

# THE BIBLE *versus* POLYGAMY.

BY ELDER DAVID H. SMITH.

---

Published by the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, -

---

## THE BIBLE VERSUS POLYGAMY.

### CHAPTER I.

#### ADAM'S CASE.

If the order of our great father's life in regard to marriage, given him of God, be any guide to his children, in the same respect then the plural wife system is wrong. Says one, "Adam had only one wife while on earth we admit, but before he came here he had many and brought one here, and became mortal that he might become the progenitor of man." Unfortunately we find no account of this proceeding in the Bible, and our subject confines us to that. On the contrary, proof exists that he did not *come* here with a *body* and a *wife*, but was created here from the dust of the earth as to his body, and that into his nostrils the breath of life was put, in other words, the Spirit entered into his body, and that from it a rib was taken, and his wife's body was formed from it.

"And I the Lord God formed *man* from the *dust* of the *ground*, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul, the first flesh upon the earth; the first man also. \* \* \* And I the Lord God, caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and I took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in the stead thereof; and the rib, which I the Lord God had taken from man made I a woman, and brought her unto the man."—Genesis ii. 8, 28. (Retranslation.)

This then shows the true origin of man upon the earth, and the statement in regard to his pre-existence and advent

upon the earth, with a body and a wife, falls to the ground unsupported.

The law of God as revealed to Adam will be found in verse 30 of the same chapter.

"Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

Remember now, you who believe in polygamy, that you declare that those who neglect to practice it in this life fall short in the fulness of glory, and all the account given of Adam places by his side only our great mother Eve, so that he will fall short of the highest bliss if your reasoning be true. You also state that this principle is for the purpose of raising up a righteous seed upon the earth. You evidently disagree with the prophet Malachi when pronouncing evil against Israel, and wherefore,

"Because the Lord hath been witness between thee and the *wife* of thy youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously."—Malachi ii. 14.

Also speaking no doubt concerning the case in hand,

"And did not He make one? yet had He the residue of the Spirit. And wherefore one? That he might seek a godly seed"—Malachi ii. 15.

Strange! Here was Adam sent abroad in the earth with one wife, that he might seek a godly seed, when you talk so much about God's establishment of polygamy for the purpose of raising up a righteous seed. Not only that, but his sons when they were married kept the order given to their father from God, for we read,

"And from that time forth, the sons and

daughters of Adam began to divide, *two and two*, in the land, and to till the land."—Gen. iv. 3.

The earth was all before this people and needed cultivation, filling up with a godly seed, and God chose through the one-wife system to bring it about. Surely if polygamy were the righteous order, God would have begun the peopling of the earth by it, as the best possible plan, when there was no United States to legislate against it, and not have confined so vast a work to so miserable, and so prostitute-producing an affair, as the one-wife order is claimed to be by the dignitaries of the people in the Salt Lake Basin. Adam, the first man, our common parent, the Ancient of Days, patriarch and prince over his numerous posterity; all honor and respect to the example set us in marriage by him, and if found worthy to meet him with his one wife in the Kingdom of Heaven, we shall no doubt be happy.

#### THE CASE OF LAMECH.

This is one that the advocates of polygamy are fond of quoting; yet we should think that for the sake of giving tone and respectability to the institution they would avoid mentioning it. Contrasted with the pure and noble example given in the marriage of our first father, very dark indeed appears this disrespectful introduction of polygamy. Truly a grand entrance into the world had your "*holy* principle of eternal exaltation,"—its author a murderer,—one who entered into a covenant of death with hell. There is no evidence that God sanctioned the first crime of plural marriage, any more than there is that he did the last one of murder under the hands of Lamech. A few wholesome quotations which we find in the history of Lamech, will do us good.

"And Lamech took unto himself two wives. \* \* \* And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, hear my voice ye wives of Lamech; hearken unto my speech,

for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. \* \* \* Wherefore the Lord cursed Lamech and *his house*, and all they that had *covenanted* with Satan, for they *kept not* the commandments of God. And it displeased God, and He ministered not unto them. \* \* \* And their works were abominations, and began to spread among all the sons of men."—Gen. v. 30-39. (Retranslation.)

So much for the case of Lamech.

#### NOAH.

Reader, here is a case of an opposite nature, of the righteousness of which we have no doubt; one upon which the blessings and approval of God were openly and avowedly placed. Righteous old father Noah was vexed in his upright heart with the evil around him. He preached holiness, integrity, and the gospel of Christ, while the world about him were feasting, marrying and giving in marriage, going into polygamy to their hearts content. No doubt these giants, these famous warriors, laughed at the abstinence of the old fogy, looking the while complacently upon their own numerous retinue of fair women culled from the market of the world, decked in the costly drapery of Babylon, sparkling with the gems of the east after the fashion of the half barbarous nations of the Orient that polygamists are so fond of quoting. When the roar of the advancing flood broke upon their ears, while Noah and his one wife, and his three sons each with his one wife, were floating thankfully forth upon the seething waters in the grand old ark, upheld by the hand of God, they saw things in a different light. The polygamists were drowned, while the monogamists were saved, and it may comfort your hearts to know, ye that believe in polygamy, that

"But as it was in the days of Noah, so it shall also be at the coming of the Son of man. For it shall be with them as it was in the days which were before the flood; for until the day that Noah entered into the ark, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, and knew not until the flood came and took

them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."—Mat. xxiv. 44, 45.

