

lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah; the energy miraculously given to Abraham's body for the generation of Isaac was continued after Sarah's death; but to suppose that he took Keturah during Sarah's life time is to do violence to his moral character. But it is said he sent away the sons of Keturah with presents during his life time, therefore it must have been during the life time of Sarah. He lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah, and he sent these sons away eight years before his death, and they were from twenty-five to thirty years old. Then this venerable Patriarch stands forth as a monogamist and not as a polygamist.

Then we come to the case of Jacob. What are the facts in regard to him? Brought up in the sanctity of monogamy; after having robbed his brother of his birth-right, after having lied to his blind old father, he then steals away and goes to Padan-aram and there falls in love with Rachel; but in his bridal bed he finds Rachel's sister Leah. He did not enter polygamy voluntarily, but he was imposed upon. As he had taken advantage of the blindness of his father and thereby imposed upon him, so also was he imposed upon by Laban in the darkness of the night. But I hold this to be true that Jacob is nowhere regarded as a saintly man prior to his conversion at the brook Jabbok. After that he appears to us in a saintly character. It is a remarkable fact that Jacob lived 147 years all told, eighty-seven of which he lived before he became a polygamist. He lived twenty-two years in polygamy, he lived forty years after he had abandoned polygamy, so that out of 147 years there were only twenty-two years during which he had any connection with polygamy.

I wish my friend had referred to the case of Moses. In his sermon on celestial marriage he claims that Moses was a polygamist, and he declares that the leprosy that was sent upon Miriam was for her interference with the polygamous marriage of Moses. What are the facts? There is no record of a second marriage. Zipporah is the only name given as the wife of Moses. What, then, is the assertion made? Simply this: It is recorded, and Moses was content to dwell with Jethro. He gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter. Josephus speaks of Jethro having two daughters, and distinctly says that he gave Moses one of them. In Numbers xii, and 1st it is said:

"And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman."

Now it is affirmed that two women are here mentioned, whereas nothing can be more untrue. Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman are one and identical; it is one and the same person called by different names. Let us see: The father of Zipporah was the priest of Midian; and according to the best authorities Midian and Ethiopia are identical terms, and apply to that portion of Arabia where Jethro lived. So the appellation Midian, Ethiopia and Arabia are applied to the Arabian peninsula. See Appleton's American Encyclopedia, volumes 6, 7 and 11. Then Moses, the Jewish law-giver, stands forth as a monogamist, having but one wife. Moses was not a polygamist. Surely the founder of a polygamist nation and the revealer of a polygamist law, as this gentleman claims, should have set an example, and should have had a dozen or a hundred wives. This son of Jochbed: he was a monogamist, and stands forth as being a reproof to polygamists in all generations.

Now, we come to Gideon. And what about this man? An angel appeared to him, that is true; but if the practice of polygamy by Gideon is a law to us, then the practice of idolatry by Gideon is also a law to us. If there is silence in the Bible touching the polygamy of Gideon, there is also silence in the Bible touching his idolatry, and if one is sanctioned so also is the other.

I wish my friend had brought up the case of Hannah, the wife of Elkanah. I can prove to a demonstration that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah; but being barren Elkanah takes another wife. But Hannah, in the anxiety of her heart pleads to the Almighty, and God honored her motherhood by answering her prayer. It is asked "Is not this a sanction of polygamy?" Nay, a sanction of monogamy, because she was the first wife of Elkanah, and because Elkanah had been guilty of infidelity and married another wife, was that a reason why Hannah should not have her rights from High Heaven, why God Almighty should not answer her prayer? You ask me why did not she pray before. Can you tell me why Isaac did not pray twenty years sooner for his wife Rebecca that she might have children? I can not tell, and you can not tell, all that I assert is that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah, and God honored and blessed the beautiful Samuel.

Now we come to David. Why did not my friend bring up David, the great warrior, king and poet, the ruler of Israel. He might have mentioned him, with ten wives all told; he might also have mentioned him as the adulterer, who committed one of the most premeditated cold-blooded murders on record simply to cover up his crime of adultery. How often do you hear quoted the words "and I gave thy master's wives into thy bosom?" Is this an approval of polygamy? If you will read on you will find also that God also promises to give his (David's) wives to another, and that another should lie with them in the sight of the sun. Surely if one is an approval of polygamy the other is an approval of rebellion and incest! David lived to be seventy-five years old. He was twenty-

seven years old when he took his first wife Michael, the daughter of Saul. For the next forty years we find him complicated with the evils, crimes and sorrows of polygamy; and the old man, seeing its great sin, thoroughly repented of it and put it away from him, and for the last eight years of his life endeavored to atone, as best he could, for his troubled and guilty experience.

