

**Jesus Was Married
By
Ogden Kraut**

First Printing 1969

(This download is to be used for teaching and educational purposes only and not for commercial gain and must be kept in its original form. The order this book, please visit www.ogdenkraut.com)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

"Did Jesus ever marry?" This has been a disputable question sometimes arising against the popular opinions of today. Tradition has formulated an opinion, popular with modern Christians, that Jesus never married. Objectors to His marriage contend that He was not subject to the same laws, ordinances, or principles which are otherwise imposed upon the rest of mankind. Some oppose His marriage by purporting that marriage is sinful in its nature--that marriage involves a base, animalistic or sensuous practice, and that the union of the sexes is an evil regardless of the conditions. Thus the popular consensus prohibits Jesus from complying with the ancient law and practice of marriage. Christianity today teaches a celibate Christ.

The reasons for believing in the marriage of Jesus, rather than in celibacy, are more logical, and to a great degree more valid, through the light of prophecy, history, and revelation. However, those who make reference to or boldly assert that Jesus was married will usually arouse a cry of "blaspheme" from the modern Christian. Despite the popular opinions and the pious modesty of our society, a careful investigation may prove interesting, if not advantageous, in the quest for an answer to this relevant question.

Chapter 2

MARRIAGE AND CELIBACY

One of God's first laws and commandments to man was marriage. And from the Garden of Eden to the present time, God has continued to sanction and bless those who have honored this covenant. Marriage, solemnized by God in the beginning, was established with a Divine acceptance for the purpose of propagation of the species, for mutual help, and for comfort and companionship. It was a union so sacred and spiritual in its nature that the man and woman were to become "one flesh. (Gen. 2:24; Matt. 19:5) This inseparable union is spirituality illustrated in a similar comparison with Christ to His Church (Eph. 5:30); and God has throughout history given many laws and commandments concerning marriage--not restraining marriage, but rather restricting anything that would break the bonds of marriage, viz., fornication, adultery, whoredom, etc. Among these perils to marriage was celibacy (state of being unmarried), which was never an acceptable practice in ancient Israel, nor in early Christianity, but rather a doctrine of the pagans until it became incorporated into an apostate Christianity. By its nature celibacy contributes little to the quality or character in man--much less in a woman--because fruitful propagation of the species is contributory; barrenness in anything tends to extinction.

Paul foresaw the apostasy of Christianity and warned the members of the Church concerning these events. Celibacy, among other things was a "doctrine of devils".

Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith,

giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. (I Tim. 4:1-3)

Interpolation of the scriptures became a fertile field for harvesting of alien philosophies and ideologies. This later became the doctrinal law of the apostate church. Under the influence of Greek gnostic thinking and Roman traditional laws, the principles of Christianity suffered worse than through centuries of barbaric persecution. Superstition and useless ritualism replaced divine revelation. Then from among these amalgamated substitutions for the Gospel, came our time-honored traditions of history which were so far from the original teachings that when some of the truthful remains of the scriptures were found, it caused a reformation.

Celibacy had become such a dominant law of the prevailing church that it required hiding the scriptures from lay members; indeed, in some cases the laws of God had to be modified or thrown aside to corroborate with the later doctrinal innovations.

Nephi had been instructed by an angel that such things would occur:

And the angel of the Lord said unto me: Thou hast beheld that the book proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew; and when it proceeded forth from the mouth of a Jew, it contained the plainness of the gospel of the Lord, of whom the Twelve Apostles bear record; And they bear record according to the truth which is in the Lamb of God.

*Wherefore, these things go forth from the Jews in purity unto the Gentiles, according to the truth which is in God. And after they go forth by the hand of the twelve apostles of the Lamb, from the Jews unto the Gentiles, thou seest the foundation of a great and abominable church, which is most abominable above all other churches, for behold, **they have taken away from the gospel of the Lamb many parts which are plain and most precious; and also many covenants of the Lord have they taken away.** And all this have they done that they might pervert the right ways of the Lord, that they might blind the eyes and harden the hearts of the children of men. Wherefore, thou seest that after the book hath gone forth through the hands of the great and abominable church, that there are many plain and precious things taken away from the book, which is the book of the Lamb of God. And after these plain and precious things were taken away, it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles; and after it goeth forth unto all the nations of the Gentiles, yea, even across the many waters which thou hast seen with the Gentiles which have gone forth out of captivity, thou seest because of the many plain and precious things which have been taken out of the book, which were plain unto the understanding of the children of men, according to the plainness which is the Lamb of God--**because of these things which are taken away out of the gospel of the Lamb, an exceeding great many do stumble, yea, insomuch that Satan hath great power over them.** (I Nephi 13:24-29)*

From the age of twelve to thirty, a gap of 18 years, the scriptural history or the life of Jesus is missing. That He "grew in wisdom" is an extremely insufficient record in the life of one so important as the Redeemer of the world. John the Beloved wrote about the words and deeds of Jesus sufficient to "fill libraries. (John 21:25). From this testimony we can be reasonably sure that much more was written in the life of Jesus than that contained in the few pages of the four gospels. Even many other known books of the New Testament are missing:

An earlier epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.

(I Cor.5:9)

Another epistle of Paul to the Ephesians. (Eph. 3:3)

An epistle of Paul from Loodicea. (Col. 4:16)

A former epistle of Jude. (Jude 1:3)

Prophecies of Enoch. (Jude 1:14)

Because great portions of the story of Christianity have been lost, discarded, or altered, the true facts are difficult, if not impossible, to find. And to these hazy scraps of history, apostasy has added dogmas, rituals, and the traditions of men. The voice of Protestantism declared the error of this historical patchwork of human creations.

Throughout the centuries of time these traditions evolved into Church law, and that law, in turn,

was advocated as historical fact. The real facts remain like a skeleton of the original structure of Christianity. So aloof from the real truth are these traditions that facts appear strange, if not erroneous when brought to light.

The history of the marriage law of Christianity is not valid as it has come down through centuries of traditional customs, philosophies, and man-managing; especially through channels which have corrupted almost every other doctrine and ordinance of a sacred gospel. The laws of the marriage covenant have become as perverted as any other part of our religious history. Through the traditions and assumptions of men, celibacy became not only an accepted doctrine of the Church for men and women, but even for Christ!

Fundamentally the question is not "What proof do we have that Jesus was married?" But rather, "where is there any proof that celibacy was a doctrinal law of God?"

Chapter 3

RABBI JESUS

To understand the nature and mission of the life of Christ, one must first understand the lineage, traditions and the religion into which He was born. History has accurately confirmed his birth, childhood, and adult life in a Jewish society. He honored Jewish laws. He taught in Jewish synagogues, and eventually became a Jewish Rabbi. His life's mission was dedicated and foreordained to be a part of the Jewish society, and the events of his life were ultimately fulfilled according to the prophecies of the ancient Jewish prophets.

Unlike any other nation, the tribe of Judah was distinct in its moral and physical laws. The purpose of cleansing or purifying the body and soul was for a dedication and preparation of the "Messiah", who would be born through that sacred lineage. Eating habits were restricted by spiritual laws to purify the blood, and marriage laws were jealously observed by the Jewish community to prevent introduction to contamination by any "gentile" strain of blood. Every Jewish woman lived with the hope and desire of being honored to bear the chosen "Messiah" and Savior of the world.

From the fall of Adam, a Redeemer became a necessity and an expectation. Prophecy depicted the event, the time and the location of his birth, as well as many incidents in the life of this blessed Redeemer. It was the grand patriarch Jacob, who bestowed a patriarchal blessing upon the heads of his twelve sons, and Judah was given the distinction of receiving the promised lineage of this predicted Redeemer. Said Jacob:

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be. (Gen. 49:10)

So were the faith and desire of the house of Judah, as they anticipated this cherished event. They concentrated with an amiable protective care on this sacred trust, and the noble examples of heroism and valor were scrawled throughout the pages of ecclesiastical antiquity.

