

DR. NEWMAN'S MARGINAL LAW.

"And thou shalt not take one wife to another, to vex her, &c." Marginal reading, Leviticus xviii: 18.

In a letter of Rev. Dr. Newman, published in this city on the 20th inst., he labors very hard to bring together and patch up the demolished and tattered fragments of his great fundamental marginal law against polygamy. Having noticed the great stress laid upon this marginal reading in his Washington sermon, I was in great hopes that he would again introduce it in the discussion. To call him out and give him confidence in appealing to the margin, in my opening speech I purposely referred to a non-essential marginal reading in the 25th of Deuteronomy: this had the desired effect; for on the next day, the Rev. Dr. assumed the marginal reading given above, as the great constitutional law, before which all other laws relating to plural marriage, were to be nullified and vanish away like smoke: he made it the grand standard, —the foundation of nearly all his future arguments, during the discussion.

On the third day, a few minutes were occupied in comparing his marginal law with the original Hebrew, showing that the marginal reading was false, and could not for a moment stand the test of the original. But being limited in time, the arguments were necessarily very brief. I now purpose to examine this unwarranted reading in the margin in greater detail, and expose still further its falsity, and establish the correctness of the version, given in the text by the English translators.

The phrase, *ishah el-ahotah* is translated in the text "a wife to her sister:" this is the proper, legitimate, literal rendering of each word. When *ishah* (woman, wife) is followed by *ahot* (sister), the phrase may, under certain circumstances, have two renderings.

First: When the persons or beings in the feminine gender, to be coupled together, are not expressed, a literal translation is necessary to show what class of persons, (such as near kinswomen, aunts, cousins, nieces, sisters, etc.,) shall or shall not be joined together; otherwise the sentence would be vague or uncertain.

Second: When Hebrew feminine nouns represent inanimate objects, such as "curtains," "loops," "tenons," "wings," etc. (see Exodus, xxvi: 3, 5, 17; Ezekiel, i: 9, 23; iii, 13,) a literal translation would entirely destroy the meaning. How very absurd it would be to represent one curtain as a wife coupled to her sister curtain, or one loop as a wife to take hold of her sister loop, or one tenon as a wife set in order against her sister tenon. To avoid these absurdities, an idiomatic rendering of the phrase, *ishah el-ahotah* is permitted, namely, *ishah* (one) *el-ahotah* (to another.) If the Hebrew phrase, in the text, take this second form, it would read,

Neither shalt thou take — one to another.

As the blank is unknown, and as there are no original words to represent the prohibited relationship, every one is left to substitute such a phrase as may seem to be most in accordance with the law contained in the twelve preceding verses. Let us fill up the blank with a few specimens, and see if we can conjecture which is the most correct:

1. Neither shalt thou take (sisters) one to another.
2. Neither shalt thou take (aunts) one to another.
3. Neither shalt thou take (nieces) one to another.
4. Neither shalt thou take (cousins) one to another.
5. Neither shalt thou take (near kinswomen) one to another.
6. Neither shalt thou take (wives) one to another.

The first five substitutions represent blood relations, while the last does not: There is therefore a much greater probability that any one of the first five may be the true meaning, than that the last should be correct. But why should the law rest upon this great uncertainty, when the first literal rendering of the English translators, gives it a definite, plain meaning that no one can misunderstand?

I shall next proceed to show that the English translators have, in a majority of cases, given the literal rendering, instead of the idiomatic to the masculine form of the phrase "one—another." The masculine form is *ish el-ahiv*, signifying "a man to his brother," translated thus: *ish* (a man) *el-ahiv* (to his brother.) The suffix *iv* stands for the possessive pronoun *his*; while *ah* stands for *brother*. When *ish* is followed by *ah*, the first (like the feminine form) is sometimes translated *one*, the second sometimes rendered, *another*. This idiomatic rendering is, indeed, absolutely necessary, when the masculine Hebrew nouns to be coupled together represent inanimate objects. For instance, the noun, *faces*, of the inanimate cherubim placed over the mercy

