hundred. Well, he ought to go on forsaking; for if he will forsake a hundred he will have ten thousand; and if he forsake ten thousand he will have so many more in proportion. It is his business to go on forsaking. That is in the Professor's book called the *Seer*. Such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating women for him.

I regret very much that I have not time to notice all the points which have been brought forward. I desired to do so. I plead for more time; my friends plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour. Now, I propose to follow out the line of argument which I was pursuing yesterday when my time expired, and I propose to carry out and apply the great law brought forward yesterday, "Neither shall a man take one wife unto another," and in doing this we call your attention to the fact that in the Bible there are only twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases of polygamy, all told, out of thousands and millions of people. I say twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases, which polygamists of our day claim in support of their position. I propose to take up, say half a dozen of the most prominent ones. I divide the period, before the law and after the law. I take up Abraham. It is asserted that he was a polygamist. I deny it. There is no proof that Abraham was guilty of polygamy. What are the facts? When he was called of the Almighty to be the founder of a great nation, a promise was given him that he should have a numerous posterity. At that time he was a monogamist, had but one wife,—the noble Sarah. Six years passed and the promise was not fulfilled. Then Sarah, desiring to help the Lord to keep His promise, brought her Egyptian maid Hagar, and offered her as a substitute for herself to Abraham. Mind you, Abraham did not go after Hagar, but Sarah produced her as a substitute. Immediately after the act was performed Sarah discovered her sin and said, "My wrong be upon thee." "I have committed sin, but I did it for thy sake, and therefore the wrong that I have committed is upon thee." Then look at the subsequent facts: by the Divine command this Egyptian girl was sent away from the abode of Abraham by the mutual consent of the husband and the wife, by the Divine command. It is said that she was recognized as the wife of Abraham, but I say you can not prove it from the Bible; but it is said that she was promised a numerous posterity. It was also foretold that Ishmael should be a wild man,—"*his hand against every man and every man's hand against him*." Did that prediction justify Ishmael in being a robber and a murderer? No, certainly not; neither did the other prediction, that Hagar should have a numerous posterity, justify the action of Abraham in taking her. After she had been sent away by Divine command, God said unto Abraham "now walk before me and be thou perfect."

These are the facts my friends. I know that some will refer you to Keturah; but this is the fact in regard to her: Abraham