Upon the lips of all Judah was the consolation of the prophetic promise that "His name shall be called Immanuel--God with us;" and for nearly 1700 years that promise continued to be repeated. The expected "Immanuel" became a part of every sacrificial rite, prophecy, prayer, and was even fused into their songs and psalms. The promised coming of their Messiah compelled them to a strict observance of all the laws of God.

When Moses led Israel out of bondage, giving them God's revelations and laws, he pointed ahead to the time when a great "Prophet" would come among them, "Like unto me." (Deut. 18:15) This grand event was to be heralded by heaven itself--the guiding star, the night as day, and messages delivered by angels; thus confirming and fulfilling these ancient prophecies upon the child Jesus.

Among the Jews the twelfth year was the time which separated a boy from his childhood. Then a Hebrew boy was called "Bar Mitzvah", which is a "Son of the Law" or "Child of the Commandment". This is a period in which he was to study and be taught by the wisest teachers in Israel, learning and studying the law and the testament. There were annual gatherings, like conferences, in which many of

these wise teachers gave instructions. Three special annual feasts were particularly set apart for the instruction of young men. These feasts were the Passover, the Pentecost, and the Feast of the Tabernacles. The Passover was the most zealously attended, and worshippers came from all parts of the land to commemorate the deliverance of the Israelites from bondage, by the judgments of God upon the Egyptians. (See Exodus 12.)

At the age of twelve, Jesus ventured inside the great Jewish temple and, perhaps, for the first time, He saw the paschal sacrifice of the lamb, (robed men acting in the office of High Priests), while hearing the sacred prayers of his nation and smelling the consecrated temple incense. But more important than this, Jesus came into contact with the learned Rabbis of Israel. It is supposed at this time that Jesus spoke with Rabbi Hillil, whose teachings are recorded with high esteem in the Talmud. However, Jesus was not taught by any Rabbi--it was He who was teaching and answering the questions of the councils, and they "were astonished at His understanding and answers". (Luke 2:47)

Jesus spent three days in the temple conversing with the learned Elders of Zion. After the third day His mother had become aware of His absence and found Him still in the temple speaking to the priests and teachers. She then proceeded to chastise Him for the way He had "dealt" with her. In reply He said, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" But "they understood not the saying," which indicates that He was about His Heavenly "Father's business." His Father's business was teaching and instructing--not doing carpenter work, as modern tradition teaches. His wisdom and understanding superseded all the learning of the councils; but He could not reveal all that He knew, nor could He expose all of the existing evils within the empire. The Prophet Joseph explained:

Our lives have already become jeopardized by revealing the wicked and bloodthirsty purposes of our enemies; and for the future we must cease to do so. All we have said about them is truth, but it is not always wise to relate all the truth. Even Jesus, the Son of God, had to refrain from doing so, and had to restrain His feelings many times for the safety of Himself and His followers, and had to conceal the righteous purposes of His heart in relation to many things pertaining to His Father's kingdom. When still a boy He had all the intelligence necessary to enable Him to rule and govern the kingdom of the Jews, and could reason with the wisest and most profound doctors of law and divinity, and make their theories and practice to appear like folly compared with the wisdom He possessed; but He was a boy only, and lacked physical strength even to defend His own person; and was subject to cold, to hunger and to death. (T.P.J.S., p. 392)

There was another reason which delayed the full ministry of Jesus. We read that it was not until he "was about thirty years of age" that he began His ministry. This indicated that He was complying with one of the laws required to fulfill the office and calling of Rabbi or priest.

It was not until Jesus was thirty years of age that He was baptized, fasted for forty days, and gathered disciples into the ministry. By this time He had complied with all of the requirements of Jewish laws as a Rabbi. Compliance to the rules and regulations of Jewish law was essential in the work of the ministry, lest the High Priests and Councils use legitimate reason to condemn or reject Him. Jesus knew this, and warned His disciples to obey carefully the requirements of their laws, because "they sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;" (Matt. 23:2-3). The chief priests and councils sought with lawyers to trap Jesus for violating even the most minute laws. Jesus, however, could recite the law in His own defense, and by the same law condemn the Pharisees for their disobedience. He could condemn the hierarchy of Judah for their hypocrisy by their own law; and also condemn them according to the laws of God.

It should be carefully noted that Jesus was often called "Rabbi" which "is to say, being interpreted, Master." (John 1:38) This was an office, title, or position of "teacher", which was highly honored by the Jews--so much so, that it became a title of prestige and social respect. If a man was a "Rabbi", he was entitled to the choice seats in social gatherings and praises of the multitudes. Jesus warned his disciples to avoid the social prestige, the public honors, and the praiseworthy titles that came with the title of "Rabbi". (See Matt. 23:5-8)

Jesus was often called Rabbi which He did not deny. It was justly applied, both as to office and honor. If Jesus was not a Rabbi according to that Jewish office, He would have immediately renounced the title. His chief Apostle, Peter, often called him "Rabbi" (Mark 9:5, 11:21), but received no word of correction from Jesus, indicating that the title was properly applied. When Jesus was called "Rabbi" by Judas (Matt. 26:25, 49) and by Nathanael (John 1:49), and the other disciples (John 1:38, 4:31, 9:2,

11:8), He acknowledged the title without dispute. Great masses of the people also called Him Rabbi. (John 6:25); and when Nicodemus, a Pharisee and a ruler of the Jews, acknowledged Jesus as Rabbi, it was conclusive evidence that Jesus was indeed a Jewish Rabbi.

The office of Rabbi required a person to be particularly well versed in the scriptures and the Talmud, whereas the office of Priest required certain sacrificial and temple ordinance ceremonies; yet, both were specially commissioned.

*To be recognized as a Rabbi, however, a talmudic student has to be ordained. The custom of ordination is very old. Joshua was ordained by Moses. . . The practice of ordination in its Mosaic form ceased in Palestine in the second half of the 4th century when the Judaeen academies were closed. In the 16th century an attempt was made in Palestine to revive the ancient ordination, as well as the Sanhedrin, with all the power and authority that it possessed, but this attempt resulted in failure. (**Encyclopedia Britannica**, Vol. 18:978)*

With the ordination to this official calling of Rabbi, Jesus could teach the gospel principles wherever He was led to do so. As a Rabbi He taught thousands upon the mountainside, in the synagogues, and even resorted to use of a whip to teach a special lesson to the money changers in the temple. The councils, lawyers, Pharisees and Priests of Judah tried by every means to prove Jesus unfit for the office, but to no avail. Jesus acknowledged the title, office, and position of Rabbi by precept and example. he was destined to be the most honored of rabbis, priests and even kings!

It was his kingly and priestly powers which brought about the envy of both pagan and Jew. His influence was felt in every domain of social, religious and political life, and soon caused the jealousy and fear of those who felt the sting of his rebuke; for Jesus exposed the corruptions of the political tyrants and the religious demigods.

Jesus lived through a constant barrage of attacks against his birth, character, authority, law and doctrine. Yet if He had lived a celibate life, that alone would have given his enemies their greatest advantage to dispute His claims, for it was against the traditional and scriptural law for a Rabbi to remain single. Jesus could only have avoided this pitfall by obeying the Rabbinical law of marriage.