## SUMMARY.

What have we gained from the preceding examination. 1st, That Adam and his immediate posterity who held the priesthood observed the one-wife system; 2nd, That it was introduced by one whose works were abominations, that he was a murderer for the sake of a covenant with Satan, cursed of God and despised of men; 3d, That Noah the preacher and practitioner of righteousness had but one wife, and that he and his three sons, each with one wife, were saved, while all the rest of mankind, though marrying copiously, were drowned; 4th, That as it was in Noah's time, so it shall be when our Savior comes to redeem us. Let us therefore place ourselves in the pure, righteous position of Noah, having if any, but one wife, that Christ may find us worthy. In view of these statements we decide the case so far examined as against polygamy. We do so without fear, yet without hatred, praying for the true light.

## CHAPTER II.

## ABRAHAM'S CASE.

Before advancing any farther in our examination of the scripture, we will see some of the requirements necessary for the entering into and living up to this doctrine; requirements, by the way, pointed out and claimed as requisite by those who advocate this principle in the Valley. 1st, This state of holy plural wedlock must be entered into by the direct "revelation and commandment, through the mediation of mine anointed" prophet, seer, and revelator, holding this power; 2nd, "And there is never but one on earth at a time holding this power." These conditions we cull from the revelation claimed by this people to be their authority for entering into the practice of

these doctrines in the latter days, found in the Seer, a periodical published by the church of the Valley, January 1853.

Now understanding the conditions of this power and covenant, or doctrine, let us examine the example of Abraham, or Abram.

Abram having a wife called Sarai, obtained promise of God that he should have a son in whom his seed should be called and blessed of God. Sarai was barren and unbelieving, and even *laughed* at the promise, and was guilty of untruth in regard to laughing when reproved for so doing. Sarai took it into her head to bring about the plan of God; so she took her handmaid and gave her to Abram. Afterward, when despised by this handmaid, she proposed dealing hardly with her, and did finally succeed in driving her away. When the Lord says any thing in regard to the matter, He commands Abram to put the bondwoman away, with her son, and this is the only command the Lord gave in regard to it. Sarai meanwhile had borne the promised son on whom the blessing rested. This is our statement. That of the polygamist is as follows. Abram had two wives, one Sarai, the other Hagar, and God blessed him in his plural marriage, and approbated it. According to the polygamic revelation, he must have gone into this plural marriage by revelation and commandment, and been sealed to all eternity. And if we wish to go to Abraham's bosom, and sit down with him in the Kingdom, we must do the works of Abraham.

Let us examine the scripture in regard to this matter. We quote

"Now Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children. And she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name was Hagar. And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold, now, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing; I pray thee go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. *And Abram hearkened unto the VOICE of SARAI.*" —Gen. xvi. 1, 2.

Where was the revelation through a prophet of God, the only one having this power? Where is the approbation of God in this thing? We find in chapter xxi., an account of Isaac's birth, and of events that followed.

"And the child grew and was weaned. And the day that Isaac was weaned, Abraham made a great feast, and Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which Hagar had borne unto Abraham, mocking; and she was troubled. Wherefore she said unto Abraham. Cast out this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, Isaac."—Gen. xxi. 7, 8.

Now let us hear how God looked upon this transaction.

"And God said unto Abraham, let it not be grievous in thy sight, because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman, in all that Sarah has said unto thee hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called."—Genesis xxi. 16.

What was Sarah's voice? "Cast out this bondwoman," and God commands him to do so. Comment is needless.

In Galatians we read that Ishmael was born after the flesh, but Isaac by the will of the Spirit. Also some statements in regard to the evil works of the flesh.

"Nevertheless what saith the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son, for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman."—Gal. iv. 30.

#### RECAPITULATION.

In the first place, Hagar was given unto Abram by Sarai; not by the Lord.

2ndly, There is no account of any revelation or commandment from God, by which Abram was actuated, neither any prophet holding power to seal to all eternity.

3rdly, The fact that an angel spoke to Hagar after she was cast out, argues nothing in favor of God's approbating her relationship to Abram, or it would argue too much, for God himself spoke to Cain, after he had become a murderer.

4thly, God himself commanded

Abraham to hearken to the voice of Sarah, which said, "Cast out this bondwoman." Also, Isaac received the blessing, although Ishmael was the first-born.

