## (Continued from First page.)

According to Dr. Edwards, the words which are translated a "wife" or "sister, are found in the Hebrew but eight times, and in each passage they refer to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, tenons, mortises, etc., and signify the coupling together one to another, the same as thou shalt not take one wife to another.

Such then is the laws Such were the ordinances forbidden, which the Egyptians and the Canaanites practiced. Now we propose to push this argument a little further. If it is said that this passage does not prohibit a man marrying two sisters at the same time, then such a marriage is nowhere in the Bible pronounced incestuous. That is the objection of my friend. To which I reply that such a marriage is forbidden by sequence and analogy. As for example, where the son, in the 7th verse, is prohib-ited from marrying his mother, it follows that the daughter shall not marry her father; yet it is not so given and precisely stated. In verse 14 it is said "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother;" so I infer that it would be equally criminal to uncover the nakedness of a mother's brother, though it is not so stated. In verse 16 it is said "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," so I infer that a man shall not uncover the nakedness of his wife's sister, that is, if two brothers shall not take the same woman, then two women shall not take the same man, for between one man and two sisters, and one woman and two brothers' is the sa ne degree of proximity, and therefore both are forbidden by the law of God. Further-more, if for argument's sake, we consider this means two literal sisters, then this prohibition is not a permission for a man to take two wives who are not sisters; for all sound jurists will agree that a prohibition is one thing and a permission is another thing. Nay, more, the Mormons do or do not receive the law of Moses as binding. That they do not is clear from their own practices. For instance, in Leviticus, xx chap. and 14 verse, it is said that

"And if a man take a wife and her mother, it 4 wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they."

Yet Mr. John Hyde, jr., page 56 of his work called "Mormonian," states that a Mr. E. Bolton married a woman and her daughter; that Captain Brown married a woman and her two daughters. These are illustrations of the violation of the law. More than this, Leviticus xviil, 18, prohibits a man from marrying two sisters; yet Mr. Hyde informs us that a Mr. Davis married three sisters, and that a Mr. Sharkey married the same number. If the question is, Is the law of Moses obeyed here or not? and supposing this gentleman can prove that the text means two literal sisters, and two literal sisters are married here, then I affirm that you do not keep God's law, or that which you say is God's law, as given through His servant Moses. Nay, more than this: if it here means two literal sisters, and, whereas, Jacob married two sisters; and, whereas, the great Mormon doctrine that God worked a miracle on Leah and Rachel that they might have children; and, whereas, it is here said that said miracles were an approval of polygamy, so also were such miracles an approval of incest; if it be true that God did not express this approval and Jacob having two wives, neither did he express disapproval of his having two sisters; therefore the divine silence in the one case is an offset to the Divine silence in the other case. Even you are driven to this conclusion, either my interpretation of this passage is correct,-neither shall a man take another wife,-two wives, or you must admit that this passage means two literal sisters, and in either case you live in viola-tion of God's law. It is for my distinguished friend to choose which horn of the dilemma be pleases. I thank him for the com-pliment he paid me, that I came here as a philanthropist. I have only kindness in my heart for these dear men and women; and had not this kindness filled my heart; had I believed in a crushing, iron, civil law I could have remained in Washington. But I come here believing the truth as it is in Jesus, and I am glad to say that I have the privilege of speaking what I believe to be God's truth in your hearing. The gentleman quoted Deuteronomy 21st, 15-17, which is the law of primegeniture, and is designed to preserve the descent of property:

woman, whom he has wronged, her food, her raiment and her dwelling, and these are the facts; and the gentleman has not proved, the gentlemon can not prove, that either the father or the son marry the girl. He says the honored term "wife" is there. Honored term! God bless that term! It is an honored term, sacred as the nature of angels. Yet I have to inform my distin-guished friend that the word wife is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek, but simply "if he take another," that is if he betroth another, and then change his mind he shall do thus and so. Where then is the gentleman's general law in approval of polygamy?

The next passage is recorded in Deuter-onomy 25 chap., and from the 5th to the 10th verses, referring to the preservation of fami-

"If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her unto him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her.

"And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother watch is dead; that his name be not put out of Israel.

"And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my hus-band's brother. band's brother:

"Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and W he stand gots, and say, I

speak unto him: and W he stand wow, and say, I like not to take her: "Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his aboe from oil his feet, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house. "And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed."

What is the object of this law? Evidently the preservation of families and family in-heritances. And now I challenge the gentleman to bring forward a solitary instance in the Bible where a married man was compelled to obey this law. Take the case of Tamar! Certainly the brother that was to know how she lost her noble manion and out beyond Jordan, and how she returned to Bethlehem, and goes to Boaz, a near kins-man, and demands that he shall margy her. Boaz says "there is another kinsman. I will speak to him." It is asked "Didn't Boas take another wife. This is not polygany. ried?" but yet that was not the business of this prophet, Hoses, was first commanded to should appear at the gate of the city before the elders, and there either marry her or say that he was disqualified because he was already a married man; and there is no proof in the Bible that Boaz had been married; nay, more than this, old Josephus, the Jewish historian, asserts that the reason why the historian, asserts that the reason why the near kinsman did not marry Buth was that he had a wife and children already, so I judge that this law, which is said to be general, is that that I laid down "Neither shall a man take one wife unto another," etc. He refers me to Numbers 31st, 17th and 18th verses.