seat, is in Hebrew a masculine noun. See Exodus xxv: 20. "And their faces shall look one to another." Also Exodus xxxvii: 9. "With their faces one to another." This could not be literally translated without manifesting the greatest absurdity. But in all other passages, the masculine phrase *ish el-ahiv* represents masculine persons, and is translated in the majority of cases literally. It may not be amiss to observe that the preposition, joining *ish*—*ahiv* is not always *el*; the prefixes *l*, *k*, *b*, are often used to express different kinds of prepositions. The phrase *ish—ahiv*, with its coupling preposition, occurs, at least, twenty-eight times in the Old Testament, thirteen of which are translated in the idiomatic form, *one—another*; the remaining fifteen are translated literally "man—his brother." I will give a few specimens:

Nehemiah v: 7. "Ye exact usury, every one of his brother."

Isaiah iii: 6. "When a man shall take hold of his brother."

Isaiah ix: 19. "No man shall spare his brother."

Isaiah xix: 2. "And they shall fight every one against his brother."

Isaiah xli: 6. "And every one said to his brother."

Jeremiah xxiii: 35. "And every one to his brother."

Jeremiah xxxi: 34. "And every man his brother."

Jeremiah xxxiv: 14. "Every man his brother."

Jeremiah xxxiv: 17. "Every one to his brother."

Jeremiah xlii: 14. "And I will dash them one against another."

If it were necessary we might quote the phrases in the twenty-eight passages where they occur in the masculine form: but these are sufficient to show that King James' translators used both the literal and the idiomatic forms of translation in both the masculine and feminine forms of the Hebrew phrase which occurs in Leviticus xviii: 18. The literal translation of the feminine form occurs only once; and this arises from the singular fact that the feminine phrase occurs only once in the Hebrew, as connected with and applied to living persons in the feminine gender. Another remarkable fact, connected with the phrase in Leviticus, is, that it is the only instance out of thirty-six cases in the two genders, where the nouns or things to be coupled together are not expressed; and for this very reason it seemed to be absolutely necessary to give the literal rendering as found in the text.

Thus we have found that the marginal reading is not only false, by an unwarranted substitution of the word "wife," but its idiomatic form also cannot be given and make sense. And therefore the text stands out in all its brightness and purity, as an everlasting condemnation of Newman's marginal law.

DR. NEWMAN'S INCORRECT HEBREW.

In the last day's discussion, I devoted a few moments in showing the falsity of Dr. Newman's rendering of the Hebrew word, translated "duty of marriage." (See Exodus xxi: 10.) He acknowledges that all the ancient and modern Hebrew Lexicons, and "all the ancient and venerable translators of the Septuagint—the famous Greek version of the Old Testament." "Say the word here means cohabitation." But the learned Doctor is not satisfied with this whole army of translators, renowned for their wisdom and learning. He has consulted a Jewish Rabbi in Washington, whose opinion he thinks outweighs all others in deciphering the Hebrew word for "dwelling." He believes that he has discovered a word translated "dwelling," which resembles in some points of its orthography the Hebrew word for "cohabitation" or "duty of marriage."

But let me inform the reverend gentleman that the two Hebrew words are as distinct in their orthography as the English words *unkind* and *munkind*, or *history* and *my tery*. The Hebrew for "cohabitation" commences with the letter *ayin*; the Hebrew for "dwelling" commences with the letter *mem*: the first has two syllables; the second has three syllables: the former is spelled *onah*; the latter *me-mah*. It cannot be proved from any Hebrew Lexicon or Grammar that I have consulted that the two words are derived from the same verbal root: and even if this could be proved, it would be no evidence that their meanings or definitions were the same; for there are great numbers of different nouns whose derivations may be traced back to a common root, and yet their definitions are as distinct as "cohabitation" and "dwelling." Neither Mr. Newman, nor his Jewish Rabbi, can find one iota of proof in the original

Hebrew to substantiate their unwarranted assumption that the two words are one and the same. Therefore, the eminent Hebrew and Greek scholars both of ancient and modern times, are still to be believed when they emphatically tell us that the word in the text rendered "duty of marriage" means "cohabitation." Hence God's own law reads:

"If he take him another wife: her food, her raiment, and her duty of cohabitation shall he not diminish."

