

Lamech will find that the murder which he committed grew out of his plurality of wives; in other words it grew out of the polygamy which he had attempted to introduce into the world. Said he to his wives, "I have slain a man;" and the inference is that this man had come to claim his rights.

My friend says that Cain was a murderer, and went down to the land of Nod but he don't exactly know the geography; but it was somewhere. And there he found a woman and married her. Now I affirm this, that when Cain killed his brother Abel he was not married, and he didn't go down to the land of Nod, then, therefore the murder he committed didn't grow out of monogamy, and seems to have had no relation to monogamy; but it grew out of this fact: these two brothers came before the Lord to present their offerings. Cain was a deist, a moralist as we may say, that is he had no sins to repent of. He therefore did not bring the little lamb as a sacrificial offering, but he came with the first fruits of the earth as a thank offering. He comes before God Almighty and says, "I have no sins to atone for, none at all; but here, I am conscious that thou hast created me and that I am dependent upon thee, therefore I present to thee the first fruits of the soil." Abel comes with his thank offering. He brings his lamb and lays it upon the altar, and that lamb pre-intimated the coming of Jesus Christ, who is "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;" and if there is any record that Abel brought a thank offering, it is a principle in theology and in scriptural exposition that the whole includes the part, just as Saint Paul says, "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice to God." Do you think that he excluded the soul? No, he speaks of one as including the other. So the offering which Abel presented was an offering sacrificial in its nature, pointing to Christ. Now, perhaps by sending down fire from heaven, or at all events in some significant manner, God recognized the righteousness of Abel, and expressed a preference for his offering, and Cain was wroth, and his pride belched forth and he slew his brother. The murder, therefore, had no reference, directly or indirectly to marriage, while the murder which the first polygamist mentioned in history committed grew out of the marriage relation.

Then my friend goes back to Adam, and says our first parents wore clothes made of skins, and therefore we must wear similar ones. Well, let us see. Our first parents were placed in a garden and were driven out of a garden, therefore we must be placed in a garden and driven out of a garden. The first man was created out of the dust of the earth, therefore all subsequent men must be created out of the same material. The first woman was created out of man's rib, therefore all subsequent women must be made so. They would make very nice women, no doubt about that! Such is the logic of my friend! So you may follow on his absurdities. He has failed to make a distinction between what is essential to marriage and what is accidental to marriage; or in other words, he has failed to make a distinction between the creation and the fall of man, and between the institution and characteristics of marriage. One, therefore, is surprised at such arguments, and drawn from such premises!

Now, my friends, that first marriage in the garden of Eden is the great model for all subsequent marriages: one man and one woman. My friend says that God could have made more if He had chosen; but He did not do so; and it seems to me, if God Almighty had designed that all us men should be polygamists, and that polygamy should be the form of marriage, that in the very beginning He would have started right, that is, He would have made a number of women for the first man. Ah! what a grand sanction that would be; but instead of that He makes one man and one woman, and says "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

This is not merely an historical fact; were it so I think the argument would be with my friend. But as I come along the stream of time I find this fact referred to as expressing a great law. I hear old Malachi repeating the same words, referring to this institution of marriage in the garden of Eden, reproving the Jews for their practice of polygamy, putting the pungent question to their conscience, "Why have ye dealt treacherously with the wife of your youth?"—Your first wife, the one with whom you went to the bridal altar and swore before high Heaven that you would forsake all others and cleave unto

her so long as you both live. "Ah!" that old prophet asks, "why have you dealt thus treacherously with the wife of your youth and the wife of your covenant?" God hates this putting away, says the prophet, and then he refers to Eden as a reason for his reproof. The reason is purely monogamous, and that in the beginning God created one woman for one man, and one man for one woman.

When the Pharisees propounded a question to the Lord Jesus Christ, touching divorce, He refers to the same grand idea spoken of by the Prophet Malachi: "Have ye not read that in the beginning God created them male and female?" Thus re-enacting, as it were, the marriage law; thus lifting marriage, which had been stained by polygamy, from its degradation, and re-establishing it in its monogamic purity. And then St. Paul, corroborating the words of Jesus, [at this point the umpires said the time was up] refers to the marriage in Eden, and says "God created them, male and female, one flesh." This is the great truth brought out in the Bible.

