SEARCHLIGHT.

VOL. 5. INDEPENDENCE, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, FEBRUARY, 1900. NO. 1.

LET US HAVE PEACE.

Notwithstanding the different questions at issue between the believers in the Book of Mormon, there is certainly a large common ground upon which all stand. That the scope of this ground may be largely increased, we believe can be demonstrated whenever those holding different views are willing to meet together for a proper discussion of the differences in faith, doctrine, etc. Meeting together for the purpose of *arguing* and displaying the learning possessed by each will have but little effect towards attaining the desired end.

It is quite certain that a great and glorious work is ahead of some part, or perhaps all, of the believers in the restored gospel. If the work is to be performed *by all*, then it behooves the different fragments to get closer together and attain a condition in which God may use them. If the work is reserved for one or two of the fragments to accomplish, then those who desire to engage in the work of the Lord should put forth an effort to discover whom are the favored ones, that they get in line and harmony with the chosen.

To reach proper conclusions, all interested must possess profound humility, coupled with deep faith and the broadest of broad charity.

We believe that the "Mormons" are now "making history," and whether that history shall be good or bad depends upon themselves. That it may be good, let all who have the hope of Zion at heart, endeavor to promulgate a spirit of peace and good feeling towards all who have a common cause.

CONCERNING POLYGAMY.

In the edition of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants used by the Utah Mormon church is found what purports to be a revelation of God treating on the subject of the eternity of marriage and a plurality of wives. Non-believers are prone to term this production "a revelation sanctioning polygamy." We herewith reproduce the first paragraph of this "revelation" which is numbered 132 in the Utah edition of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. It is headed "Revelation on the Eternity of the Marriage Covenant, including plurality of wives," etc.

1. Verily, thus saith the Lord unto you, my servant Joseph, that inasmuch as you have inquired of my hand to know and understand wherein I, the Lord, justified my servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; as also Moses, David and Solomon, my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines.

Much dispute has arisen regarding its author. The followers of Brigham Young make claim that it was given through Joseph Smith the prophet; the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints claim that it is a forgery upon Joseph Smith and charge Brigham Young with being its real author. It matters little to the investigator who was responsible for its production. Its claim upon him (if any there be) must arise from whatever merit the "revelation" itself contains, for no one's name can better it, and if it be untrue no one possesses a name of sufficient potence to save it.

There are portions of it that deal with historical facts that shall claim our present attention. In the opening paragraph of this "revelation" are certain statements that are contrary to history. It is stated, for instance, that Isaac, the son of Abraham, was a polygamist. It is also stated that God justified Abraham in the practice of a plurality of wives. Both of these statements are contrary to plain history recorded in the Bible. Nowhere can it be found that Isaac was a polygamist, but on the contrary, the history in the Bible touching his life, goes to show that he was a strict monogamist, and we challenge any polygamist to prove from the Bible, the contrary. It is the case of Abraham, however, that is the most palpable perversion of historical facts. Polygamists invariably make the argument that Abraham received his plural wife Hagar at the hands of his wife Sarah, in conformity to the law governing plural marriages, and claim that Abraham could not refuse, even had he been disposed on account of God having commanded him to *hearken unto Sarah*. It is quite true that Sarah gave her maid, Hagar, to Abraham; it is also true that she did so while laboring under a *misapprehension* of *facts*, and guided solely by her own feelings and judgment.

God had promised that Abraham should have an heir, and Sarah, being past the usual child-bearing period of life, concluded that if Abraham had an heir of his own flesh, *some other* woman than *herself* must be its mother; she did not realize that God possessed the power, and, indeed, would

use it that *she* might become the mother of Abraham's heir, therefore, she formed in her own mind a plan to procure an heir, by giving her maid, Hagar, to Abraham, and it is almost needless to remark that her plan was not the one that God had planned, nor the one that he eventually used. Indeed, instead of God accepting the heir born of the relations between Abraham and Hagar, when the occasion arose, he repudiated the whole transaction by branding as illegitimate the son born of that union, and designated a child born about fourteen years later to Sarah, as the *true seed* of Abraham, as we shall attempt to show in this connection. We ask those of our readers not familiar with the Bible story concerning these matters to get their books and turn to the sixteenth chapter of Genesis, and go with us as we examine the narrative, and we will let you be the judge as to the truth of the statement that Abraham found warrant to practice polygamy on account of God telling him to give heed to the words of Sarah.