What are the significant points in this passage! They are simply biasson-Accord-ing to the Jorish law a destinute Jow was permitted to apprentice his daughter for and to guard the rights of this girl there were certain conditions; First, the period of her master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the master or his son should marry the girl, but the father nor the son marry the girl, but the father nor the son marry the girl, but the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry the girl, but the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son the son marry her, but before the young man changed his mind, and then the son the rises the following panal-ties, namely that he shall provide for this were the facts; and the geatleman has not proved, the geatleman has not proved, the geatleman has not proved, the geatleman has not drow; that the proved, the geatleman has not prove, that the son data marry marry the girl. The set proves the argument and her dwelling, and there are the facts; and the g

That is, says Newcomb, a wife from among the Isrealites, who were remarkable for spir-itual fornication. My friend is so determined on a literal interpretation that he gives a lit-eral interpretation, whereas this distinguished biblical scholar says that it was not literal fornication, but rather spiritual; in other words, idolatry; for in the Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, idolatry is

"Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabit-ants of the land, and they go s whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou sat of his sacrifice."

The 14th verse of the same chapter save:

"For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God."

He therefore sees thee with indignation join thyself in marriage to one of those who had committed fornication or spiritual idolatry, lest they should raise up children who, by the power of example, might lay themselves under the terribleness of idolatry. The prophet is directed to get a wife of whore-doms; and, after this, he is directed to go and love an adulterous woman. My friend cites these as examples where God makes and exception to a general law. He also cites the case of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the case of consanguinity, in Deuteronomy xxy, from 5th to 10th verse. Now the first three cases were merely typical; the first two were designed to set forth more impressively the relations between God and His people. The case of consanguinity has nothing to do with polygamy. It is only a modification or exception in special cases for the preservation of the families of Israel from have married her could not have been a mar-ried man, because she had to wait antil he grew up. Then take the case of Ruth. You know how she lost her noble Mablon afar of general law?

T.& W. TAYLOR Z. C. M. Dry Goods.

yet that is the argument ant that is the logical conclusion. The last passage my friend referred to was the 1st Chapter of Hosea and 2d verse. "The beginning of the word of, the Lord by Hosea. And the Lord said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee s wife of whorodoms and children of whoredoms for the land hath committed great whoredoms, departing from the Lord." laws were general, applying to all men, mar-ried or unmarried. Has he proved it? This CHEAPER is wholly gratuitous. There is no word in either of these passages which permits or di-rects a married man to take more than one wife at a time. I challenge the gentleman for the proof. It is no evidence of the sanc-

tion of polygamy to bring passage after pass-age, which, he knows, if construed in favor mentioned under the term fornication. God calls himself the husband of Israel, and this chosen nation owed Him the fidelity of a wife, Exodus the 34th Chapter and 15th verse: the time was up,)

COMPANY.

and WEST, to all the

Principal points in

America & Europe,

Both from this City and by their own lines

NORTH AND SOUTH,

THE **MINERS & BUILDERS** TELEGRAPH COMP DESERET

UMBER will be sold cheap at the New Min 8 Miles up Little Cottonwood, or at E. T. MUMFORD'S 14th Ward. Is now prepared through having made connection with the Orders promptly filled. ATLANTIC and PACIFIC TELEGRAPH THAM'S WANTED TO HAUL

d193 ly

Sinbs, 81.50; per Cord, at the Mill-To transmit Business EAST C. B. HAWLEY.

d189 2m

Have a Well Assorted Stock of

Hardware,

Crockery,

AT THEIR STORE ON

EAST TEMPLE ST.

NOTICE !

Clothing,

Groceries.

W. F. ANDERSON, H. D., Surgeon and Physician,

Office at Besidence, 13th Ward. 4251:11

From all important places in the Territory, W. H. Hooper, H.S. Eldredge, L.S. Hills We are also prepared to furnish daily

BANKERS.

The Several Departments of this Institution are now

COMPLETELY STOCKEDI

And the PRICES are

LOWER THAN EVER

## Etc. DRY GOODS THAN EVER

DEPARTMENT.

GROCERY

DEPARTMENT

CLOTHING

DEPARTMENT.

U DEPARTMENT.