From these statements we conclude, that God did not sanction Abram's relationship with Hagar. This case is therefore no argument in favor of polygamy; but rather against it.

#### ISAAC.

The promised seed in whom the blessing came. The Bible reader will wonder why we mention *him*, seeing that he had but one wife; but for all that, polygamists are fond of quoting him, ringing him in as graciously and boldly as if he had had a dozen. He had but one, however, the fair and favored Rebekah, whose story is so beautiful, who came to him from the homes of his kindred people, to comfort his heart for the loss of a mother. It will be remembered that Abraham was instructed to teach his household the commandments of God, so that if this were one of them, no doubt Isaac would have entered into it; but like many of the rising generation of Utah, he had seen enough of the evil in his father's time. He had one son, however, who went into this practice; Esau, the hairy man, who sold his birth-right, and who, the New Testament informs us, was a profane person.

"And Esau was forty years old when he took to wife Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Bashemath the daughter of Elon the Hittite; which were a grief of mind unto Isaac and to Rebekah."—Gen. xxvi. 34, 35.

#### JACOB'S CASE.

The argument used by polygamists in this case is as follows: Jacob had four wives, and the approval of God rested upon this fact. He was blessed in so having them. God approved of it as is shown by the blessing of Joseph the son of the second wife, Rachel by name. Leah was the first wife, Rachel the second, and her son

Joseph, being sold into Egypt, was the savior of his family, and became a blessing to them. Through him the Lord raised up a righteous branch for the redemption of all Israel. Jacob also had two wives beside, making four in all. Now behold the son of a polygamist by his second wife, preserved of God, blessed and called of Him. Does not this show that God approved and sanctioned this holy principle?

It might have a bearing that way, if this were the fair and true statement of the case. We will examine the history on this matter. Jacob came to the house of Laban and saw there the fair, clear-eyed Rachel, and so great was the love he bore her that he covenanted to serve seven years for her; and they seemed but a short time. Laban covenanted to give her to him at the end of his term of service. At its close, whose right was valid to the fair Rachel? Evidently that of Jacob, for we hear him speaking of her in the following language.

“And Jacob said unto Laban, Give unto me MY WIFE, that I may go and take her, for my days of serving are fulfilled.”—Genesis xxix. 21.

Reader, was she not his, and the first wife also, for there is no account preceding this of his having a wife. Sanctioned by love, made holy by covenant, it was a right and proper union, and no wonder that God blessed Rachel and called her son Joseph to receive His blessing and approval. This verse is not all, the next one closes the covenant, and puts the fact that Rachel was the first wife beyond all doubt. AND LABAN GAVE HER TO JACOB, and gathered together all the men and made a feast. Nothing but the most designing and shallow sophistry could have the face to endeavor to evade this.

It was not until after this *giving, receiving, and feasting*, at the marriage of Jacob to Rachel, that Leah is mentioned as an actor in the scene. Then in the hours of darkness, with an un-

pardonable lack of modesty and feminine pride or rectitude, she suffered herself to be imposed upon the upright, confiding Jacob, by being smuggled into his bed in the stead of his lawful wife,—a *contraband article* in every sense of the word,—by a treacherous and idolatrous father. And this is the revelation from God commanding Jacob to enter into this holy order (!) This the holy prophet clothed with authority from God to sanctify this plural marriage;—an idolator and an observer of laws extant in a heathen nation!! Shame upon such doings! Shame upon the principle that needs such examples to bolster it upon its tottering foundation! Alas! Alas! that the saints of God should so lose their inherent sense of right, as to suffer themselves to be so led and blinded that they cannot discern the baseness of this designing sophistry.

“And it came to pass in the evening, that he took Leah his daughter, and brought her to Jacob, and she went in and slept with him.”

“And it came to pass, that in the morning, behold, it was Leah.”

Afterward, Jacob obtained possession of his lawful wife; and the only excuse Laban could find to cover his treachery with was, that

“It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born.”

However, as he had already given her first, this last act but convicts him of haste to get rid of both.

As for the other two women, they were given him by Rachel and Leah in jealous controversy, each striving to out-do the other in bringing children to Jacob, hoping thereby to gain his favor.

Twelve patriarchs or fathers of tribes were borne to Jacob by these women, Rachel, Leah, Bilhah, and Zilpah. Because they were the mothers of these twelve sons, from whom sprang the twelve tribes of Israel, and because their names, Joseph, Benjamin, Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebu-

lon, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, are said by John the Revelator to be upon the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem, the advocates of polygamy say that plural marriage must be a true and faithful doctrine, and that if we are opposed to it, we shall never inherit a portion in that celestial city. We confess our inability to perceive the correctness of this reasoning. The fact that they were the fathers of these twelve tribes, does not prove that polygamy is right, any more than it proves that Reuben did right when he transgressed with his father's concubine. The truth of the matter is that God promised; nay, swore even by Himself that he would make Abraham's seed as numerous as the sands of the sea shore. So, whether he or his posterity did *right* or not, they would have been the fathers of an innumerable posterity. God promised this unconditionally, and it would have transpired whether by one wife or a dozen; whether they were sinful or perfect. God would fulfill his word.