Chapter 4

THE GOSPEL LAW

The definition of "fulfilling" the requirements of the law was used when Jesus came to John to be baptized. Baptism was a law of the gospel, practiced by the Jews before Jesus began His ministry. When John refused to baptize the Savior, Jesus demanded John to "suffer it to be so" because it was necessary that he "fulfill" the requirements of the laws of righteousness. Baptism is one of the eternal laws and commandments to which even the Savior of the world had to comply--or "fulfill". It is not compatible with the laws of heaven that one be exalted without obedience to these eternal laws. Although Jesus was the "Lawgiver", it does not permit Him the distinction of also being a lawbreaker. Obedience was a particular requirement upon the Savior for every law and ordinance of the gospel. This confession came from Jesus Himself when He said, "I came not to destroy the law; but to fulfill." He was the example of perfect obedience to the Gospel laws; and marriage, like baptism, is one of the eternal laws.

One of the Old Testament and Talmudic laws required every Rabbi to be married. It was not until the 20th Century that this law was changed (generally among the Reformed and Conservative Jews) however, there are no unmarried Rabbis today among the Orthodox Jews. Marriage was one of the first commandments; therefore, a Rabbi was called to be an example, and to gain that experience before he could properly counsel and teach others concerning this commandment. A profound scholar writing on this subject says:

*Jesus said once that he came to fulfill the Law: the first positive commandment of the Bible according to, rabbinic understanding (Maimonides, *Minyan ha-Mitzvet*, 212) is that dealing with the propagation of the human race (Gen. 1:28); thus it has been considered the duty of every*

member of the House of Israel to marry at an early age. The late rabbis set eighteen as the age for marriage (Ab. v. 24); and anyone, they maintained, who remained after twenty without marrying was cursed by God himself (Kid. 29b). Earlier traditions, however, persistently encouraged children to marry as soon as they reach the age of puberty (Sanh. 76b) and many important Jews are known to have been married at such an early age. Indeed, so important was marriage regarded in ancient Israel that frequently men who had passed twenty without marrying, were compelled by the courts to take a wife. (M. Zvi Udley, Th. M., Ph.D.)

Celibacy is by no means a virtue among the Jewish people. Indeed it is for this reason that many Jews cannot accept Christianity. Said Rabbi Hirsch:

Now as the life of Jesus is pictured in the New Testament, there are certain peculiar defects in that life from the Jewish point of view. His teachings are the ideal teachings of Judaism; they are not new teachings, nor new revelations. They are confirmations of Jewish thought and life. But his personal life--I am speaking respectfully; I do not think anyone should think I cast any shadow on the beauty and perfection of that life, but I can take it as it is pictured--you know he was not married and from the Jewish point of view, that is a defect. The Jewish morality insists that a man who does not assume the social responsibility for the continuation of society, lives a life that is not complete. (Rabbi Emil Hirsch. "My Religion," New York, 1925, pp. 43-44)

The ancient Jewish prophets depicted the life of their Messiah in minute detail. The time and place of His birth, His teachings, the betrayal, crucifixion, etc., were all accurately predicted. Later Jewish scholars, almost without exception, have interpreted these prophecies to include their Messiah to be married. In the Jewish society, marriage was a commandment strictly observed--almost as a compulsory law.

Every Jewish man should marry at eighteen, and he who marries earlier is more meritorious. (The Shalchan Aruch, Eben Haezer 1:3)

Since the Mishnah fixes the eighteenth year of one's life as the age of marriage, a man unmarried after this time is, in many communities, regarded as not having conformed with inviolable tradition. (Jewish ceremonies and Customs, William Rosenau, p. 155)

Marriage was firmly implanted in the minds of all Jewish men; however, it was most rigidly observed by those who complied to the laws and offices of Rabbi and Priest. Jewish law required a High Priest to be married on the "Day of Atonement;" and so important was this law that in the case of some unforeseen circumstance, an extra woman was held in readiness for the marriage. This marriage on the Day of Atonement was a prerequisite for entering the Sanctuary. Paul wrote that Jesus was the "Great High Priest" who would make atonement for all men. Since one of the laws of "great high priest office" was marriage, then every priest including Jesus had to comply with that ordinance to fulfill the obligation of that office.

Also, Paul wrote in an epistle that "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are figures of the true: but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us." (Heb. 9:24) Now then, if it were required that the High Priests be married to enter the Holy Places on earth, which are but "figures of the true, then how much more demanding are the requirements to enter into the heavenly sanctuary!

The scriptures render some evidence that Christ did "fulfill" the law of marriage. Apostle Orson Spencer asked this familiar question and then proceeded to answer it.

"Well," say you, "I am partly constrained to feel satisfied that all the New Testament writers fully agree with you, as to the divine authority and perpetuity of the Patriarchal system of marriage, and increase of their posterity; but I want one more additional proof in favor of the system, before every relic of doubt can be swept from my mind. I want you to show me distinctly that Christ Jesus was ever married, or ever had a wife, or that he ever will be married and have a wife. If you can satisfy my curiosity on this one remaining point, then I will forbear."

Well, this makes me think of a similar question dictated by the Holy Ghost 1800 years ago. The question was this: "Who shall declare HIS generation?" Now, sir, if you can believe an angel from heaven, and the light of human eyes on this point, you will not need much of my testimony to confirm it. A certain angel, spoken of in the Revelation of St. John, willing to gratify curiosity upon this same interesting subject says to one, "Come hither, and I will show the Bride, the Lamb's

wife, to the inquisitive person who wanted to know about the wife of Christ." Again, John the Revelator says, most distinctly, that the Lamb's wife hath made herself ready, and blessed are those who are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. Now, if the Lord has in very deed shown unto men in the flesh, the very Bride, and WIFE of Christ, and also the NUPTIAL celebration, then an honest mind may be at rest upon this subject. The first miracle that Jesus wrought, was used to grace a nuptial celebration. And sir, God claims to be the Father of the human family, that is, of our spirits: and so far as the body of Jesus our elder brother is concerned, he is his Father in the flesh. He made a covenant with Jesus Christ, our eldest brother, that his family, after whom all heaven is named, should increase without end. The same was repeated to Abraham, and all that are Christ's, down to the last person that shall ever be born. The last child of Christ that is born, whether in the Millennium or final consummation and end of all things, will claim this "promise" of endless increase. (Orson Spencer's Letters, p. 224-226)

Both modern and ancient historians generally agree that all of the Apostles were married. Clement of Alexandria, born about 150 A.D., occupied a most profound and interesting position in the history of Christianity. He was a philosopher, historian, and Christian whose works are most valuable in formulating much of the early Christian Church. A century and a half later another historian, Eusebius, quoted many portions of Clement's works. Eusebius was a founder of a theological school and is said to have been "one of the most learned men of his age." Said he:

*Now Clement, whose words we have just quoted, after what has already been mentioned, with respect to those who reject marriage gives a list of the Apostles who were known to have been married, (Stromata 3:52) saying: "Or will they disapprove even the Apostles? For Peter and Philip begot children, and Philip, too, gave his daughters to husbands, and Paul does not hesitate in an Epistle to address his wife (Phil. 4:3; 1 Cor. 9:5, 13), whom he did not take about with him that he might facilitate his ministry." Since we have mentioned these matters, there is no harm in my presenting another narrative of the same author, which he wrote down in Book 7 of the Stromata, relating it in the following way: "They say, indeed, that the blessed Peter, when he beheld his wife being led away to death, rejoiced because of her calling and return home, and called out to her very encouragingly and comfortingly, addressing her by name, 'O thou, remember the Lord.' Such was the marriage of the blessed and the perfect disposition of those dearest to them." (Stromata 7:63, 64) Let these matters germane to the subject at hand suffice on my part for the moment at this point. (**Ecclesiastical History** by Eusebius, Bk. 3, Chap. 30)*

The fact that Paul and the other Apostles were married has been accepted and taught by President Brigham Young and other leaders of the Church. For example, Apostle Orson Hyde said:

The bishop is to be the husband of one wife. And as for old Paul, everybody says he lived and died a bachelor; but he said all things were lawful for him, and that he had power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas. Paul did not make known all things, for all things were not lawful to tell. He said himself, he knew a man that was caught up to the third heavens, and heard things unlawful to utter. If he did not take a wife, and multiply, and replenish the earth, he did not fulfil the first great fundamental law of nature. (J.D. 2:83-84)

The Lord never forbid any of His disciples from marriage, nor did He ever indicate that He Himself could not marry.