The first four verses of the 16th chapter of Genesis are devoted to a narration of how Abraham's wife, Sarah, gave him her maid, Hagar, as a second or plural wife, and also the conditions following. It is in the fourth verse that Sarah shows her repentance of the act of giving Hagar to Abraham, and she makes use of the significant expression, "*My wrong* be upon thee." Abraham, recognizing the rights of Sarah, and looking upon Hagar in the true light of a maid only, answers Sarah, "Behold thy *maid* [not my wife] is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee."

This was certainly a strange remark for Abraham to make if Hagar was really his wife and had been given him in obedience to the law governing celestial or plural marriage.

If it was true as stated in the Utah Doctrine and Covenants revelation, that Abraham received Hagar under the operation of the law governing plural marriages, he seemed to be totally unaware of any such thing, or at least he totally ignored its provisions, for instead of defending Hagar and affording her the protection she would be entitled to were she his wife, obtained under the direction and law of God, he simply answers Sarah's complaint of Hagar's misbehavior, by saying to Sarah, "Behold thy maid is in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee." If Abraham was bound to Hagar by any legal ties whatever, he certainly failed to recognize or mention them. Simply, "thy maid, do as you please." The rest of the chapter deals with the flight of Hagar from before the wrath of Sarah, the meeting with the angel of God, and the command for Hagar to return to "her mistress." Had she been a *wife*, in the sense that Utah believers teach, it would have been impossible for the relation of *mistress* and *maid* to be sustained between these two women.

Nevertheless Hagar bore a son to Abraham, and he was called Ishmael. Some time after this when Abraham had reached the age of ninety-nine God appeared and informed him that he was about to perform his covenant concerning the seed of Abraham (notwithstanding Abraham was the father of a boy thirteen years old, born to him by his wife's maid). That they should be numerous and would be the covenant people of the Lord; that he would give to Abraham's seed the land of Canaan for an everlasting inheritance; and that this seed should spring from a son which Sarah (not Hagar) should bear to Abraham. Sure enough when the time rolled around a child was born to Sarah, and of whom God had said, "Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed: and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant and with his seed after him."

Now, read the next verse and see the disposition he makes of Ishmael, born several years before to Abraham, and who, had he been a legitimate son of Abraham, would have been entitled to all the blessings accorded the first born in those days and times. However, God passes him and refuses to recognize the son of Hagar and Abraham as legitimate seed of Abraham, nevertheless makes provision for the lad, because of the prayers of Abraham concerning him. The Lord tells Abraham, "And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful," etc., but, "*My covenant* will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah [Abraham's legitimate wife] shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year." Here it is that God clearly draws the line between the legitimate and the illegimate seed of Abraham, and does not even accord Ishmael doubtful standing of being termed illegitimate; simply cuts him off altogether as the seed of Abraham, and declares that to Isaac must be given that title, a thing that would have been impossible from a standpoint of justice, had Hagar been the wife, and Ishmael the legitimate son of Abraham.

After Sarah had become the mother of little Isaac and his weaning time had come (see verse 8, chapter 21), the old trouble between Sarah and Hagar seems to have revived, and Sarah demanded that Abraham should "Cast out this bond woman and her son; for the son of the bond woman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." This demand made by Sarah was a great trial to Abraham. It was at this point in his history when God is preparing to separate Abraham and

his plural wife, Hagar, that the command came for him to "hearken to Sarah's voice;" and at no previous time was such an instruction given him. We quote verse 12: "And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievious in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; for in Isaac shall thy seed be called."