On going to the records we discover that the fact of their names being placed upon the twelve gates of the new Jerusalem, happens in this wise. These names were those of the twelve tribes of Israel, and not merely of these twelve men as individuals.

As for entering into this holy city, and going to Abraham's bosom, &c., we are informed by our Savior, that many shall come from the east, and from the west, and shall sit down with him in the kingdom. We are not to suppose that the "many" have all passed a life without sin; nor that any one, however sinful, may not by repentance and faithful works enter into this exaltation. Nor would their having been forgiven and redeemed from sin, nor their having been received into happiness, be any argument that those sins were justified, nor that they were ever after to become examples worthy of our imitation.

According to Bible history, God has ever conferred His most choice blessing upon the son of the legal, first wife, the only wife we may say, for the Bible itself styles Bilhah a concubine. Are we to say that an illegal child can never receive a blessing from God? By no means. A child is not responsible for its parentage. If such a person turn to God and does His works, obeying the gospel of Christ, who shall say that God will not bestow upon him all the blessings poor humanity is heir to at best; so that forty sons of ancient polygamists might have received blessings from God, without compromising God as justifying the sin of their parents. Does not God send the rain upon the unjust? Yet who shall say that this justifies them in their injustice. Are not the homes of the wicked oft filled with children? Are not their houses grand, their equipage splendid, their feet in high places, their coffers filled with the earnings of the poor? Yet for all this God shall bring them to judgment, and these things are the arguments with which Satan seeks to allure the shallow-minded to their destruction. Behold, they say, the wicked prosper, let us do likewise;—it is policy, and we shall flourish;—but they know not the end.

Joseph the son of Jacob, recognized of God, who was sold into Egypt, was an example of chastity and uprightness. We have an account of only one wife for him. He was the promised, blessed son. This ends our examination of the biblical examples of marriage as found in Genesis.

### CHAPTER III.

#### UNDER MOSES.

We have an account of two wives for Moses, taken at different periods; but, unfortunately for polygamists, we are not informed whether both were living at once or not. This case must therefore

remain an open question, it being impossible to determine from the history given, whether he had them both at once or not. It would be folly to establish so important an order as plural marriage, that affects so strongly the domestic relation, upon so obscure and vague an account. From this circumstance this cannot be used as against this doctrine. It is therefore so far as this case is concerned an open question.

#### UNDER THE LAW OF MOSES.

There is one passage made use of by the defenders of Polygamy, found in Exodus xxi. 10.

In order to understand this text, it is quite necessary to quote from the 7th verse.

“And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid servant, she shall not go out as the men servants do.”—Exodus xxi. 7.

A former verse provides for the liberation of a man servant at the termination of seven years.

“If she please not her master, who hath not betrothed her to himself; then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her to a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath to do this dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish.”—Exodus viii. 8-10

The polygamists declare that here is a man under the law of Moses having one wife and taking another, and the Lord of heaven giving commandment regulating the provision for the first, thus approving polygamy. If this be correct, God sanctions not only plurality, but slavery also, and the fair daughters of Zion may not only be married into harems, containing many wives, but be sold also to a life of servitude as slaves. Who but the depraved would tolerate such a proposition? Hear the truth of the matter. A man under the Jewish custom and law of Moses, buys a Hebrew maid for a servant. If *he betroths* (promises, not

marries) her to his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters; that is, endow her with a marriage portion, with proper raiment and food. But if his son marries another, not fulfilling this betrothment, remember she is only betrothed to him, what then shall the master do. Why give her still the duty of marriage, the dowry, with proper raiment and food, in compensation for the broken promise of marriage to his son; or failing to do this, she shall go free without being redeemed with money. God hates covenant-breaking, and is no respecter of persons; therefore as a promise was made that the maid-servant was to be given in marriage to the master's son, he, the master, was to endow her as a daughter, and as the son broke that betrothal by marrying another, the maid-servant was still to receive the dowry, with food and raiment beside, or go free to the house of her father. I find no other reference or commandment in regard to marriage in Exodus, though perusing carefully with a view to such.

Shocking neglect to charge upon God, that He has failed to make plain a commandment which should have been made conspicuous without question, if Moses and his followers were required to enter into the order of plural marriage, as practiced in Salt Lake City, or suffer eternal loss of glory. This privilege of exaltation to the highest of all glory to be so sadly slighted by the Great law-giver! Sadly strange; but if polygamists be right, remarkably true!