And what of Solomon? He is the greatest polygamist,—the possessor of a thousand wives! Had this gentleman told me that Solomon's greatness was predicted, and therefore his polygamic birth was approved, and his polygamic marriage also approbated, I can remind him of the fact that the future greatness of Christ was foretold; but the foretelling of the future greatness of the Lord Jesus Christ was not an approval of the betrayal by Judas and the crucifixion by the Jews. Neither was the mere foretelling of the future greatness of Solomon an approval of the polygamic character of his birth.

I suppose the gentleman on this occasion would have referred to the law of bastardy and have said, if my doctrine is true, then Solomon and others were bastards. I could have wished that he had produced that point. He did quote and declare in his temple, not long since, in reference to the law touching bastardy, that a bastard should be branded with infamy to the tenth generation. But it is plain that he has misunderstood the law respecting bastards, as contained in Deuteronomy 23d and 2d. It is known from history that the same signification has not always been attached to this term. We say a bastard is one born out of wedlock, that is monogamous matrimony. In Athens, in the days of Pericles, five centuries before Christ, all were declared bastards by law who were not the children of native Athenians. And we here assert to-day that the gentleman can not bring forward a law from the book of Jewish laws to prove that a child born of a Jew and Jewess, whether married or not, was a bastard. The only child recognised as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman; therefore the objection falls to the ground, and Solomon and others, who were not to blame for the character of their birth, are exonerated.

The geometrical progression of evil in this system of polygamy is seen in the first three kings, Saul, David and Solomon. Saul had a wife and a concubine,—two women; David had ten women, Solomon had a thousand, and it broke the kingdom asunder. God says it was for that very cause. He had multiplied his wives to such an extent, that they had not only led him astray from God into idolatry, but the very costliness of his harem was a burden upon the people too heavy for them to bear. I said the other day that polygamy might do for kings and priests and nabobs, and could not do for poor men; it costs too much and the people are taxed too much to support the harem.

Ah! you bring forward these few cases of polygamy! Name them if you please. Lamech the murderer; Jacob, who deceived his blind old father, and robbed his brother of his birthright; David, who seduced another man's wife and murdered that man by putting him in front of the battle, and old Solomon, who turned to be an idolater. These are some polygamists! Now let me call the roll of honor: There were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Aaron, Joshua and Joseph and Samuel and all the prophets and apostles. You are accustomed to hear, from this sacred place, that all the patriarchs and all the kings and all the prophets were polygamists. I assert to the contrary, and these great and eminent men whom I have just mentioned, belonging to the roll of honor, were monogamists.

Yesterday the gentleman gave me three challenges; he challenged me to show that the New Testament condemned polygamy. I now proceed to do it. I quote Paul's words, 1st Corinthians, 7th chap., 2d and 4th verses:

"Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband."

"The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife."

Marriage is a remedy against fornication, and this is the subject of the chapter. This is the opinion of Clark, Henry, Whitby,—Langley and others. One great evil prevailed at Corinth,—a community of wives, which the apostle here calls fornication. St. Paul strikes at the very root of the evil and commands that every man have his own wife and that every woman have her own husband; that is, let every man have his own peculiar, proper and appropriate wife, and the wife her own proper, peculiar and appropriate husband. In this there is mutual appropriation and exclusiveness of right, and this command of Paul agrees with the law of Moses in Leviticus 18, 18, "Neither shalt thou take one wife unto another," and the two are one statute, clear and unquestionable for monogamy and against polygamy. The apostle teaches the reciprocal duties of husband and wife, and the exclusive right of each. In verse four it is distinctly affirmed that the husband has exclusive power over the body of his wife, as the wife has exclusive power over the body of her husband. It is universally admitted that this passage proves the exclusive right of the husband to the wife, and by parity it also proves the exclusive right of the wife to the husband. These relations are mutual, and if the husband can claim a whole wife, the wife can claim a whole husband. She has just as good a right to a whole husband as he has a right to a whole wife. First Corinthians, 6th chap., 15th, 16th and 17th verses, says:

"Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of

Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid."