Here is the *first* intimation to Abraham that he must *hearken unto what Sarah said* unto him, and thus it transpired that the command God wished to give Abraham through his wife Sarah was one requiring him to *desist* from the practice of polygamy, instead of continuing it as Utah teachers would have us believe, for we find Sarah told Abraham to cast out the bond woman and her son, thus destroying the polygamous relations between Hagar and Abraham. So instead of God commanding Abraham to live a polygamous life, he commands him to hearken to a command which would end his polygamous relations. The twenty-fifth chapter of Genesis shows that subsequently Abraham had concubines, or plural wives, and that the different women who bore children to Abraham were in no wise considered his wives, nor were their children recognized as being heirs to him. (See verses 5 and 6). "And Abraham gave all that he had unto Isaac, but unto the sons of the concubines which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts and sent them away," etc.

This same paragraph in the so-called revelation, that contains the erroneous statements concerning Abraham and Isaac, also includes Moses among those whom God justified in the practice of a plurality of wives. While it may be true that Moses was married to two different woman, yet it was by no means clear that he was married to both at the same time, nor is the theory untenable that the two different names used in referring to his wife were simply different appellations belonging to one and the same woman.

While the foregoing facts drawn from the Bible are sufficient to cast the deepest suspicion on the divine authenticity of the "revelation on the eternity of marriage," yet it remains for the Book of Mormon to furnish the most direct and positive proof of the falsity of this doctrine.

As we stated before, the first paragraph of this so-called revelation contains the statement that God *justified* Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David and Solomon in the practice of polygamy. It is to the two last named that we desire to direct your particular attention, for we propose to bring evidence from the Book of Mormon to refute the statement and to show that instead of God *justifying* David and Solomon in having many wives and concubines, that he actually *condemns* it in direct and posive words. In the second chapter of the book of Jacob (the third book in the Book of Mormon) is found the following:

> But the word of God burthens me because of your grosser crimes. For behold thus saith the Lord, this people begin to wax in iniquity; they *understand not* the scriptures because they seek to *excuse* themselves in committing whoredoms because of the things which are written concerning David and Solomon his son. Behold David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines which thing was *abominable* before me, saith the Lord, etc.

Thus it may be seen the Book of Mormon declares that the wives and concubines possessed by David and Solomon was an abomination.

The Brighamite alleged revelation says God justifies them. Surely the God we worship does not justify what he condemns and declares to be an abomination in his sight. This same revelation argues because the prophet Nathan gave wives to David that polygamy was acceptable in God's sight; Aaron also made a molten calf for the children of Israel to worship, yet God did not accept it. God ever grants unto men according to their desires in order that their free agency may be unimpaired. In the fourteenth chapter of Ezekiel he even declares that he will answer men according to the idols they have set up in their hearts. If David was not satisfied with one wife and wanted more it brought no condemnation on God's prophet to allow David to have his wish. God often granted things to his people that were not good for them yet they desired them and so got them. The case of making Saul a king is a notable example of God's dealings with dissatisfied humanity.

The Lord was opposed to the children of Israel having a king; He advised against it, but when the time came that nothing but a king would do them He permits Samuel to choose a king for them and assists him in making the choice, as also the anointing of Saul notwithstanding His disapproval. When the time came with David that he must have some more wives He permitted Nathan to grant them, yet by so doing He no more *approved* or *justified* the action than He did in the case of making Saul king at the hands of Samuel. That case will suffice and answer for every instance in which polygamists drag forward the mistakes and misdoings of these lamentably weak individuals and seek to use them as *precedents* and *examples* that thereby they may lay a foundation for scriptural sanction of the doctrine of polygamy.