We will refer to a passage found in Deuteronomy xxi. chapter, beginning at the 15th verse. It will be remembered that God in dealing with the children of Israel, had to do with a wicked and rebellious people, fresh from proud, barbarious, voluptuous Egypt, relishing its evil keenly; and that rejecting the purer gospel, a law of carnal commandments was given

them in its stead; or as Paul has it,

"Wherefore then, the law was added because of transgression. \* \* \* Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster until Christ"—Gal. iii. 19, 24.

God had not so much respect to that generation of Israel, as He had to His oath made to their fathers by which he was bound to bring them out. Hence it is that, in answer to the statement of the Pharisees on the question of divorcement.

"Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away."—Mark x. 4.

Our Savior said:

"Jesus answered and said unto them, for the hardness of your hearts he wrote you this precept; but from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause shall a man leave his father, and mother, and cleave unto his wife; and they two shall be one flesh; so then they are no more two, but one flesh; what therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."—Mark x. 5, 6, 7.

On account of this divorcement, and to meet the case of a man's losing his first wife by death, and marrying another, and having children by both, we find the following clause to which we referred, and which is used by polygamists as upholding their doctrine.

"If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have borne him children, both 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 that 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."—Deut. xxi. 15-17.

To say that polygamy is the only condition justifying this clause, is to betray a superficial observation, or a biased mind; for on examining chapter xiv., we learn how they were to deal with the hated wife; so that according to law he could not retain both at once, the loved and the hated, for according

to the law he was to put the hated away.

"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house. And when she is departed, out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife. And if the latter husband hate her, and write a bill of divorcement," &c.—Deut. xxiv. 1-3.

We are told that the first may not have her again. So you see he could not retain a hated wife under Moses; only the law provides that if she shall have children they shall not be disinherited because of their mother being hated; nor deprived of the right of the first-born. As yet we find no commandment making polygamy a law.

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### UNDER THE JUDGES.

Israel came into their inheritance, and after a time they were in trouble on account of their wickedness. And the Lord raised up Gideon, who received the favor of God and the power of working miracles, and who delivered Israel out of their trouble. Did he receive God's approbation? Most certainly. Did he retain it? Ah! there is a question. Because a man is favored of God once, there is no reason to suppose that all his subsequent acts are God-like, or examples for our imitation. They desired to make him king; he refused. This was well enough, but that which he did do was not well. For requesting the ear-rings taken in war, he

"Made an ephod thereof, and put it in his city, even in Ophrah; and all Israel went thither a whoring after it; which thing became a snare unto Gideon, and to his house."—Judges viii. 27.

Forty years went by, and we learn that "Gideon had three score and ten sons of his body begotten, for he had many wives."



First idolatry,—then polygamy; a most appropriate style of progression. Proper company surely; only in this case, idolatry obtained first—polygamy generally precedes. Surely Gideon had glory enough! If so many sons, perhaps so numerous “a righteous seed,” lead to great good, great exaltation, this “righteous” family must have had loving and peaceable times, bringing forth the glory of so great an example in polygamy. Gideon had two names, Jerubbaal and Gideon.—Judges viii. 35. To show the beautiful righteousness of these sons, we quote Judges ix. 5.

“And he [Abimelech] went unto his father’s house at Ophrah, and SLEW *his brethren the sons of Jerubbaal*, being *three score and ten persons*, upon one stone! notwithstanding, yet Jotham the youngest son of Jerubbaal was left; for he hid himself.”

Three score and ten brothers slain by this son of polygamy on one stone! Shade of truth, here is righteousness!! This is an example quoted by the upholders of polygamy, for us to imitate. Idolatry, polygamy, and wholesale murder of brothers by blood, appropriate triune. If it were not for the horrid cruelty of this scene, one might almost pronounce it a fit terminus to the dark chapter of Gideon’s snare. This example deserves to stand alone.

## CHAPTER V.

### SAMUEL.

Elkanah, the father of Samuel, had two wives. Hannah the mother of Samuel was mentioned first. From this clue we conclude that she was the first wife, and as her son was given her of God, he was dedicated to God’s service, and doing righteously, was greatly blessed. Nothing is said that would lead us to think that God approved of Elkanah’s having two wives.

### PRIESTS.

The law for priests was as follows:

“And he shall take *a wife in her virginity*. A widow, or a divorced woman, or

profane, or a harlot, these shall he not take; but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife.”—Leviticus xxi. 13, 14.

Why not virgins or more than one? Limited every time to the singular, *a* virgin. A title to one house does not mean many, A VIRGIN is ONE VIRGIN, and the priest lawfully could take no more.

### KINGS.

The law for kings was,

“Neither shall he multiply wives unto himself, that his heart turn not away; neither shall he *greatly* multiply to himself silver and gold.”—Deut xvii. 17.

Gold and silver he may multiply unto himself, but not greatly multiply; but wives he is not to multiply at all. Reader, twice one are two, and this is multiplication. Here is a positively express law and commandment, signifying God’s pleasure in regard to the marriage of the Priest and the King, and it denies to them the practice of polygamy.

