

whether he has a family or not, that command is given to him: it is the law of God, and the reason is given in order that the name of the dead might not perish and be cut off from Israel. The living brother had to preserve the inheritance in his deceased brother's family. Now, if the widow of the deceased brother married a stranger—a person that did not belong to that particular tribe, the inheritance would go to a stranger, and would be shifting from tribe to tribe, or even might become the inheritance of one that did not belong to the tribes of Israel. In order to prevent this, the firstborn male of the living brother was to be considered the son of the dead brother, and was to receive the inheritance and perpetuate the same in the family; and this was to continue from generation to generation. Now, suppose that there were seven brothers, as there often were families of that size in Israel; suppose they married them wives, and six of them should die without leaving male issue to bear up their name, but the seventh brother was still living; do you not see that this law and commandment would be binding on that seventh, still living, to take the six widows? This he would be compelled to do; and yet this generation say polygamy is a crime, while here is the sanction of Divine authority. Here a man is brought under obligation to take these six widows, and raise up seed to his dead brothers. How long was this to continue? Is there any evidence in the Bible that it was to cease when Christianity should be introduced by our Savior and his Apostles? What was the condition of the Jewish nation at the time Jesus went forth preaching repentance and baptism and admitting members into his Church? I will tell you, there were thousands and thousands that were polygamists, and were obliged by the command of God to be so. They could not get rid

of it, if they obeyed the law of Moses; and if they did not obey, they were to be cursed.

These polygamists, then, that took their deceased brothers' wives, according to the notions of Christendom in the nineteenth century, would be prohibited from baptism. The Son of God and the Apostles that went forth 1,800 years ago, were so holy that they must not permit any of these polygamists to enter the Christian Church, though they were only obeying the command given by the God of heaven through Moses; yet they must not be baptized—they must be rejected. This would be the argument of Christianity in the nineteenth century. But can we suppose that Jesus would be so inconsistent that he would actually command a thing a few thousand years before (for Jesus was the one that gave the law to Moses), and then come two or three thousand years afterwards, and not permit the people to enter his Church because they had obeyed that former command? Such is the foolish argument of Christendom in these days. Say they, Polygamy is not to be sanctioned under the Christian dispensation. I would like to know where their evidence is. What part of the New Testament, or where, in the teachings of Jesus and his Apostles, do we find such evidence recorded, that a man should not have more than one wife? It cannot be found. But says one, "I have read the New Testament, and I do not recollect that the term wives is used by the eight writers of that book; but they always used the term "wife," in the singular number. And from this it is presumed that they did not have more than one. Let us examine the strength of this presumption.

I find eighteen or twenty writers of the Old Testament who use "wife," and not wives. Will you, therefore, draw the conclusion that plurality was not practiced among them under the Old