A thousand theories fall before one fact. Polygamists may build theory after theory based on the *supposed* approbation by the Almighty of the doctrine of polygamy in individual cases scattered throughout the Bible; but the one little passage in the Book of Mormon completely demolishes these theories because it contains the absolute *law* of God prohibiting the practice of a plurality of wives. This *law* was framed and given for the *express purpose* of rectifying the evil the people had fallen into by *supposing* that God justi-

fied polygamy because David and Solomon, his servants, had many wives and concubines. Certain people in our day and time have fallen into the same error as did these people in supposing on account of what was written concerning David and Solomon that God justified polygamy, but the Lord says nay to them in the Book of Mormon; but when latter day Israel would not remember the "*former* commandments," but went to God and asked him to justify a thing which he had expressly condemned, there was but one thing left for him to do and doubtless he did it. He answered them as he did in days of old, *according* to the idol they had set up in their hearts. (See Ezekiel 14).

This plain language of the Book of Mormon at once settles the matter, for it is only by *inference* and alleged precedent that polygamy finds any support from the Bible, for *nowhere* in that book is it stated that polygamy was right in the sight of God. While the Book of Mormon contains the *law* of God on the subject and that law prohibits the practice, the different historians whose writings go to make the Bible simply stated what happened and narrate the incidents in the lives of its famous men without attempting to declare what was or was not the law; polygamists point to the fact that a great many of the patriarchs had several women and say that because these men were once servants of God and practiced polygamy it must be right. And the revelation which is mostly an argument takes up, as we stated, the case of David who had wives given him by Nathan the prophet, and says surely God would not permit Nathan to give wives to David if polygamy was wrong. Again the Book of Mormon takes up the case of David and notwithstanding the Lord knew Nathan had given wives to David, yet He says it was *an abomination.*

This plural marriage revelation teaches in substance that it is necessary for men and women who marry to be joined together by an officer who possesses power to link them in ties that will last during this life and also throughout eternity, and polygamists claim that men who are faithful in observing this "celestial commandment" are allowed after death to resume the relation of husband to the wives they possessed while on earth. The avowed object of this resumption in eternity of various duties and functions of the married state, is that the worlds which are given faithful polygamist husbands after their resurrection, may be peopled by their *seed.* They believe that when one of the "faithful" passes beyond the vail he "passes by" the angels and those possessing a like glory and ascends to the station of a god, where he is given dominion over a world as yet unpeopled. According to polygamist ideas, it is here that the multitude of plural wives comes into play. As a natural consequence, when the much married man resumes the family relations that were interrupted by death, his wives bear him children, and with these children and their increase, all born in eternity, it is proposed that he shall people the new world that has been given him for his faithfulness to the doctrine of a plurality of wives.

These ideas may serve as argument and theories among people with a leaning towards polygamy, but there is an old saying that one fact is worth a thousand theories. That saying is quite true, as is also the statement that the facts are against the doctrine of polygamy. If polygamists are to be believed, men and women, after putting on immortality resume the matrimonial relations sustained during the natural life and become fathers and mothers just the same as they did during their earthly careers. Argument may go a long ways to prove that such ideas are incorrect, but luckily there is a passage in the Book of Mormon that completely demolishes the idea that children may be born to persons possessing immortal bodies. The prophet Alma declares that "Adam fell that men might be." Adam and his wife Eve were in an innocent state before the acts were committed that resulted in their expulsion from the garden. During the time that elapsed previous to their fall, *no children were born to them,* and it was not until *after* the fall that they became parents, thus showing the truth of Alma's statement that "Adam fell that men might be."