If polygamy be salvation and exaltation, as is claimed by Utonians, would God withhold it from the Priest and King of Israel, and permit it to the common people? Not at all. It is evident that the law from the beginning was,

“Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh.”—Gen ii. 30.

Royal Bible! men, priests and kings disobey thy commands and misrepresent thee, but thou art holy still; and verily thou shalt judge them in the last day!

### KING DAVID.

We have seen the law governing the Kings of Israel. Nevertheless David, the famous King of Israel, as well as others of the Kings of Israel, disobeyed this law. And to show the lightness with which they regarded the law of God, we read that Saul took one of David’s wives and gave her to another. See 1 Samuel xxv. 44. Now because they did these things, have we any

reason to say that God loved such doings? Certainly not. On the contrary, we learn that in the case of David that he incurred the displeasure of God, for he was not allowed to build the temple of God; and in the New Testament we are told, that "David is not ascended into the heavens." Acts ii. 34. Whereas the promise is that they who please God shall rest in Paradise, which Paul says is "up." David, no doubt, while humble and just, was a man after God's own heart; but his subsequent acts, like those of Gideon, were anything but right.

We now quote a text that is a strong fort with the advocates of polygamy.

"And Nathan said to David, thou art the man. Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I anointed thee King over Israel, and I delivered thee out of the hand of Saul; and I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom."—2 Sam. xii. 7, 8.

There, exclaims the polygamist, does not God say that He gave them to David? Then certainly it was right. Not so fast. God gives the lives of the innocent into the hands of the wicked, that is, He permits the wicked to slay the innocent, (for He could prevent it if he would), and when men desire evil he frequently allows them to accomplish it; but does He justify it?

To illustrate this style of giving, and to show that it was for evil and not for good, for cursing and not for blessing, we quote the 11th verse of the same chapter.

Thus saith the Lord, behold I will raise up **EVIL** against **THEE** out of thine own house, and I will take **THY WIVES** before thine eyes, and give them unto thy neighbor, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun."

Now, if it were for evil that God gave David's many wives to another, was it not for evil that another's wives had been given to him? Yes, of a surety.

Why did God permit this? Because these men were voluptuous and sensual,

willingly evil, and would have it so God will as surely judge them for it as he will the thief and the murderer. I grant that to slay Uriah and to take his wife, was more cruelly wicked than it would have been to take her among many, had she been a virgin; but this latter would still have been abominable, being against the law declaring that kings shall not multiply wives. As it was it was murder and polygamy combined.

Hear the voice of penitence, 13th verse.

"And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord."

Hear that of judgment.

And Nathan said unto David, the Lord also hath not put away thy sins that thou shalt not die."—(Retranslation).

Were these women sealed to David by prophets for eternity? We have no account of it. They were only the fair ministers of voluptuousness that ever attend upon kings, and ever will, until the King of righteousness shall reign. What became of them? Like Hagar of old they were put away.

"And David came to his house at Jerusalem; and the king took the ten *women his concubines*; whom he left to keep the house, and put them in ward, and fed them, but went not in unto them. So they were shut up unto the day of their death, living in widowhood."—2 Sam. xx. 3.

Now ye sticklers for Abraham's and King David's examples, do the works of these men that were worthy of imitation. Put away the bond-woman, the many wives and concubines. David's experience with his "righteous" seed was any thing but pleasant. One died stricken by the hand of God. Another, of great beauty, was very wicked and brought about the confusion prophesied of in the above quotation. Another, though gifted with wisdom, failed to apply it to his own life, for he exceeded his father in polygamy, and allowed the admission of its boon companion, idolatry.

His name was Solomon.

“And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines, and his wives turned away his heart. \* \* \* And Solomon did evil in the sight of the Lord, as David his father, and went not fully after the Lord. \* \* \* Wherefore the Lord said unto Solomon, forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenants, and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee.” 1 Kings xi. 3-10.

There was another of the Israelitish kings who “desired many wives,” and the following verse states that he did evil in the sight of God. On reading the tenth chapter of Ezra, we learn that Israel had a great time of repentance and putting away of their strange wives at the voice of God. It could not have been alone because of belonging to other nations, for in the law we find they were allowed to marry captives taken in war.

We have referred already to Malachi, who upbraided Israel for sinning against the *wife of their youth*, and we find a similar passage in Proverbs v. 18.

“Let thy fountain be blessed; and rejoice with the *wife of thy youth*.”

What sweet and delicate language! How does it bring to the mind thoughts of life-long faithfulness; of a sacred and love sanctified home; of the assimilation and drawing together, through grief and joy, of two hearts, each willing to sacrifice for the other all the world beside, and each requiring no sacrifice from the other save that which they are willing to abide by themselves; of honored children whose birth is crowned with joy and virtue, who are kindred and not strangers; of love, enduring, concentrate, faithful, pure, and blessed of God.

