

in his translation of the Hebrew, from all these translators and lexicographers? His only answer was that he found a certain Jew in Washington who told him that it meant "dwelling," or rather that its original root referred to a "dwelling." I thought that was a very poor argument against all the translators of the Christian world, who are mostly monogamists. But we will pass on. I do not intend to dwell too long on these subjects.

So far as the law of Moses is concerned, to prove that the house of Israel kept up their polygamous institution from generation to generation, let me refer you to another law to show that they were compelled to do this, or else to come out in open rebellion against the law of Moses. In the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy, we read something like this—"When brethren dwell together, and one of them die, the living brother shall take the widow of the deceased brother, and it shall come to pass that the firstborn that is raised up shall succeed in the name of his brother." This was a positive command given to all Israel. Now was this command confined to young men who were unmarried, or was it an unlimited command so far as living brothers were in existence? This is a question to be decided. There is nothing in all the Scriptures that makes any distinction between a married brother who survives and an unmarried brother; the law was just as binding upon a living brother, if he had already a wife living, as it was upon a living brother if he had no wife, it being a universal law, with no limits in its application, so far as the house was concerned. This law, then, compelled the children of Israel to be polygamists; for in many instances the living brother might be a married man, and in many instan-

ces there might be two or three brothers who would take wives and die without leaving seed, and in that case it would devolve upon the surviving brother to take all the widows. This law was not given for that generation alone, but for all future generations. Some may say, that when Jesus came, he came to do away that law. I doubt it. He came to do away the law of sacrifices and of burnt offerings, and many of those ordinances and institutions, rites and ceremonies which pertained to their tabernacle and temple, because they all pointed forward to him as the great and last sacrifice. But did he come to do away all these laws that were given in the five books of Moses? No. There are many of these laws that were retained under the Christian dispensation. One of the laws thus retained was repentance. The children of Israel were commanded to repent, and no person will pretend to say that Jesus came to do away the law of repentance. Another was the law of honesty, upright dealing between man and man; no one will pretend to say that that law ceased when Jesus came. The laws concerning families and the regulation of the domestic institutions were not intended to cease when Jesus came, and they did not cease only as they were disregarded through the wickedness of the children of men. The laws concerning monogamy, and the laws concerning polygamy were just as binding after Jesus had come, as they were before he came. There were some laws which Ezekiel says were not good. Jesus denounced them, and said they were given because of the hardness of the hearts of the children of Israel. Ezekiel says that God gave them statutes and judgments by which they should not live. Why did he do it? Because of their