But, for the sake of argument, let us admit for a moment thot children might be born in eternity, of parents who had put on immortality. It is certain that children so born must forever remain *single* and unmarried, on account of the declaration of Jesus, who positively declared: "For when they shall rise from the dead they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels which are in heaven. (Mark 12: 25). Then if they neither marry nor are given in marriage in heaven, whoever lives in the married state at that time must depend on marriages performed before he rises from the dead, and of course children born in the world to come would be unable to be wedded in this. Now, let us carry the thing a little farther; if the fathers and mothers of these children are in possession of the powers of generation it would naturally follow that they would impart to their posterity whatever power they had themselves, and the result of this condition would be a race of men and women born with the instincts and attributes of paternity without leave to satisfy them in the begetting of children, because Jesus declares there is no marrying, nor giving in marriage in eternity, and of course it would not do for them to raise families without being married. If it were possible and right for these children born in eternity to take unto themselves wives without marrying them, then would it be useless for polygamists in this life to take all the care and trouble to be married here in preparation for that state, for if children born in eternity could sustain family relations without having the marriage ceremony, so could those who rise from the dead, but Jesus declares they neither marry nor are given in marriage in the resurrection.

[CONCLUDED IN OUR NEXT ISSUE].

WE trust that our readers will pardon us in the use of so much of our space in a consideration of the doctrine of plurality of wives. It is a question of vital interest to "Mormons," and we wish all believers in the Book of Mormon to understand our position on that doctrine.

SEARCHLIGHT.

VOL. 5. INDEPENDENCE, JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI, MARCH, 1900. NO. 2.

SEARCHLIGHT.

Published Monthly by Church of Christ in Zion.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, 25 CENTS PER YEAR, IN ADVANCE.

JOHN R. HALDEMAN, EDITOR.

Subscriptions commence with February number. Any person sending us three new subscribers for one year will receive one year's subscription free. One cent stamps taken. Address all subscriptions and communications to John R. Haldeman, P. O. Box 83, Independence. Mo.

Entered at Post Office at Independence, Mo., as second-class matter.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION: Geo. P. Frisbey, Geo. D. Cole, Jas. A. Hedrick.

CHURCH OF CHRIST holds preaching services every Sunday in meeting house on the Temple Lot at 11 a. m. and 7:30 p. m. Everybody invited and welcome.

IMPORTANT NOTICE.

No one entitled to participate in the actions of the General Church Conference should be absent from the April 1900 session. Matters of the *gravest consequence* and affecting every member in the Church of Christ will be presented for *consideration* and *action*; it, therefore, behooves the different branches to see that their elders are present and participate in the business to be laid before the body.

It may require some sacrifice to accomplish this, but we believe a deep sacrifice for this purpose is demanded at this time.

WORK ON BUILDING PROGRESSES.

Two more rooms have been finished in our Temple Lot building, and for the present have been thrown into one room which is being used as a place of worship. It is a significant fact that in this room (built under divine guidance for the purposes of a council room) was held the council between the six Reorganized elders and the six elders of the Church of Christ.

It is doubtful whether even those participating in that council realized the gravity of the situation or the results likely to follow its determinations.

It is hoped that sufficient money will be raised at the coming conference to finish the entire interior, which, when completed, will give us a building admirably adapted to our needs.

ANOTHER COUNCIL.

In response to an invitation six of the representative men of the Reorganization met six elders of the Church of Christ in a council which assembled on Tuesday, March 6th, and continued until the Sunday following.

The Utah church was invited to send some of its men to participate in the meeting, but they declined to do so.

The object of the elders of the Church of Christ in issuing the invitation was that a consideration of grave matters relating to the work of the redemption of Zion might be had, and, if possible, agreements reached, which, when reported to the conferences of the several bodies represented, might result in unity of action in the work of building the temple at Independence, etc.

Many questions of importance were considered, and some referred for action to the conferences of the two bodies represented.

The meeting adjourned until after the April conference.

OVERCOMING.

When we battle with temptation and strive to overcome we should not forget that perhaps more than our own soul's salvation depends on the victory.

None are without influence, some in a great, some in a small degree. Others are watching their fellows, and especially watching professors of religion; and many, about to be overcome, are often strengthened for renewed struggles by beholding the never wavering attitude of some brother or sister consecrated to Christ.

The example of a lifelong christian cannot fail of producing an effect for good upon those with whom he comes in contact.