A Presbyterian minister and professor at the Davis and Elkin College in West Virginia recently wrote that Jesus must have been married. His article was immediately picked up and published by other religious newspapers, one of which is shown on the following page.

A May 1969 editorial in the "Showers of Blessings" publication of Denver, Colorado, picked up this same theme and added their comments. Once the ice of superstition has been broken, then others will join in the activity.

Was Jesus Married?

Let us look at the requirement for the priesthood. The Old Testament law required that a man be thirty years of age and married in order to become a priest. That is why Yahshua the Messiah

(Jesus) was not baptized and not anointed and did not begin his ministry in Palestine until his thirtieth birthday, which was on October 5th, 30 A.D. An Associated Press report from Elkins, West Virginia says:

Quote: "Jesus may have been married and the father of children, according to a Presbyterian minister--professor at Davis and Elkins College.

"Dr. William Phipps, writing in the current issue of the Journal of Ecumenical Studies said that failure to marry and reproduce was regarded as a serious sin in Biblical times.

"If Jesus had been a bachelor, Dr. Phipps contends, the Bible would surely contain some record of his being criticized for it.

"Dr. Phipps said that in Greek translation of the Bible there's no difference in the word for 'wife' and 'woman', and the Bible often mentions Jesus being with a woman.

"Under Talmudic law, a man couldn't be considered righteous--in fact, couldn't even be considered a complete man--if he didn't marry and have children," Dr. Phipps writes.

"The Talmud asserts very strongly . . . that it's almost the same as committing murder to not reproduce." End quote.

I have quoted similar views in my writings many times; not quoting from the Talmud but from the Old Testament law of Moses and the meaning of New Testament words such as those used by Martha when she said to Mary, her sister: "The Master is come and calleth for thee." (John 11:28) "Master" was the title that a wife used when speaking of her husband. The New Testament also required that all church officers such as bishops, elders, and deacons be married and the fathers of children. (1 Tim. 3:1-4, 12) A man that is not married or who has never been married meets neither the Old Testament Israel nor the New Testament Church requirements for the priesthood. The Apostle Peter was married. (Matt. 8:14) Saul of Tarsus, who was better known as Paul, was married, for that was a requirement to be a member of the Sanhedrin; and Saul (Paul) sat on that council and voted for the death of Stephen. (Acts 7:58-60, Acts 8:1) The truth makes us free. Jesus (Yahshua) was probably married before and during all the time of his ministry. Many women traveled with him and ministered to his needs.

And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him, And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance. (Luke 8:1-3) (page 17)

This announcement by an accepted minister and professor was given public news coverage.

Newsweek magazine also gave national publicity to his findings.

Recent manuscripts found in Qumran and other excavations have introduced further information to substantiate Christ's marriage. In **The Gospel According to Thomas** there are significant references to the marriage of Jesus.

Log 22: "... They (the disciples) said to Him: Shall we then, being children, enter the Kingdom? Jesus said to them: When you make the two one, (one flesh--or marriage) and when you make the inner as the outer... and when you make the male and the female into a single one, (married), so that the male will not be male and the female (not) be female, . . . then shall you enter (the Kingdom)."

*Log. 114: "Simon Peter said to them: Let Mary go out from among us, because women are not worthy of the Life. Jesus said: See, I shall lead her, so that I will make her male, (one in marriage) that she too may become a living spirit, resembling you males. For every woman who makes herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven." (**The Gospel According to Thomas**, p. 57. Coptic text established and translated by A. Guillaumont, etc., 1959)*

And in another apocryphal manuscript called **Gospel of Philip**:

Log 32: "There were three who walked with the Lord at all times, Mary his mother and her (his) sister and Magdalene, whom they called his consort. For Mary was (the name of) his sister and his mother and his consort."*

** Consort: (1) A husband or wife. (**The World Book Encyclopedia Dictionary**, 1966)*

Log 55: *"The Sophia whom they call barren is the mother of the angels. And the consort of (Christ is) Mary Magdalene. (The Lord loved Mary) more than (all) the disciples, and kissed her on her (mouth) often. The others toothey said to him, 'Why do you love her more than all of us?' The Saviour answered and said to them, 'Why do I not love you like her?'" (The Gospel of Philip, pp. 35 & 39-40. Translated from the coptic text, with an Introduction and Commentary by R. McL. Wilson, B.D., Ph.D., London, 1962)*

* In the Commentary of this book, Dr. Wilson quotes Peter as saying, "We know that the Saviour loved you more than other women." (referring to Mary Magdalene) And he quotes Levi as saying later: "He loved her more than us."

* * *

Celibacy had no recognition within the scriptures. Ancient Jewish law and early Christian law sanctioned and required their disciples to obey the marriage covenant. If the apostles fulfilled the law of marriage, it is only reasonable to assume that they were obeying that law by sanction and direction of the Lawgiver Himself.

And though Jesus gave and instructed his disciples in all of the laws of the gospel, including marriage, it is most unreasonable that He would neglect or refuse to obey that law Himself.

Jesus Christ never omitted the fulfillment of a single law that God had made known for the salvation of the children of men. It would not have done for him to have come and obeyed one law and neglected or rejected another. He could not do that and then say to mankind, "Follow me!" (Joseph F. Smith, Mill. Star 62:97)

The first principle, ordinance, and commandment given to man was the marriage law. It would indeed seem very peculiar that the Lord of all mankind would be a perfect example in all things except marriage. Historical records, scriptural evidence, and reason all prove that He was the Good Shepherd in obeying every law of the Gospel.

Chapter 5

THE CANA MARRIAGE

Circumstantial implications at the marriage in Cana of Galilee infer that Jesus was the bridegroom at this occasion. These implications become vividly clear when the story is carefully read. First, the story as recorded in John 2:1-12:

And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there; and both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage.

And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come.

His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it. And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And he saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it.

When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was: (but the servants which drew the water knew;) the governor of the feast called the bridegroom.

And saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have

drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now.

This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.

After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples; and they continued there not many days.

Observe, that Jewish marriages were arranged by the parents. From the account of this marriage at Cana, there is little doubt that Mary, the mother of Jesus, was the person responsible for making the wedding arrangements. Many writers comment upon this unusual situation without indicating or assuming any more than" . . . the incident had a personal interest for the mother of Jesus." (**Abingdon Bible Commentary**, p. 1069) Dr. Talmage also mentions the relationship between this marriage event and Mary's responses.

*She manifested concern and personal responsibility in the matter of providing for the guests. Evidently her position was different from that of one present by ordinary invitation. Whether this circumstance indicates the marriage to have been that of **one of her own immediate family**, or some more distant relative, we are not informed. (Jesus the Christ, p. 144)*

Again, Talmage noted a similar circumstance which revealed this interesting affiliation with Jesus.