This shows, most emphatically, that the betrothal of the first was consummated in marriage, and that this special duty of marriage must not be diminished.

ORSON PRATT, SEN.

Salt Lake City, August 26th, 1870.

INTERESTING.—We have been permitted to extract the following items from a letter to President George A. Smith, written on the 21st inst. at Chicago, by Elder Edward Stevenson, then on his way westward. He says: "I arrived here a few hours ago, direct from Kirtland, Ohio. I am well, as also Martin Harris, who is with me, although he is now in the 88th year of his age and rather feeble. But he walks along remarkably well, and while at Kirtland hoed out quite a lot of corn, and last fall hired out by the day to dig potatoes. He stands his journey, thus far, quite well, and feels filled with new life at the idea of going to the valleys of Utah, to see his children and friends. * * * He is coming to the conclusion, after trying everything else,—although he has always borne a faithful testimony to the truth of the Book of Mormon,—that the work of the Lord is progressing in the tops of the mountains and that the people are gathering in fulfillment of prophecy."

Elder Stevenson, during his trip East this time, has paid a visit to the Hill Cumorah, whence the plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated were obtained. He says, although the hill is very steep,—the highest in these parts, wheat has been grown on the very spot whence the plates were taken." He visited and talked with an old gentleman, now seventy-four years of age, who, when the plates were exhumed, resided adjoining the hill, and resides there still. The people now call the hill "Mormon Hill." In the country around, old buildings, forts, earthworks and mounds have been discovered, showing that in times long past, it was thickly peopled, and that it has been the theatre of conflicts between contending armies.

RELEASES AND APPOINTMENTS.—The following releases and appointments are from the *Millennial Star*, of the 9th inst:

"Elder Alma Eldredge is released from the Presidency of the Bristol Conference as soon as his successor is ready to take charge, and is appointed to preside over the Sheffield Conference after Elder F. H. Hyde's return home. Elder Thomas Howells is released from the Presidency of the Glamorgan, and appointed to preside over the Bristol Conference. Elder George G. Bywater is appointed to preside over the Glamorgan Conference. These two latter appointments to take effect from and after the Conference at Aberdare, Aug. 14th."

MORE BEE EXPERIENCE.—Brother John Morgan, agent of the News at Mill Creek, writes on the 23rd, as follows, in relation to his experience in bee keeping:

"I sent for a hive of bees by W. D. Roberts last winter. I have had one swarm come off since I got them; they swarmed about the 17th of June. I weighed the hive last night, Aug. 23rd '70, deducting the weight of the hive and bees, leaving ninety-three pounds of honey. I also had Bro. Putnam transfer my old swarm, into Kidder's patent hive, about six weeks ago. When he transferred them he took about thirty-five pounds of honey from them, and they have at the present time, from forty to fifty pounds in the hive, and are working in the cap boxes. I also helped Brother Birch, to weigh a young swarm of his last night, that swarmed about seven weeks ago; deducting the weight of the hive and bees there were seventy pounds of honey."

The above is encouraging, and shows that with proper attention bees are a profitable investment; and besides this, the honey thus obtained is known to be the genuine article. We hope to see bee culture become more general.

In connection with the above we may say that Brother S. H. Putnam, the bee manager, left for Provo yesterday to be at the convention of bee keepers now in session there. He will remain a few days, and can be consulted by any desirous of information on the subject of bee keeping; and will also attend to transferring if any should desire his services. This is a very good time to change bees into new and good hives. As the nights are getting cooler, the comb can be removed without danger of daubing the bees. Brother Putnam has yet a number of swarms to transfer in this city; he has already changed over forty swarms here, and we believe has given entire satisfaction.