The writer can recall many times listening to these gray haired veterans of the cross recounting their experiences and telling of the many hard fought battles with the powers of darkness; and the fact that they stand as living witnesses of man's ability to overcome through the blood of

the Lamb, puts hope into the heart of those grown faint; strength to the limbs of the weary, and gives sight to those whose eyes have grown dim through the washing of many tears.

We know not whose eyes are upon us, nor who we are helping to uphold by our example; so when temptation is upon us, when trials thicken and danger seems to surround us, let us never slacken in the least, but strive with redoubled efforts, having the thought ever before us that our victory may mean victory for others, and that if we go down we may drag others with us.

FINISH OUR BUILDING.

It is sincerely hoped that sufficient means will be raised at the coming conference to finish the Temple Lot building.

Remarkable progress has been made considering the financial ability of our people. We have no debt hanging over the building, and do not owe a cent on it nor the grounds. It has taken sacrifice to do this much and will take more sacrifice to complete the building; yet not so much but what it can be accomplished by our own people. All that now remains to do can be finished for less than $300, we believe. Let our people come to conference prepared to take the needed steps that shall insure the completion of this building, for the Lord undoubtedly has other work ahead of us; for if you remember, the building we are now occupying was to be built as preparatory for something else. It will not take a very long nor deep consideration to determine what that "something else" is, and when one realizes the possibilities that are now lying before us it should cause his heart to leap and his blood to tingle. Do not let these golden opportunities pass, but be fully awake to the princely heritage that now belongs to the people of God and be ready to improve the chances that God seems to be throwing in our way. *Finish the house.*

THE type, cases, etc., used some time past for the SEARCHLIGHT, have been moved into the west room on the ground floor of our new building, and doubtless the next paper printed by the Church of Christ will be issued from the Temple Lot. All we lack now is a press suitable to print on, and when that is obtained we will be very well equiped for printing a small paper. It is not the purpose of our people to attempt the publication of anything elaborate in the way of a paper, but rather to print a small sheet and endeavor to make it as interesting as our limited abilities will allow. We feel sure that some day and perhaps not very far into the future, a paper will be printed and go forth from the Temple Lot that will bear glad tidings to many souls who have long fed upon hope. Of course we hope to be among the number who shall control and direct such a publication, yet willing to help hold up the hands of others should God choose to so direct.

CONCERNING POLYGAMY.

[CONCLUDED.]

Polygamists are fond of making the assertion that God instituted polygamy in order to raise up a righteous seed, basing their claim upon a doubtful construction of a passage in the Book of Mormon. We will go back to the very beginning of mankind and show that God, on signal occasions, has acted in a manner to show that *monogamy* and not polygamy was according to his way.

If polygamy was instituted as a law from the very beginning as this Utah production states, and had it been the law when God created the first man, and when he created Eve, the first woman, he would of a necessity have acted within and been governed by the law, and instead of creating only *one* woman to be a wife to Adam, he would have created several. Unfortunately for polygamists Genesis fails to mention any other woman save Eve as wife to Adam.

When God destroyed the wicked in a flood and spared Noah and his family, if polygamy was his method of raising up righteous seed it is strange he did not command Noah and his three sons to take three or four wives apiece. But the Book says they had but one wife apiece. Again, in Abraham's day when the Lord began laying plans for the formation of a nation of "priests and kings," he repudiates the children born to Abraham of polygamous wives and concubines. He singles out the one son Isaac, the child of his first wife, and allows Abraham to send the remainder away with gifts, not counting or recognizing them as his seed.

Changing now to Book of Mormon history we find the Lord preparing to lead off those people who were to form "a righteous branch of the loins of Joseph." If polygamy was the method of procuring *righteous seed* what a glorious opportunity to have put it in operation, and started Lehi and his sons toward the promised land with four or five wives apiece. But the Lord God did nothing of the kind. On the contrary, Book of Mormon history shows that polygamy was unknown during the early part of Nephi's residence on this land; that finally men began to practice it because of what was written concerning David and Solomon,

and the Lord wastes no time in rebuking them for their abominations and moves on his prophet to declare that its practice was an abomination in his sight.