There are other instances of transgressions mentioned, with many examples of faithfulness worthy of record, but this much will suffice, so conclude we our examination of the Old Testament scriptures.

## CHAPTER VI.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It is with surer feelings of mind in regard to our subject that we enter upon this new ground, for the ushering in of the gospel in purity, the fulfillment of the law of carnal commandment brings in more decided lines of right, with deeper, clearer insight into the eternal nature of truth.

The order of marriage as taught by our Divine Savior is plain, unequivocal and clearly expressed.

“Have ye not read that he who made man in the beginning made him male and female. \* \* \* For this cause shall a man leave father, and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh. \* \* \* Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh.”—Mat. xix. 4-6.

If salvation, glory and exaltation, depend upon the possession of more than one wife, would not our Savior have made plain the commandment, “Seek ye wives, for therein is found salvation.” Nay! but his holy words specify *one wife*.

We realize that marriage is the natural condition of the fully developed man and woman, and God enjoins it upon all who are suitable for it; but He does not say that we must marry and be saved, or that we shall be damned if we do not. Marriage is not said by our Savior to affect our future condition. Of course we are responsible to God for the use as well as the abuse of this talent; but it is not, like the ordinances and requirements of the gospel, essential to our salvation and exaltation. It is a sacred privilege attending this life, for the perfect development of our own souls, and the continuance of our noble race upon the face of the earth. That these statements are valid and proper we feel assured from our Savior’s language,

The children of *this world marry and are given in marriage*, but they who are accounted *worthy to obtain the world through the resurrection of the dead, neither marry nor*

are given in marriage. Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God."—Luke xx. 34-36.

This explodes that wickedly blasphemous idea, that an angel is something degraded in God's kingdom, merely barren slaves and servants to wait upon those who by having many wives have got above them. If they are the children of God, and we are only worthy to obtain that world and become equal with them,—those great, strong, pure, splendid beings, clothed in power and light, we shall be unspeakably happy. As for getting above them by marrying, the idea is imbecile and ridiculous.

The doctrine of inequality in the celestial kingdom, one sitting in great glory with many wives, another with less glory because of few wives, and another with none because of no wife, is pernicious in the extreme. We are repeatedly informed that all are equal in that home of peace. "There is one glory of the sun."—1 Cor. xv. 41.

Our quotation above says, "equal unto the angels" and "children of God."

"And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together."—Rom. viii. 17.

With those who say Abba Father, the children of God, there is no room for inequality.

"And to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."—Eph. iii. 19.

If these children of God receive of all the fulness of God, there is no possibility of getting ahead of them. The thing is simply nonsensical. Paul in speaking to the disciples, says, "All things are yours." "And ye are Christ's and Christ is God's."

They that seek a place wherein difference of caste or of glory is to be had, must remain here, or put up with the "glory of the stars," wherein "one star differs from another in glory."—1 Cor. xv. 41. And we doubt, if they seek

to "allure through the lusts of the flesh," their getting even there. Christ prayed that God would make his disciples one in him, as he was one with God, and in the celestial glory they will be so. There are numerous quotations which might be made to overturn this absurd theory of polygamic exaltation; but to use them for this doctrine would be like firing off a cannon to kill a mouse.

But, says the polygamist, they all receive a fulness, but one holds more than another, consequently is of different capacity like a "quart," a "gallon" measure, and a "bucket," each full and therefore equal. Shade of reason! Do they really think there will be any undevelopment or incapacity in the celestial kingdom! Why, we "shall see as we are seen," "and know as we are known." God will develop every capacity to its fulness, and every power unmeasurably. There will be no more difference in capacity than there will be in glory, for a difference in one ensures a like variation in the other;—all will be raised to a like standard of eternal perfection, or put down, if unworthy to become so, to a kingdom where they belong. The argument is lacking in truth, even as the types are in delicacy and refinement.

## CHAPTER VII.

Can an unmarried person be saved? Reader, please do not laugh; for although this question would be preposterous in and of itself elsewhere, in Utah it is made of vital import. A woman must be sealed or married, for sealing is by polygamists called *plural marriage*, or she can not come up in the resurrection of celestial glory.

A man is a servant in the future, if unmarried, without glory or salvation, in fact is "damned." A few wholesome quotations are all that is necessary to rebut such a doctrine.

"For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant; even unto them will I give in mine house, and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters, I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off."—Isaiah lvi 4, 6.

He that giveth himself in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth himself not in marriage *doeth better*."—1 Cor. vii. 38.

Why this language, if marriage constitutes salvation?

"And I looked, and, lo, a lamb stood on the mount Sion and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads. \* \* \* And they sung as it were a new song. \* \* \* These are they which were not defiled with women; *for they are virgins*. These are they which follow the lamb whithersoever He goeth."—Rev. xiv. 1-4.

