

thirty thousand and you will find that the quotient is eighty-three, showing that number of souls on an average in each family. Now if these families were all monogamic, how many children must have been born to each wife? Eighty-one.

This argument is founded on Scripture, and it shows plainly, even if you should double the number of families or of the firstborn, that they could not be all monogamic families, for if we suppose there were sixty thousand families, it would make every married woman the mother of forty odd children, and if such a supposition could be entertained it would go to show that women in those days were more fruitful than they are now. These declarations are given in your Bible, which is also my Bible; that is, in King James' translation. We all believe, or profess to be Bible believers or Christians. Do not be startled my hearers at these declarations of your Bible. No wonder then that this passage which I have taken for my text was given to that people, because they were a people who needed to be guided in relation to their duty. "If a man take another wife;" that is, after he has got one, if he take another one, "her food"—whose food? The food of the first wife—"her raiment," that is the raiment of the first wife, "her duty of marriage, he shall not diminish." Now this is plain, pointed and positive language in regard to polygamy as it existed among the house of Israel in ancient times. Why did not the Lord say, if polygamy were a crime or a sin—"If a man take another wife, let all the congregation take him without the camp and stone him and put him to death?" Or if that was too severe let them incarcerate him in a prison or dungeon for several years? If it be a crime why did he not say so? It is just as easy to say

that, as to give directions as to what course a man shall pursue with regard to his first wife, if he takes another one.

This is Bible doctrine as it existed in those days. I know that it has been argued that the first woman, here spoken of, was merely a betrothed woman, and not married. But if this be so, what a curious saying this in our text—that her duty of marriage shall he not diminish if he take another wife. This and other expressions show clearly that they were both wives, and that there was a certain duty to be attended to by the husband, besides providing them with food and raiment. It was argued here in this tabernacle before some eight or ten thousand people, on a certain occasion, that the Hebrew word translated "*duty of marriage*," ought to have been translated "*dwelling*"—"Her food, her raiment, and her dwelling, he shall not diminish." I recollect asking the learned gentleman, Rev. Dr. Newman, why he translated it dwelling, instead of translating it as all other Hebrewists have done? I asked him to produce one passage in all the Bible where that word translated "duty of marriage," meant a "dwelling," but he could not do it. The Hebrew word for "dwelling," and the Hebrew word for "duty of marriage," are two entirely distinct words. I referred him to the learned professors in Yale College, and to many others who have translated this Hebrew word "duty of marriage." These professors and other learned translators, have referred to this special passage, and have translated it in two ways—one is "duty of marriage," and the other is cohabitation. Now, if this latter be correct—her food, her raiment, and her cohabitation, shall not be diminished. I asked him why he varied