Returning to Bible history we find that John, the forerunner of Christ, was born of monogamist parents as was also the Savior. If children, born of polygamist parents, are so much more righteous than others, why was the Savior and John born of monogamist instead of polygamist parents. With all of these things against polygamy staring in the face of the author of the so-called revelation what could have induced him to go and ask the Lord "Wherein he justified Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, etc., in the practice of polygamy" when there was not a line in all the sacred writings that stated any such thing. The truth of the matter as we verily believe is that certain men in the church desired to follow the example of Abraham and others in possessing many wives, and having set up the idol in their hearts and asked the Lord concerning it, he answered them as Ezekiel said he would. He granted according to their desires.

There is one passage in the Book of Mormon quoted by polygamists in support of their doctrine that we shall also examine in this connection. The passage referred to is connected with the passage found in the book of Jacob, and quoted by us in this article. It is as follows: "For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people, *otherwise* they shall hearken unto these things."

Polygamists put much stress on the word *otherwise* used in the above passage, and claim that it is the presence of this word that indicates God's purpose to have his people practice polygamy some time in the future. When questioned about this passage they are ready to admit that God did not want his people to practice polygamy at *that time*, "but," say they, "the fact that God used the word *otherwise* shows that he will command his people 'in a different manner' some time in the future, for the word otherwise means in a different manner or way." "Therefore," they say, "the passage should read something like this: 'The Lord does not desire the people to practice polygamy *now*, but if I will raise up unto me a righteous seed I will command my people, and in *a different manner* shall they hearken unto these things."

The "things that they were to hearken unto at that that time was to refrain from practicing polygamy, and to reason from a polygamist standpoint, whenever the time came for God to command his people to hearken "in a different manner," they would have to practice instead of refraining, in order to make their hearkening "in a different manner" from what it had previously been.

Their theory would be all right but for one thing. The word otherwise as used in the passage quoted does not mean "in a different manner." When the word "otherwise" is used as an *adverb* then it means "in a different manner," but it is used as a *conjunction* in the Book of Mormon passage, and bears a meaning that completely upsets the polygamic theory. The proper definition of the word "otherwise" when used in the manner that it is in the Book of Mormon is "for the cause named." Now, we go back to the causes that lead up to the use of this language and then quote it, and then substitute for the conjunction "otherwise" its proper meaning. To do this we must take up the matter at a point some time previous to the giving of the law against polygamy.

The Nephites had begun to practice polygamy, notwithstanding God had led them out of Jerusalem for the avowed purpose of raising up a righteous seed of the loins of Joseph. When remonstrated with concerning the practice of this doctrine, they justified themselves by pointing to the example of David and Solomon who had many wives and concubines. But the Lord tells them through his servants that they erred concerning what was written about David and Solomon. More than this he declared that the practice was an abomination in his sight, and commanded that a man should have "save it be one wife and concubines none." The Lord points to the fact of his being engaged in raising up a righteous seed, and adds, "for if I will saith the Lord, raise up unto me a righteous seed I will command my people, and for the cause named [that is, the fact that he was raising up a righteous seed, and that polygamy was an abomination in his sight] they shall hearken unto these things."

Some polygamists say that a plurality of wives in itself was not an abomination, but it was the excessive number that David and Solomon had that displeased the Lord; and that if they had been content with a few dozen wives instead of hundreds it would have been all right. This kind of an argument does not gibe very well with the opening paragraph in the polygamic revelation for there the Lord is made to say that he justified Abraham, Isaac, David and Solomon in the having of *many* wives. The Book of Mormon says that "truly David and Solomon had *many* wives and concubines which was an abomination in my sight. The so-called revelation makes the Lord to say that he justified them in having *many* wives. Which place was it that the Lord really was speaking? He could not have uttered both the state-

ments attributed to him. As for ourselves we prefer to believe that it was the Lord speaking in the Book of Mormon, and that some deceptive spirit was responsible for the contradictory utterance contained in the so called revelation.