FLORENCE

Sewing Machine!

In point of labor there is the same difference between thrashing with a flail, or using a Thrashing Machine, that there is between sewing by hand or using a good Sewing Machine.

We have just received a consignment of forty Machines and can now offer an assortment of all the various styles manufactured by the Florence Company.

PARTIES INTENDING TO PURCHASE SHOULD MAKE THEIR SELECTION EARLY.

CHAS. S. HAMMER, General Agent.

The Florence Sewing Machine has no fancy combinations or other complicated attachments; it has no uncertain wire coils or wire levers. Its manufacture is conducted by a thoroughly RESPONSIBLE COMPANY, and in purchasing a machine you need have no fear of ever being unable to purchase needles and other findings. The Florence is the ONLY COMPANY that keeps its machines in repair free of charge, no matter when sold or where. It is our ambition to have every Florence Machine give entire satisfaction.

The Florence lays no claim to cheapness, we aim at perfect finish; every machine goes through the company's adjusting room, and must then pass the inspector's office, before going out to Agents; the least inaccuracy will condemn it.

They are probably the highest priced Machine in the American market, and being built of HARDENED STEEL by SKILLED WORKMEN, aided by all the appliances that capital can bring to bear, it is offered at a price commensurate with the value of the article, and can be brought into about as honest comparison, with its numerous CAST IRON competitors, as a watch from Jergenson or Jacat may be compared with the Nickel or Oroide offerings of a Chatham Street Mock Auctioneer.

It is a growing knowledge of these facts that has gained favor so steadily for the Florence Machines, and made them the Universal favorites, wherever prejudice is laid aside and honest comparison made.

That very excellent authority the American Institute, New York, awarded the FIRST PREMIUM to the FLORENCE over Thirteen Competitors, and in their report the committee very tersely remarked, "This is better than any of its class known to the Judges."

It may be proper to remark here that the Florence Machine of the present manufacture is vastly improved, and the first of these Improved Machines ever offered in Utah are those sold at the Branch Office at Salt Lake.

Among the recent purchasers from this office, we beg leave to refer to the following parties:

SALT LAKE CITY,	
John Sharp, Jr.,	Warren Hussey,
Joseph Ball,	Mrs. Spring,
Wm Sloan,	Chas Strobbridge,
Mr. Jermy,	C. F. Smith,
W. D. Brown,	Theo. Morf,
J. D. Hawkins,	Alfred Best,
Mrs. Thomas,	Jos. E. Taylor.
CAMP DOUGLAS,	
Mrs. Sanno.	
CENTREVILLE,	
Thos. Harris,	Mrs. Shurtliff,
Mrs. Wood.	
FARMINGTON,	
Daniel A. Miller,	Wm. Miller,
Mr. Edwards.	
OGDEN,	
Mr. Thos. Dee,	Mr. Crawford,
Mr. Edwards.	
CACHE COUNTY,	
Bishop Wm. Budge,	Moses Thatcher,
J. H. Martineau,	
AMERICAN FORK,	
Bishop Harrington.	Mr. Nelson,
PROVO,	
Isaac Bullock,	
BATTLE CREEK,	
Hyram Winters.	
SPRINGVILLE,	
Lyman Woods,	M. Packard,
Mr. Mavock,	Martin Taylor,
Mr. Crandell,	Mrs. Stevenson.
LEVAN,	
John Whitbeck.	
PAYSON,	
J. Moore,	Levi Colvin,
Martina Simons.	
ST. GEORGE,	
Col. Jackson.	
TOOELE CITY,	
Jerry Whitehouse.	

Illustrated Priced Circulars mailed to any address.

Branch Office Florence Sewing Machine Co., EAST TEMPLE STREET SALT LAKE CITY.

CHAS. S. HAMMER General Agent.