"What! know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? for two (saith he) shall be one flesh."

"But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit."

This passage is brought against the idea, but what are the facts? It is objected that if one flesh is conclusively expressive of wedlock, that St. Paul affirms that sexual commerce with a harlot is marriage. For argument's sake I accept the assertion. The passage in question is: "What! know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body?" "For two," says he, "shall be one flesh, but he which is joined to the Lord is one spirit." Now look at the facts of the position, showing the true relation of the believer to Christ. It is illustrated under the figure of marriage. The design of this figure is to show that the believer becomes one with Christ; and the apostle further explains, in reproof of the Corinthians mingling with idolaters and adulterers, that by this mingling they become assimilated and identical. He brings up an illustration that if a man is married to a harlot, not simply joined, but cohabit with or married to a harlot he becomes identical with her; in other words one flesh.

There is a passage which declares that "a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." It is asserted that he must have one wife anyhow and as many more as he pleases. It is supposed that this very caution indicates the prevalence of polygamy in that day; but no proof can be brought to bear that polygamy prevailed extensively at that time; on the contrary I am prepared to prove that polygamists were not admitted into the Christian Church, for Paul lays down the positive command, "Let every man have his own wife and every woman have her own husband;" so that if you say the former applies to the priest, and the latter applies to the layman, what is good for the priest is good for the layman, and vice versa.

How often is it asserted here that monogamy has come from the Greeks and Romans. But look at the palpable contradiction in the assertion. It is asserted that monogamy came from those nations; it is also asserted that polygamy was universal at the time of Christ and His apostles. If monogamy came from the Greeks and Romans, then polygamy could not have been universally prevalent, for it is admitted that at that time the Romans held universal sway, and wherever they held sway their laws prevailed, hence the two statements cannot be reconciled.

Now we come to the words of the Savior, Matthew v, 27 and 28; and xix, 8 and 9, and Mark x and 11 and 12. At that time when the Savior was discoursing with the Pharisees, as recorded in Matthew xix, the Jews were divided as to the interpretation of the law of Moses touching divorce: when a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it comes to pass that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorce. Upon the meaning of the word uncleanness, the Jews differed; some agreed with the school of Rabbi Hillel: that a man might dismiss his wife for the slightest offence, or for no offence at all, if he found another woman that pleased him better; but the school of Rabbi Shammai held that the term uncleanness means moral delinquency. The Pharisees came to Christ, hoping to involve Him in this controversy; He declined, but took advantage of the opportunity to give them a discourse on marriage, and in doing so, he refers to the original institution, saying "have ye not read that in the beginning God made them male and female?" Thus He brings out the great law of monogamy. Grant that the allusion is incidental, nevertheless, it is all important as falling from the lips of the Great Master.

I was challenged to show that polygamy is adultery. The gentleman challenged me, and I will now proceed to prove it. As adultery is distinguished in scripture from whoredom and fornication, it is proper to ascertain the exact meaning of the words as used by the sacred writers. The word translated whoredom is from the Hebrew verb *Zanah* and the Greek *porneia*, and means pollution, defilement, lewdness, prostitution and in common parlance, whoredom, the prostitution of the body for gain. The word translated fornication is from the same Hebrew verb, and, in general, signifies criminal, sexual intercourse without the formalities of marriage. Adultery is from the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moicheia* and is the criminal intercourse of a married woman with another man than her husband, or of a married man with any other woman than his wife. This is indicated by the philological significance of the term *adulterate*, compounded of two words meaning *to another*, as the addition of pure and impure liquors, or of an alloy with pure metal. Adulterer is from the Hebrew *Naaph* and the Greek *Moichos* which mean as above.

The material question to be settled is, Is the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moichos* or *Moicheia* confined to the criminal sexual intercourse between a man, married or unmarried, with a married woman? This is the theory of the Mormon polygamists, but I join issue with them and assert that the scriptures teach that adultery is committed by a married man who has sexual intercourse with a woman other than his wife, whether said woman is married or unmarried. It is conceded that he is an adulterer who has carnal connection with a woman married or betrothed. Thus far we agree.