Additional grounds for viewing with suspicion the revelation on the eternity of marriage exist in its advocacy and teaching of the doctrine of a plurality of Gods.

It is true that many quotations can be made which lend color to the idea that there is a multiplicity of gods; but when the same quotations are viewed in their true light and correctly understood, they afford but slight support to the plurality of gods doctrine.

The term "gods" is used a great many times in the Old Testament, but that the term "gods" is ever used in the Bible to indicate a plurality of personages known as the Lord, "God of Israel," Jehovah, etc., we emphatically deny, and challenge proof to the contrary.

The word "god" to the ancient is but the translation of the word "ruler," and was applied by the ancients indiscriminately to those in power, whether spiritual or temporal. The appellation was also applied to the idols worshiped by the heathen nations that surrounded the Israelites. But the term Jehovah, as we have it, was a term exclusively reserved by the children of Israel for the designation of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.

Nowhere in the Bible can it be found where a plurality of *Jehovahs* is mentioned; and wherever the plurality of gods is named it means simply a plurality of rulers. It is impossible to believe that the language means anything else on account of the concise and definite statements of Isaiah in the Bible and of Zeezrom in the Book of Mormon.

Zeezrom, when the direct question was put to him, "Is there more than one God," emphatically denied the existence of more than one, and to make the matter certain and sure he declared that an angel had so informed him.

Isaiah is equally strong in his testimony recorded in his forty-fourth chapter which is as follows:

"Thus saith the Lord, the king of Israel and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, I am the first, and I am the last and beside me there is no God. And who as I shall call and shall declare it and set it in order for me, since I appointed the ancient people? And the things that are coming and shall come, let them shew unto them. Fear ye not, neither be afraid; have not I told thee from that time, and have declared it? Ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? Yea there is no god, I know not any." (Verses 6, 7, 8).

This quotation also helps to dispose of rather an ingenious argument sometimes advanced, to support the idea of a plurality of gods. We have heard the question put something like this, "Did not Jesus Christ often refer to his 'Father,' and in doing so did he not admit his sonship? And was not Jesus a god?" If answered in the affirmative, the statement would then follow, "Now, you have admitted that God the Father and God the Son both have an existence; that makes two gods, and if two can exist then why not more?"

While it is quite true that Jesus often used the term "my Father," yet he did not use it in the sense commonly understood, for if he did, then by so doing he would completely destroy the force of the assertion contained in the Book of Mormon where he declared to the Nephites that "I am the very eternal Father."

The New Testament also quotes Jesus as declaring, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also." Isaiah links the Father and Son together in *one* God by his declaration in the sixth verse of the forty-fourth chapter. He says:

"Thus saith the Lord, the King of Israel, and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts: I *am* the first, and I *am* the last: and beside me *there is* no God."

Thus the King of Israel, and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts, are declared to be the first and the last and the only God.

We shall not attempt a minute explanation of the matter, or how it is possible for Jesus to speak of the "Father," and to also declare himself to be the "very eternal Father," "maker of heaven and earth." The very fact that Jesus has declared himself on the matter, as has also two of his prophets, one in the Bible and one in the Book of Mormon, is sufficient for us. When advocates of a plurality of gods can blot out the declarations of these three, it will then be time to consider their deductions gathered from mere references scattered among the writings found in the Old Testament.

An effort has been made to make capital out of a place in the Book of Mormon where the word "gods" occurs. A careful reading of the language preceding and following the words "gods" in the Book of Mormon, discloses the fact that instead of meaning "many gods," it means appertaining or belonging to God. Our reason for so stating is that almost the same sentence in which it occurs is used in *another place* in the Book of Mormon, and there the possessive case is unmistakably plain. It only occurs the once as "gods," and this once is an evident blunder of the printer in failing to insert the possessive mark between the "d" and "s" in gods, when the type was first set.