*"What have I to do with thee?" He asked and added: "Mine hour is not yet come." Here we find no disclaimer of the ability to do what she apparently wanted Him to do, but the plain implication that He, not she, must decide when that time had come. She understood His meaning, in part at least; and contented herself by instructing the servants to do whatsoever He directed. Here **again is evidence of her position of responsibility and domestic authority at the social gathering.** (Jesus the Christ, p. 145)*

Another and more widely acclaimed writer on the life of Christ gave further, suggestions about the circumstances of this marriage:

*. . . but the presence of Mary, who must have left Nazareth on purpose to be present at the wedding, seems to show that **one of the bridal pair was some member of the Holy family.** Jesus, too, was invited, and His disciples and the use of the singular implies that **they were invited for His sake, not He for theirs.** (The Life of Christ, by Farrar, p. 123)*

Traditional Jewish records explain that a "call" is usually made to the Bridegroom and his groomsmen when the wedding preparations are complete. Jewish traditions explain this call was made in the evening. We note, according to John, that Jesus was "called" to the wedding.

In the Jewish marriage the guests were provided by the host with fitting robes, wine, and other amusements. At this marriage at Cana when the wine had been consumed, Mary appealed to Jesus. Why did Mary assume a responsible concern for the wine if the wedding was not for a member of her own household? Why would she appeal to Jesus if it was someone else's wedding? If Mary was hostess and Jesus was the Bridegroom, then they were fulfilling their proper obligations at this wedding!

Note also that Mary gave direct instructions to the servants that "whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." It is evident that Mary was not assuming authority or unwisely directing the servants if she was hostess. And why would she give strict orders to the servants of the wedding to obey the jurisdiction of Jesus over them, if He were not the bridegroom? Jesus then acting as a provisionary host directed the servants to "fill the waterpots," and then continued to meet His obligation by providing the needed wine.

The "governor (master of ceremonies) called to the Bridegroom and saith unto him . . . Thou hast kept the good wine until now." He was undoubtedly talking to Jesus as the Bridegroom! And when the governor said to Jesus, "Thou saved the best for last," he indicates that Jesus had also provided the **first** wine. Jesus then had fulfilled the obligations of a Bridegroom on both of these occasions!

Jesus regarded Himself as a Bridegroom. (Matt. 9:14-15) And John, the most beloved disciple of Jesus, had declared that he was the "friend of the bridegroom." (John 3:29)

Great scholars and scriptorians, such as Orson Hyde who had memorized the Bible in three languages, acknowledged that Jesus was the Bridegroom at Cana.

Did the Savior of the world consider it to be his duty to fulfil all righteousness? You answer,

yes. Even the simple ordinance of baptism he would not pass by, for the Lord commanded it, and therefore it was righteousness to obey what the Lord had commanded, and he would fulfil all righteousness. Upon this hypothesis I will go back to the beginning, and notice the commandment that was given to our first parents in the Garden of Eden. The Lord said unto them, "Multiply and replenish the earth. . . ."

...Our first parents, then, were commanded to multiply and replenish the earth; and if the Savior found it his duty to be baptized to fulfil all righteousness, a command of far less importance than that of multiplying his race, (if indeed there is any difference in the commandments of Jehovah, for they are all important, and all essential,) would he not find it his duty to join in with the rest of the faithful ones in replenishing the earth? "Mr. Hyde, do you really wish to imply that the immaculate Savior begat children? It is a blasphemous assertion against the purity of the Savior's life, to say the least of it. The holy aspirations that ever ascended from him to his Father would never allow him to have any such fleshly and carnal connexions, never, no never." This is the general idea; but the Savior never thought it beneath him to obey the mandate of his Father; he never thought this stooping beneath his dignity; he never despised what God had made; for they are bone of his bone, and flesh of his flesh; kindred spirits, that once basked in rays of immortality and eternal life. When he found them clothed upon and surrounded with the weaknesses of mortal flesh, would he despise them? No. It is true, I have seen men who became poor and miserable all at once, and then those who were their friends in the days of their prosperity turn from them, and scarcely deign to bestow them a look, it being too humiliating to associate with them in their poverty. But it was not so with the Savior; he associated with them in other spheres, and when they came here, descending below all things, he did not despise to associate with these same kindred spirits. "Then you really mean to hold to the doctrine that the Savior of the world was married; do you mean to be understood so? And if so, do you mean to be understood that he had more than one wife?"

The Christian world by their prejudices have driven us away from the Old Bible, so we must now appeal to the New Testament, for that seems to suit the prejudice of the people; though to me it is all alike, both the Old and New Testaments; for the scribe that is well instructed, brings out of his treasury things both new and old. This is my treasury, or rather, it is one of my treasuries, and what I cannot find there, I trust will come down from on high, and lodge in my heart. The gift of God is also my treasury, even the Holy Spirit.

Now suppose I should set out myself, and travel through the cities of the nation as a celebrated reformer, preaching revelations and sentiments as lofty as the skies, and rolling out ideas strange and new, to which the multitude were entirely unaccustomed; and wherever I went, suppose I had with me three or four women—one combing my head, another washing my feet, and another shedding tears upon them, and wiping them with the hair of her head. Suppose I should lean upon them, and they upon me, would it not appear monstrous in the eyes of the world? Would they ride me into Jerusalem upon our ass's colt, and cast branches of the palm tree beneath my feet, shouting, "Hosannah, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; hosannah in the highest?" I guess they would give me a coat of tar and feathers, and ride me on a rail; and it is my opinion they would serve the Savior the same, did he go about now as he did eighteen hundred years ago...

When does it say the Savior was married? I believe I will read it for your accommodation, or you might not believe my words were I to say that there is indeed such a scripture. We will turn ever to the account of the marriage in Cana of Galilee, and the mother of Jesus was there. Yes, and somebody else, too. You will find it in the 2nd Chapter of John's Gospel; remember it and read it when you go home. (John's 2nd Chapter was then quoted.)

Gentlemen, that is as plain as the translators, or different councils over this scripture, dare allow it to go to the world, but the thing is there; it is told; Jesus was the bridegroom at the marriage of Cana of Galilee; and he told them what to do.

Now there was actually a marriage; and if Jesus was not the bridegroom on that occasion, please tell who was. If any man can show this, and prove that it was not the Savior of the World, then I will acknowledge I am in error. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 2:79, 80, 82)

Then again, two years later, Apostle Hyde continued to advocate the marriage of Jesus in spite of any public disclaim by some modern Christians.

It will be borne in mind that once on a time, there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and on a careful reading of that transaction, it will be discovered that no less a person than Jesus Christ was married on that occasion. If he was never married, his intimacy with Mary and Martha and the other Mary also whom Jesus loved, must have been highly unbecoming and improper to say the best of it.

I will venture to say that if Jesus Christ were now to pass through the most pious countries in Christendom with a train of women such as used to follow him, fondling about him, combing his hair, anointing him with precious ointment, washing his feet with tears, and wiping them with the hair of their heads and unmarried, or even married, he would be mobbed, tarred, and feathered, and rode not on an ass, but on a rail (Orson Hyde, J.D. 4:259)

In certain councils of the Church, Mormon leaders have often discussed and expressed definite views pertaining to this subject. On one occasion Joseph F. Smith expressed similar views about the Cana marriage.