Now can it be proved that the sin of adultery is committed by a married man

having carnal connection with a woman neither married nor betrothed? To prove this point I argue.

First, that the Hebrew word *Naaph*, translated in the seventh commandment, adultery does include all criminal sexual intercourse. It is a generic term and the whole includes the parts. It is like the word kill in the sixth commandment, which includes all those passions and emotions of the human soul which lead to murder, such as jealousy, envy, malice, hatred, revenge. So this word *Naaph* includes whoredom, fornication, adultery, and even salacious lust. Matthew 5th, 27, 29.

Second. The terms adultery and fornication are used interchangeably by our Lord, and mean the same thing. A married woman copulating with a man other than her husband is admitted to be adultery, but the highest authority we can bring forward calls the act fornication, Matthew 5th, 3, 2. Romans 7th, 2, 3; 1st Corinthians 7th 1, 4.

Third. The carnal connection of a man with an unmarried woman is positively declared to be adultery in God's holy word. It is so recorded in Job 24, from the 15th to the 21st verse; and in Isaiah 57 and 3rd it is taught that the adulterer commits his sin with the whore. Therefore I conclude that the term *Naaph*, as used in the seventh commandment comprehends all those modification of that crime, down to the salacious lust that a man may feel in his soul for a woman.

But it may be asked: If this is so why then, does the Mosaic law mention a married woman? We deny that such a distinction is made. We do admit, however, that special penalties were pronounced on such an action with a married woman, but for special reasons. What were they? To preserve the genealogy, parentage and birth of Christ from interruption and confusion, which were in imminent danger when intercourse with a married woman was had by a man other than her husband. And no such danger could arise from the intercourse with a married man with an unmarried woman. That law was temporary, and was abolished and passed away when Christ came. Under the Jewish dispensation he that cohabited with a woman other than his wife was responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment; the woman was also responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. But here you say if this be true, then some great men in Bible times were guilty of the violation of the seventh commandment. I say they were; but they were not all polygamists; that I have demonstrated to you to-day. But take the facts: Abraham, when convinced of his sin put away Hagar; Jacob lived several years out of the state of polygamy; David put away all his wives eight years before he died; and if there is no account that Solomon put away his, neither is there the assurance that he abandoned his idolatry.

This then, my friend, is the argument; and as a Christian minister, desiring only your good, I proclaim the fact that polygamy is adultery. I do it in all kindness, but I assert it as a doctrine taught in the Bible.

I am challenged again to prove that polygamy is no prevention of prostitution. It has been affirmed time and time again, not only in this discussion, but in the written works of these distinguished gentlemen around me, that in monogamic countries prostitution, or what is known as the social evil, is almost universally prevalent. I perceive that I have not time to follow out this in arguments; but I am prepared to prove, and I will prove it in your daily papers, that prostitution is as old as authentic history; that prostitution has been and is to-day more prevalent in polygamic countries than in monogamic countries. I can prove that the figures representing prostitution in monogamic countries are all overdrawn. They are overdrawn in regard to my native city, that the gentleman brought up, New York, and of the million and over of population he can not find six thousand recorded prostitutes. I can go, for instance, to St. Louis, where they have just taken the census of the prostitutes of that city, and with a population of three hundred thousand, there are but 650 courtesans. You may go through the length and breadth of this land, and in villages containing from one thousand to ten thousand inhabitants, you cannot find a house of prostitution. The truth is, my friends, they would not allow it for a moment. Those men who assert that our monogamous country is full of prostitutes put forth a slander upon our country.

Our distinguished friend referred to religious liberty, and claimed that he had the right under the Federal Constitution to enjoy religious liberty and to practise polygamy. I am proud as he is that we have religious liberty here. I rejoice that a man can worship God after his own heart; but I affirm that the law of limitation is no less applicable to religious liberty than it is to the revolution of the heavenly bodies. The law of limitation is as universal as creation, and religious liberty must be practised within the bounds of decency, and the well-being of society; and civil authority may extend or restrict this religious liberty within due bounds. Why, the Hindoo mother may come here with her *Shasta*—with her Bible—and she may throw her babe into your river or lake, and the civil authority, according to your theory, could not interpose and say to that mother, "You shall not do it." That is the theory. You say it is murder, I say it is not. I say the