#### Second Day.

After the opening with religious exercises Prof. Pratt commenced:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We again come before you this afternoon, being the second session of our discussion to examine the question: "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" I will here remark, that yesterday afternoon I occupied one hour upon the subject, and brought forth numerous evidences from the Bible to show that polygamy was a divine institution sanctioned by the Bible, and sanctioned by the Almighty who gave the laws contained in the Bible. Here let me observe that it is of the utmost importance to clearly understand the point under discussion. I perceive that in the arguments that followed me yesterday the subject is dwelt upon somewhat lengthily with regard to the meaning of the term polygamy—that it included both a plurality of wives and a plurality of husbands. Hence a new term was introduced by the reverend Doctor, who followed me namely polygyny, if I recollect the term, having reference to the plurality of wives. This seems to be the question under discussion. Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy? and as the word polygamy appears to be discarded and scouted, it would be: Does the Bible Sanction Polygyny? Perhaps I may not have the term aright; that is Does the Bible sanction plurality of wives? It was said by the speaker who followed me, in relation to the plurality of wives—perhaps I had better refer to some of his remarks from print, lest my memory should not serve me on the occasion. The first remark to which I will call your attention is in regard to the original of the Bible. I admit in this discussion the Bible called King James' translation as authority. I admit the Bible in the original Hebrew, if it can be found. Of course we have Hebrew Bibles at the present day. I hold one in my hand; that is, a Bible in the Hebrew language. But there is no such thing in existence as the original copies of the Bible; neither secondary copies; and copies that might come in as the hundredth copy, I presume cannot be found, as, for instance, of the original law of Moses, written on tables of stone. Such tables and such original have not been in existence to our knowledge for the last eight or ten hundred years. We cannot refer to them; we cannot refer to any copies only those that have been multiplied in modern times—that is, comparatively modern times. And inasmuch as these copies disagree one with the other, so much so that it is said there are thirty thousand different readings in the various manuscripts and copies, who is to decide whether this Hebrew Bible, translated from one of a number of manuscripts, is translated from the original or not? Certainly it would not do for me as an individual to set up my judgment in the matter; nor for any other learned man to set up his judgment. I would far rather take the translation known as King James', made by the able translators chosen in his day; men of great learning who had studied the original languages, the Hebrew and the Greek, and had become extensively acquainted with manuscripts in existence; I say I would far rather take their judgment than one that might be advanced by myself, or by any other learned man, however deeply he might be versed in the Hebrew or Greek. I do not by these remarks disparage the Bible, or set it aside. By no means. I accept it as proof as it was translated by those

men who were chosen for the purpose. And hundreds of thousands, I may say scores of millions of copies of this Bible have been circulated among all nations in various languages. They have been sent forth by millions among the inhabitants of the earth for their information.

We will pass along after having decided upon the nature of the Bible that is to be admitted as evidence and proof in regard to polygamy. It was stated in the course of the remarks of the reverend gentleman in relation to polygamy, or polygyny, which ever term we feel disposed to choose, that marriage with more than one woman is considered adultery. I will read one or two of Mr. Newman's sentences: "Take his exposition"—that is the Savior's—"Take his exposition of the ten commandments as they were given amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, and you find he has written a commentary on the Decalogue, bringing out its hidden meaning, showing to us that the man is an adulterer who not only marries more women than one, but who looks on a woman with salacious lust. Such is the commentary on the law by the Lord Jesus Christ."

With part of this I agree most perfectly. If a man, according to the great commentary of our Savior, looks upon a woman with a lustful heart and lustful desire, he commits adultery in his heart, and is condemned as an adulterer. With the other part, I do most distinctly disagree. It is merely an assertion of the reverend gentleman. No proof was adduced from the New Testament Scriptures; no proof was advanced as the words of the great commentator, the Lord Jesus Christ, to establish that position that a man who marries more than one woman is an adulterer. If there is such a passage contained within the lids of the New Testament, it has not come under my observation. It remains to be proved, therefore.