Joseph F. Smith . . . He spoke upon the marriage in Cana of Galilee. He thought Jesus was the Bridegroom and Mary and Martha the brides. He also referred to Luke 10th Chap., 34 42 verses. Also John 11th Chap., 2 & 5 verses, John 12:13. Joseph Smith spoke upon these passages to show that Mary and Martha manifested much closer relationship than merely a believer... (Journal of Wilford Woodruff, July 22, 1883)

Certainly if anyone was married to Jesus it would have been Mary Magdalene. Her life can attest to a devotion as deep and as faithful as any loving wife to a husband. Jesus was often found in the home of Mary giving her instruction and consolation, as a devoted husband would do. Even in death Mary showed a bereavement and sorrow that only a wife would manifest. Why was she so bereaved at the tomb? Is not a widow usually the last to leave and the most often to return to a tomb? If Mary was not a wife, why was her grief so great that it required an angel to comfort her? How faithful and devoted Mary was to Jesus! She stood willingly at the cross to suffer at the death of Jesus. (John 19:25) She was with the body of Jesus when it was taken down. (Matt. 27:61; Mark 15:47; Luke 23:55) She came to anoint the body with spices. (Mark 16:1) In the early morning hours before anyone else, she was at the sepulchre. (Matt. 28:1; Mark 16:2)

There at the tomb Mary wept bitter tears "because they have taken away my Lord and I know not where they have laid him." (John 20:14) This grief could only be known to a widow whose concern was for the body of her husband. It was under such grief that she saw two angels. (Matt. 28:5)

And later when Mary saw Jesus and recognized Him, she cried, "Rabboni," which means "my great Master" or more often "Husband". With exulting joy at seeing Him alive, she rushed to embrace Him but He said, "HOLD me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." (John 20:17, Ins. Version)

Here from the Inspired Translation of the Bible, Joseph Smith changed the word "touch" to "hold". And why not? Would Mary, whose profound grief at the loss of Jesus, run to "touch" Him? Indeed, her astonishment and joy at seeing Jesus would have caused her to rush and embrace Him as she had done while He lived. But now He was immortalized and she was yet but a mortal, and He had to restrain her while He went to the Father. Mary's love appears almost unbounded in her devotion and affection for Him. But more outstanding than Mary's love for Jesus is the love that was manifest by Jesus towards Mary. It was the closeness and attention that Jesus paid to Mary before considering any others. It was to Mary, before any other disciple, that Jesus first appeared after His resurrection. Mary was the first mortal to see the resurrected Christ! (John 20:14-15) Although Peter was the chief apostle, and had been so devoted to the Lord, he was to take second place in this grand manifestation of the resurrected Savior! Mary was comforted and then given instructions to relate to the apostles and disciples. It seems as though she stood foremost among any other mortals. Why? Only the bonds of marriage could have placed Mary within a mutual devotion more intimate than those of the apostles. This touching experience is a grand manifestation of the love which could only exist within the bonds of a devoted man to his wife! For, "neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man in the Lord," (I Cor. 11:11) for this was the Gospel Law.

Chapter 6

AN EVERLASTING COVENANT OF MARRIAGE

When Paul the Apostle reflected upon the history and the future of Christ's Gospel, he was saddened by the realization that there would "come a falling away" (2 Thes. 2:3) from those true teachings. Then while writing to Timothy he said that even "all they which are in Asia be turned away" (2 Tim. 1:15); and he also marvelled that those in Galatia were "so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel" and that "there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." (Gal. 1:6-7) However, with consolation he knew that the "times of refreshing shall come" which would be "the times of restitution of **all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began.**" (Acts 3:21) This would be called the dispensation of the fullness of times and "that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one **all things** in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." (Eph. 1:10) This restoration of the **fullness** of the gospel would include every doctrinal law, principle, and ordinance which God had ever revealed to man "by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."

One of these gospel laws, among the many which had been deleted or diluted, was the practice and principle of plural marriage. It had been taught and practiced by the ancient prophets, patriarchs and the apostles. This law was commonly known and lived from the times of the ancient patriarchs and continued down throughout the Christian Dispensation.

Although the practice of plural marriage was commonly known and believed by many people in the Jewish society, it was never condemned by Jesus. The Savior had surely witnessed plural marriage, heard it taught, and of course had read of the many examples of this law in the scriptures; yet there is no evidence that he opposed or refuted that practice. He spoke of strict moral issues which pertained to every physical or mental sin involving sex, but the word polygamy was never refuted, nor did he utter a word against those prophets and patriarchs who had obeyed this principle of marriage. Because Jesus took no issue against polygamy, it is therefore implied that Jesus must have sanctioned that law. This fact was generally understood and accepted by many sriptorians and reformers.

*Our chief reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Zuinglius, etc., after a solemn consultation at Wittenburg, on the question "whether for a man to have two wives at once, was contrary to the divine law?" answered unanimously "that it was not"--and on this authority, Philip the Landrave of Hesse actually married a second wife, his first being alive. The language of this council was "The Gospel hath neither recalled nor forbid what was permitted in the law of Moses with respect to marriage." (**Thelyphthora**, Vol. 1:212, by Rev. Martin Madan)*

Nearly a hundred years ago a Christian minister by the name of James Campbell, because of an illness, resorted to traveling the world and studying its various religions. One of the religious practices which seemed to interest him most was the principle of polygamy. Through diligent study and research, both in present practices and from practices within the scriptures, he decided to write a book on the subject. Among his conclusions he contended that Jesus and His apostles had sanctioned plural marriage.

The marriage system of polygamy never formed a part of that ceremonial dispensation which was abrogated by the New Testament; nor has it ever been proved that the New Testament was designed to affect any change in it; but the presumption is that this new dispensation has also left it, as it found it--abiding still in force. If any change were to be made in an institution of such long standing, confirmed by positive law, it could obviously be made only by equally positive and explicit ordinances or enactments of the gospel. But such enactments are wanting. Christ himself was altogether silent in respect to polygamy, not once alluding to it; yet it was practiced at the time of his advent throughout Judea and Galilee, and in all the other countries of Asia and Africa, and, without doubt, by some of his own disciples.

The Book of the Acts is equally silent as the four Gospels are. No allusion to it is found in any of the sermons of instructions or discussions of the apostles and early saints recorded in that book. It was not because Jesus or the Apostles durst not condemn it, had they considered it sinful, that they did not speak of it, for Jesus hesitated not to denounce the sins of hypocrisy, covetousness, and adultery, and even alter and amend, apparently, the ancient laws respecting

*divorce and retaliation; but he never rebuked them for their polygamy, nor instituted any change in that system. And this uniform silence, so far as it implies anything, implies approval. John the Baptist was thrown into prison where he was afterwards beheaded for reproofing King Herod on account of his adultery, and we cannot doubt, that, if he would have mentioned it; for Herod's father was, just before that time, living with nine wives, whose names are recorded by Josephus, in his "Antiquities of the Jews;"--but John only reproofed him for marrying Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, while his brother was living. He administered the same reproof to Herod that Nathan had formerly done to David, and for similar reasons. The apostles always denounced the sins of fornication and adultery, but never denounced polygamy, nor intimated in any way that it was a sin. In all the long and painful catalogues of sins enumerated in the first, second and third chapters of Romans, many of which relate to the unlawful indulgence of the amorous propensities, polygamy is not once named. It is the very place where it is morally certain that it would have been named if it were sinful; and, that it is not there named, we are fully warranted to believe that it is not sinful. (**The History and Philosophy of Marriage**, Rev. James Campbell, pp. 69-71)*

Whenever God had commanded men to obey the principle of plural marriage, it became a binding law of the gospel to them. If they should refuse to obey that law or should contend against it, they were then breaking that covenant and would incur the judgment of God upon them. If God requires His people to live plural marriage, they have no other recourse but to accept it and obey His will. Such a law would become a part of their faith and religion--binding upon their conscience--and to disobey would be a sin.