Surely they would be in some exalted place then.

Oh! Polygamist! Our Savior Himself, unmarried, was more charitable than you are toward the virgins, the old maids and bachelors, who so freely receive your condemnatory disparagement, together with the miserable men of one wife.

We do not forbid to marry, but we most decidedly say that the salvation and exaltation of every man or woman, depends upon himself or herself, and with God; that we all stand upon our agency, not depending one upon another for salvation. Moreover, salvation is more likely to be endangered by a disregard and light treatment of the rights of marriage, than by chaste virginity. To such as believed gave he power to become the sons and daughters of God, not alone to such as married; for this they perhaps possessed the power to do before. Paul, also says, that the unmarried are apt to care for God; while the responsibilities of the married with their cares are increased, so being hindered they are less likely, if marriage make any difference, to gain the crown. Eunuchs, children, virgins, being saved, marriage is not

absolutely necessary, either to salvation or exaltation. What remaineth then is to ask is,

Is polygamy admissable, judging from the New Testament scriptures?

Both Matthew and Mark have recorded our Savior's command, as limiting it to one wife. "*A man shall cleave unto his wife*." And Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 2, makes it still more imperative.

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

If that is not plain it were vain to endeavor to make it so. Comment is needless. Ephesians 5th chapter is full of exhortation to the husband and wife, as such a thing as polygamy was unknown to them. If a man marry, the woman is his wife, and he is her husband, and another can not have him without having another's husband, and that is fornication or adultery, according to the above command. In reprov- ing the churches through John the Revelator, Christ says,

"So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I *hate*."—Rev. ii. 15.

The scriptures do not tell us what that doctrine was, but on consulting Buck's Theological Dictionary, we discover it to be they allowed "a community of wives." His references are taken from Eusebius.

A few words as to its general working, and we shall bid this disagreeable subject adieu. The universal comment given in Utah is, that the first wife is unhappy, and the others are almost invariably so. While they are the favorite, they may triumph for a season, but when another who bids fair to become the favorite is taken, adieu to happiness.

How fair the contrast makes the one wife's home, where order reigns, where each is an help meet, and where the husband is not a petty tyrant, putting one aside and taking another in the stead thereof, as his mind inclines.

Many are the first wives that say that it was not until their husbands became totally indifferent to them that they could endure the order at all. Many are the second wives that testify that they were unhappy in it. Many entering it from conscientious motives, most bitterly repent it. It tends to anything but a righteous seed, as exemplified in the families of those practising it, as many can testify.

It does not tend to prostitution for it is wholesale liberty itself, tending to a lightness in regard to the married state that is fearful, as exemplified by the frequent divorces and marriages in Utah, many marrying and divorcing and remarrying until they scarcely know themselves by name.

While in Salt Lake City, and conversing with an eminent doctor there, who had gathered many facts in regard to this system, he stated that *nature* strives to correct it, for the male children born in it are in the majority, and and degenerate also, extremely liable to precocity in the direction of the social evil. We have been considering this doctrine from the Bible, which favors this statement, as the numerous sons and few daughters of Jacob, Gideon, David, Solomon, and other ancient polygamists most clearly show.

It is the habit of the Utah elders to cast severe reflections upon the habits of the outside world around them, as if prostitution and infidelity to the marriage covenant were the universal order of the day, hoping thereby to make their rotten order look a trifle clean by blackening everything around them. To be sure the world is impure, and there is a floating populace, in our great cities and upon our thoroughfares, that is fearfully corrupt; but in the minor cities and villages, and especially in the country places, sexual depravity

of the kind so much written of here, is as cordially despised and as little known as in Utah. But even if it were not so, would this evil be any excuse for their evil?

Polygamists are addicted to the habit of quoting the half-barbarous nations of Asia and the far east, where women are bought and sold in open market, exposed naked, their teeth examined, and the price paid down for them, as if this was any criterion for christians to go by. They are fond also of misrepresenting the census, stating that an overplus of women made this order necessary, although frequently shown that it is just the contrary in the United States, and in Utah too.

If any one says a word in regard to the evil tendencies of the practice, they cry out that we are perfectly ignorant of their city and habits, as if it were impossible, being among them however long a time, to discover anything in regard to them. It is universally conceded that their children are much more liable to die than others, and if they live they are remarkable examples of natural depravity.

The marriage state is like a spring once given to a people who were told that so long as they considered sacred, and kept it pure, it would be the source of life and health to them, giving ceaseless and unalloyed joy; but if they should pollute it, and disesteem it, it would be a pestilent source of most loathsome corruption and unhappiness.

In view of our researches in the Old and the New Testaments, we, without hesitation pronounce the Bible clear and free from the charge of teaching polygamy, concluding with a repetition of Paul's exhortation, "LET EVERY MAN HAVE HIS OWN WIFE, AND LET EVERY WOMAN HAVE HER OWN HUSBAND."