We will now pass on to another item, that is the meaning of the word "sanction." "Does the Bible sanction polygamy?" I am willing to admit the full force and meaning of the word sanction. I am willing to take it in all of its expositions as set forth in Webster's unabridged edition. I do not feel like shirking from this, nor from the definition given. Let it stand in all its force. The only adequate idea of sanction, says Mr. Newman, is a divine and positive approbation, plainly expressed; or stated so definitely and by such forms of expression as to make a full and clear equivalent. It is in this way that we take the term sanction in the question before us. Admit that it must be expressed in definite terms, these terms were laid before the congregation yesterday afternoon. From this Bible, King James' translation, passage after passage was brought forth to prove the divine sanction of polygamy; direct commands in several instances, wherein the Israelites were required to be polygamists; and in one instance, especially, where they were required under the heaviest curse of the Lord: "Cursed be he that continueth not in all things written in this book of the law; and let all the people say Amen," was the expression. I say, under this dreadful curse and the denunciations of the Almighty, the people were commanded to be polygamists. Did this give authority and sanction to practice that divine institution? It certainly is sanction, or I do not understand the meaning of the word as defined by Webster, and the meaning of the arguments presented by my opponent. I waited in vain yesterday afternoon for any rebutting evidence and testimony against this divine sanction. I was ready with my pencil and paper to record anything like such evidence, any passage from the Bible to prove that it was not sanctioned. I heard a remarkable sermon, a wonderful flourish of oratory. It fell upon me like the dews of heaven, as it were, so far as oratorical power was concerned. But where was the rebutting testimony? What was the evidence brought forth? Forty-nine minutes of the time were occupied before it was even referred to; forty-nine minutes passed away in a flourish of oratory, without having the proofs in rebuttal and the evidence examined which I had adduced. Then eleven minutes were left. I did expect to hear something in those eleven minutes that would in some small degree rebut the numerous evidences brought forth to establish and sanction polygamy. But I waited in vain. To be sure, one passage, and only one that had been cited, in Deuteronomy, was merely referred to; and then without examining the passage and trying to show that it did not command polygamy, another item that was referred to by myself with regard to Lamech

and Cain was brought up. Instead of an examination of that passage, until the close of the eleven minutes, the subject of Abel's sacrifice and Cain's sacrifice, and Cain's going to the land of Nod and marrying a wife, and so on, occupied the time. All these things were examined, and those testimonies that were brought forth by me were untouched.

Now, then, we will proceed to the fourth, or rather to the fifth position he took: that is the first great form of marriage established in the beginning—"one woman created for one man." However, before I dwell upon this subject, let me make a correction with regard to Cain and Lamech; then we will commence on this argument. I did not state yesterday afternoon, as it was represented by the speaker who followed me, that Cain went to the land of Nod and there married a wife, for there is no such thing in the Bible. I stated that Cain went to the land of Nod, after having murdered his brother Abel. I stated that we were not to suppose that God had created any woman in the land of Nod, and that Cain took his wife in the land of Nod. We are not to suppose this; but we are to suppose that he took his wife with him. He went to and arrived in the land of Nod, and begat a child. So says the Bible. But what has all this to do with regard to the form of marriage? Does it prove anything? No. The murder that Cain committed in slaying his brother Abel does not prove anything against the monogamic form of marriage, nor anything in favor of it. It stands as an isolated fact, showing that a wicked man may be a monogamist. How in regard to Lamech? Lamech, so far as recorded in the Bible, was the first polygamist; the first on record. There may have been thousands and tens of thousands who were not recorded. There were thousands and tens of thousands of monogamists, yet, I believe, we have only three cases recorded from the creation to the flood, a period of some sixteen hundred years or upwards. The silence of scripture, therefore, in regard to the number of polygamists in that day, is no evidence whatever.

But it has been asserted before this congregation that this first case recorded of a polygamist brought in connection with it a murder; and it has been indicated or inferred that the murder so committed was in defence of polygamy. This I deny; and I call upon the gentleman to bring forth one proof from that Bible, from the beginning to the end of it, to prove that murder had anything to do in relation to the polygamic form of marriage of Lamech. It is true he revealed his crime to his wives, but the cause of the crime is not stated in the book. What, then, had it to do with the divinity of the great institution established called polygamy? Nothing at all. It does not condemn polygamy nor justify it, any more than the murder by Cain does not condemn the other form of marriage nor justify it.

Having disposed of these two cases, let me come to the first monogamist, Adam. Let us examine his character, and the character of his wife. Lamech "slew a young man to his wounding a young man to his hurt." That was killing one, was it not? How many did Adam kill? All mankind; murdered the whole human race! How? By falling in the garden of Eden. Would mankind have died if it had not been for the sin of this monogamist? No. Paul says "that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." It was by the transgression of this first monogamist and his monogamic wife, that all mankind have to undergo the penalty of death. It was the cause; and I presume it will be acknowledged on the part even of monogamists that it was a great crime. What can be compared with it? Was Cain's crime, or Lamech's crime to be compared with the crime of bringing death and destruction, not only upon the people of the early ages, but upon the whole human race? But what has all that to do with regard to the divinity of marriage? Nothing at all. It does not prove one thing or the other. But when arguments of this kind are entered into by the opponents of polygamy, it is well enough to examine them and see if they will stand the test of scripture, and sound reason, of sound argument and sound judgment. Moreover, Adam was not only guilty of bringing death and destruction upon the whole human race, but he was the means of introducing fallen humanity into this world of ours. Why did Cain slay Abel? Because he was a descendant of that fallen being. He had come forth from the loins of the man who had brought death unto the world. When we look abroad and see