In July of 1841 the Prophet Joseph Smith received a revelation pertaining to "the principle and doctrine of men having many wives" and the Lord said to Joseph:

*Prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions which I am about to give unto you for **all those who have this law revealed unto them must obey the same.** For behold, I reveal unto you a new and an everlasting covenant; and if ye abide not that covenant, then are ye damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter into my glory. For all who will have a blessing at my hands shall abide the law which was appointed that blessing, and the conditions thereof, as were instituted from before the foundation of the world. (D & C 132:3-5)*

In this revelation on plural marriage the Lord speaks of it as his "LAW" thirty-one times. This law, when obeyed in righteousness, would bring untold blessings in the future state. It was an "everlasting covenant" to be embraced as a part of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Lord said that Joseph Smith was given the appointment to "restore ALL THINGS" (D & C 132:40), and this doctrine and law was a part of that which necessarily had to be restored.

This revelation respecting the law of plural marriage was as valid as any other revelation that Joseph Smith ever received. To doubt or dispute it, as a member of the LDS Church, would jeopardize their salvation. Many men and women have been willing to suffer the ravages of mobs, the fires of persecution, jail, poverty and even death to defend that "law". To every faithful member of the Church it became a part of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Savior in the Meridian of Time acknowledged this principle and sustained the prophets who lived it, thereby accepting the doctrine of plural marriage as a part of His gospel. And, these laws were preached and practiced--as the gospel--by the ancient prophets. Said the Prophet Joseph Smith:

But it is said that Abel himself obtained witness that he was righteous. Then certainly God spoke to him; indeed, it is said that God talked with him; and if He did, would He not, seeing that Abel was righteous, deliver to him the whole plan of the gospel? And is not the gospel the news of the redemption? How could Abel offer a sacrifice and look forward with faith on the Son of God for a remission of his sins, and not understand the Gospel?

*We all admit that the Gospel has ordinances, and if so, had it not always ordinances, and **were not its ordinances always the same?***

Perhaps our friends will say that the Gospel and its ordinances were not known till the days of John, the son of Zacharias, in the days of Herod, the king of Judea. But we will here look at this point: For our own part we cannot believe that the ancients in all ages were so ignorant of the system of heaven as many suppose, since all that were ever saved, were saved through the power of this great plan of redemption, as much before the coming of Christ as since.

*It will be noticed that, according to Paul, (Gal. 3:8) the Gospel was preached to Abraham. We would like to be informed in what name the Gospel was then preached, whether it was in the name of Christ or some other name. If in any other name, was it the Gospel? And if it was the Gospel, and that preached in the name of Christ, had it any ordinances? If not, was it the Gospel? And if it had ordinances what were they? Our friends may say, perhaps, that there were never any ordinances except those of offering sacrifices before the coming of Christ, and that it could not be possible before the Gospel to have been administered while the law of sacrifice of blood was in force. But we will recollect that Abraham offered sacrifice, and notwithstanding this, had the Gospel preached to him. * * * So, then, because the ancients offered sacrifice, it did not hinder their hearing the Gospel; but served, as we said before, to open their eyes, and enable them to look forward to the time of the coming of the Savior and rejoice in His redemption.*

*We find also, that when the Israelites came out of Egypt, they had the Gospel preached to them, according to Paul in his letter to the Hebrews, which says: "For unto us was the Gospel preached, **as well as unto them**; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it." (Heb. 4:2) It is said again, in Gal. 3:19, that the law (of Moses, or Levitical law) was "added" because of transgression. What, we ask, was this law added to, if it was not added to the Gospel? It must be plain that it was added to the Gospel, since we learn that **they had the Gospel preached to them.** (T.P.J.S., p. 59-60)*

If then the Gospel was preached to Abraham and yet Abraham lived plural marriage, it indicates that Abraham was complying with the requirements of the ordinances of the Gospel. We must therefore conclude that Abraham was obeying this principle as a law which was obligatory upon him. He was then justified in doing so. This was revealed to the Prophet Joseph:

Abraham received all things, whatsoever he received, by revelation and commandment, by my word, saith the Lord, and hath entered into his exaltation and sitteth upon his throne.

Go ye, therefore, and do the works of Abraham; enter ye into my law and ye shall be saved. But if ye enter not into my law ye cannot receive the promise of my Father, which He made unto Abraham. (D. & C. 132:29, 32, 33)

Orson Pratt justified Abraham's living plural marriage, and came to the conclusion that it was a part of the Gospel of Christ.

*If plurality is offensive in the sight of God, why was Abraham, who practiced it, called the friend of God, and the father of the faithful? Why did the Lord promise that in him, as well as in his seed, all the families of the earth should be blessed? Why require all the families of the earth, under the Christian dispensation, to be adopted into the family of a polygamist in order to be saved? Why choose a polygamist to be the father of all saved families? Why require all Christian families in order to be saved, to walk in the steps and do the works of Abraham? Why did God proclaim Himself to be "The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," and say that this shall be "**my name and my memorial to all generations?**" (See Exodus 3:15.) If polygamy is not to be sanctioned among generations of Christendom, why did He represent Himself to be the God of Polygamists, and say that all generations should adopt that memorial of Him? Why choose these polygamists to be examples for Christians, and say, that many should come from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sit down with them in the kingdom of God? Will Abraham's wives and concubines, and Jacob's four wives be in the kingdom of God with their husbands? If so, will it not greatly corrupt the morals of Christians to sit down in the same kingdom with them? Will not Christians be greatly ashamed to be found sitting in the company of Polygamists? Will not Christians entirely ruin their characters by being adopted into the family of so noted a Polygamist as Abraham, and be obliged to acknowledge him as father, and be called his children? The scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, **preached before the Gospel unto Abraham**, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Gal. 3:8) What kind of Gospel was preached unto Abraham? Was it not the same Gospel that was preached after Christ, by which the heathen were to be justified, and by which all the families of the earth might be blessed by becoming the children of Abraham through adoption? Did it not require the same Gospel to save the Polygamist father in the kingdom of God, as that which saves his adopted children that sit down with him in the same kingdom? Does the Gospel, since Christ exalt Christians to a more glorious kingdom than the one where Abraham dwells? If not, is it any better than the Gospel preached to Abraham? Did not Abraham see the day of Christ and*

*rejoice in it, and look forward to his atoning sacrifice, the same as Christians afterwards looked back to the same atonement? If the Gospel which was preached to Abraham required the same faith--the same repentance--the same, justification--the same sanctification through the Holy Ghost--if it procured for him the same blessings--the same gifts of prophecy and revelations--the same gifts of seeing visions of conversing with angels--the same miraculous powers and heavenly promises--if it made him worthy of the title of the friend of God, and exalted him to be the father of the faithful, even the father of all saved nations--if, moreover, it saved him in the kingdom of God--in the same kingdom where his Christian children are to sit down with him--then was it not the Gospel of Christianity--the very same Gospel that was preached after Christ? And if the same Gospel, then who dare deny, that polygamy was not practiced by the very best of men, under a Christian and Gospel dispensation? Who dare say that Abraham's righteousness was not as great as the righteousness of his children? (Orson Pratt, **The Seer**, pp. 187-188)*

Plural marriage was practiced by a few of the Jews during the Christian dispensation; however, it has nearly always been a doctrine that has aroused the prejudice and wrath of others. We may determine that plural marriage was one of the reasons that caused the persecution and oppression of Jesus; for if plural marriage was a part of the Gospel, then Jesus would have taught it and practiced it Himself.