Orders are now coming inifer

MACHINERY

And those who intend Ordering or Purchas-ing, would consult their own interest

d95-tf

BY CALLING EARLY

PLOWS,

D

"If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have borne him children, base the beloved and the hated; and if the first born son be hers that was hated; "Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit had which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son

of the hated, which is indeed the first-born: "But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his."

How did heapply this law? Why he first assumed the prevalence of polygamy among the Jews in the wilderness, and then said the law was made for polygamous families as well as for monogamous. He says "inasmuch as polygamy is no where says "inasmuch as polygamy is no where condemned in the law of God, we are en-titled to construe this law as applying to polygamists. But I have shown already that Lev. 18, 18, is a positive prohibition of this law, and therefore this passage must be interpreted by that which I have quoted. I propose to erect the balance to-day, and try treatment of a captive woman by the con-every scriptural argument which he has queror who desires her for a wife, and has

has two wives in succession, that he may love the last a little better than the first! and I believe it is common out here to love the last a little better than the first. And how natural it is for the second wife to in-fluence the father in the disposition of his property so that he will conter it upon her child! While the children of the first wife, Dear worran parhage dead and more a wife, Dear worran parhage dead and more a wife, and if a man entice a maid that is not befroth-ed, and if a man entice a maid that is not befroth-ed, and if a man entice a maid that is not befroth-ed, and if a man entice a maid that is not befroth-de his wife. "If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins."

"Now therefore kill every male among the lit-tie ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. "But all the women-children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for

He quotes Deuteronomy, 21st, 10th and and

13th verses:

"When thou goest forth to war against thind enemies, and the Lord Thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them

captive, "And seest among the captives a beautiful wo-man, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to be thy wife; "Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house, and she shall shave her, head, and pare her

This passage is designed to regulate the treatment of a captive woman by the con-

Produced in the scales of justica. I have recited to you God's solemn law, —"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another;" and I will try every passage by this law. My friend spent an hour hare yesterday in seeking a general law; in a minute I gave you a general law. How na-tural is this supposition that where a man has two wives in succession, that he man

He quoted Exodus 22d chap., 16] and 17, and Deuteronomy 22, and 28 and 29.

Boaz. The divine law required that this man take a woman guilty of adulteryor fornication, and then to take an adulteress, and the representation was made that he took them and had them at the same time; whereas, if Mr. Pratt had read a little further, he would find that the prophet divorced the first wife for adultery, and he had a right to do it; and after he divorced her, then he went and took a second wife.

Professor Pratt admits, mark you, admits that none of these passages, nor all of them together can afford in this day a warrant for the practice of polygamy. Gives it up! Turns the Bible aside! I will read to you from his own words:

"Now therefore kill every male among the lit-the eness and kill every momen that hath known man by lying with him. "But all the women-children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep! allye for yourselves." This passage has nothing whatever to do with polygamy. It is an account of the results of a military expedition of the Jews against the Midianites; their slaughter of a portion of the people, and their reduction of the re-mainder to slavery,—namely the women for domestics. My friend dwells upon thirty-two thousand women that were saved! What were these among the Jewish nation,—a peo-ple numbering two and a half millions? He quotes Deuteronomy, 21st. Toth and and

Then he yields the point! I respectfully ask him, if this is his position why doas he asttmpt, in all his writings, and to establish it in that clever book, the Secri Why did he, this system here, not because the Jews did it; not because the Divine law sanctioned it years ago; but because a certain man of the name of Smith received a revelation that this

my friends, can see the logical conclusion, or in other words the illogical bearing. Now, I come to the assumptions by the gentleman. First, that there is no law con-demning or ferbidding polygamy. Has he proved that? Second, that the Hebrew ma-tion, as it was in the wilderness, when the Mosaic code was given, was polygaming Mosaic code was given, was polygamous. Has he proved that? Can he find in the Mossic code was given, was polygamous. Has he proved that? Can he find in the whole history of the Jewish nation from the time they left Egypt to the time they entared the land of Canaan, can he find more than one instance of polygamy? Per-haps ha may find two. I will be glad to re-ceive that information, for I am a man seek-ing light; and to day I throw down a chal-lenge to your eminent defender of the faith, to produce more than two instances of polygamy, from the time the Jews left the iand of Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. I will assist him in his research and tell him one, and that was Caleb. Now supposing that a marder should be com-mitted in your city, would it be fair for Eastern papers to say that the Mormons are a murderous people? No, I would rise up in defence of your I would say that that is a crime and an injury to the people here! Yet, during a period of forty years we find one man out of two millions and a half of people practicing polygamy, and my friend come sforward and assumes that the Israel-ites were polygamists.



I am manufacturer and general dealer in Pure Unadulterated Vinegar and Fine and Coarse NEW STYLES! GOOD QUALITIES! lait

Try me once and see whether business is managed satisfactorily.





DRESS GOODS

LOW PRICES



DEDVOID OR PLOYOD, DICOVOD, CL

JAMES HACUE.

EAST TEMPLE STREET