The Prophet Joseph Smith indicated this:

*It always has been when a man was sent of God with the priesthood and he began to preach the **fullness of the Gospel**, that he was thrust out by his friends, who are already to butcher him if he teach things which they imagine to be wrong; and **Jesus was crucified upon this principle**. (T.P.J.S., p. 310)*

*Many men will say, "I will never forsake you, but will stand by you at all times." But the moment you teach them some of the mysteries of the kingdom of God that are retained in the heavens and are to be revealed to the children of men when they are prepared for them they will be the first to stone you and put you to death. It was this same principle that crucified the Lord Jesus Christ, and **will cause the people to kill the prophets in this generation**. (T.P.J.S., p. 309)*

*I prophecy, in the name of the Lord God of Israel, anguish and wrath and tribulation and the withdrawing of the Spirit of God from the earth await this generation, until they are visited with utter desolation. This generation is as corrupt as the generation of the Jews that crucified Christ; and **if He were here today, and should preach the same doctrine He did then, they would put Him to death**. (T.P.J.S., p. 328)*

The Prophet Joseph only confirmed what the ancient philosophers and historians had written as true facts of history.

The Apostle Jedediah Grant commented:

The grand reason for the burst of public sentiment in anathemas upon Christ and his disciples, causing his crucifixion, was evidently based upon polygamy, according to the testimony of the philosophers who rose in that age. A belief in the doctrine of a plurality of wives caused the persecution of Jesus and his followers. We might almost think they were "Mormons". (Jedediah Grant, J.D. 1:346)

What does old Celsus say, who was a physician in the first century, whose medical works are esteemed very highly at the present time? His works on theology were burned with fire by the Catholics, they were so shocked at what they called their impiety. Celsus was a heathen philosopher; and what does he say upon the subject of Christ and his Apostles, and their belief? He says, "The grand reason why the Gentiles and philosophers of his school persecuted Jesus Christ, was because he had so many wives; there were Elizabeth, and Mary, and a host of others that followed him."

After Jesus went from the stage of action, the apostles followed the example of their master. For instance, John the Beloved Disciple, writes in his second epistle, "Unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth." Again, he says, "Having many things to write unto you (or communicate), I would not write with paper and ink; but I trust to come unto you, and speak face to face, that our joy may be full." Again--"The children of thy elect sister greet thee." This ancient

philosopher says they were both John's wives. Paul says, "Mine answer to them that do examine me is this: 'Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas.'" He, according to Celsus, had a numerous train of wives. (Jedediah Grant, J.D. 1:345)

It is only logical that Jesus and His Apostles would honor all the laws of marriage in order to set the proper example for their followers. The Church of Christ required its officers, such as elders, bishops and even deacons, to marry. (See I Tim. 3:1-4, 12.) Peter was married (See Matt. 8:14.); Paul, who was a member of the Sanhedrin, had to be married to vote on the decisions of that body (See Acts 7:58-60; Acts 8:1.); all of the Apostles honored Abraham in his marriages.

Modern Christian ministers are embarrassed at the thought of Jesus being married, as though it were some sort of moral sin. However, if marriage has any element of sinfulness, where is it mentioned in the scriptures? Jesus never forbid nor condemned nor failed to sanction any of the principles and laws pertaining to this everlasting covenant of marriage--especially in the lives of Abraham, Jacob, and a host of other prophets who had lived plural marriage. Neither did He criticize any of the laws pertaining to marriage or plural marriage as established by Moses.

Chapter 7

THE ANCIENT PRACTICE OF PLURAL MARRIAGE

Jesus defended and honored His lineage through the grand patriarch Abraham. Is it possible that Jesus would sustain the life of that great prophet, but not the laws and principles that made him great? Throughout the ministry of Jesus and His disciples there is not one word of denunciation against the principle of marriage or plural marriage. Certainly they were aware of such scriptures in the Old Testament as, "If he take him **another** wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall he not diminish." (Exodus 21:10) Yet He made no change in these instructions. Rather he advocated men to "do the works of Abraham" to be worthy of being Abraham's seed.

The Catholic and Protestant ministers of today deny the marriage of Jesus and the law of plural marriage. However, in reading the Gospels, there looms the frequent mention of Jesus's association with many women. With all of these women surrounding Jesus, it appears that He was more of a Mormon than Catholic or Protestant.

It is not presumptuous to assume that Jesus had lived plural marriage--it had always been a law among the prophets of Israel. Jesus was to obey those laws--not to destroy them--but to show mankind how to live a **fullness** of all of the laws of God and the Gospel. His answer to Satan when tempted was "to live by **every** word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;" and the Prophet Joseph Smith could only declare the same to this dispensation:

*Thus we have no new commandment to give, but admonish elders and members to live by **every word** that proceedeth forth from the mouth of God, lest they come short of the glory that is reserved for the faithful. (T.P.J.S., p. 306)*

The Prophet recognized that Jesus was also confined to obey **all** of the commandments and ordinances which had ever been given to man.

If a man gets a fullness of the priesthood of God, he has to get it in **the same way that Jesus Christ obtained it**, and that was keeping **all the commandments and obeying all the ordinances** of the house of the Lord. (T.P.J.S., p. 308)

Several examples of this implication are recorded in the New Testament; and if we can accept this doctrine under the Christian Dispensation, then many incidents in the life of Christ will become clearly evident. Said Orson Pratt:

The Evangelists do not particularly speak of the marriage of Jesus; but this is not to be

wondered at, for St. John says: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." (John 21:25) One thing is certain, that there were several holy women that greatly loved Jesus--such as Mary, and Martha her sister, and Mary Magdalene; and Jesus greatly loved them, and associated with them much; and when He arose from the dead, instead of first showing Himself to His chosen witnesses, the Apostles, He appeared first to these women, or at least to one of them--namely, Mary Magdalene. Now, it would be very natural for a husband in the resurrection to appear first to his own dear wives, and afterwards show himself to his other friends. If all the acts of Jesus were written, we no doubt should learn that these beloved women were his wives. (Orson Pratt, **The Seer**, p. 159)

Among the dearest friends of Jesus were Lazarus and his two sisters, Martha and Mary. How often Jesus must have visited the home of this happy family. And these casual, perhaps often visits, gave him comfort and solace from the frenzied and turmoil of His daily labors. No doubt these associations with Mary and Martha grew more friendly and devoted because affections and true love will naturally increase; for love begets love. John the disciple, who knew of these circumstances, wrote: "Now Jesus loved Martha and her sister (Mary) and Lazarus." What kind of love was he speaking of? Was not this a different kind of love from that which he generally manifest? Or else why would John mention it? If Mary and Martha were wives and Lazarus a brother-in-law, then Jesus did love them with a deeper and more intimate love which was so noticeable to John.

Now Martha, in her character, was a woman with a particular attention and devotion to her home. In the work of housekeeping and family duties she found much pleasure and satisfaction. As a faithful devoted wife, she exercised her special gift in keeping an orderly and efficient home. Mary, however, was blessed with other types of gifts. She was a contemplative woman and given to spiritual feelings and religious instruction.

These two sisters, devoted as they were to their talents, and to Jesus, were sooner or later, by their nature, destined to clash. On one occasion while Jesus was with them, as the meal was being prepared by Martha, she felt that Mary was neglecting her share of the household duties, thereby leaving these chores to her. Martha could not see the value of Mary's conversations and meditations at the feet of Jesus while she alone managed the chores of the household. In such a circumstance, "Martha was cumbered about much serving and came to Him, and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me." (Luke 10:40)

MARY AND MARTHA

How much like a wife to offer such a complaint to her husband--for who would suggest such a thing to a casual guest--especially to such a notable person? If Jesus were merely a visitor, what logical reasoning would cause Martha to ask this guest to impose the household obligations upon Mary? Certainly propriety and manners would have constrained such feelings until after the guest had departed. No, these were emotions being expressed regarding household conduct which Martha felt should be corrected by the husband of the house. Jesus knew the feelings of her heart, and being considerate and wise, with loving words said: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful (filled with cares) and troubled about many things"--demonstrating a consolation to her and her troubles. He acknowledges her burdens and with the feeling of an understanding husband calls her name twice as if to show His care and sympathetic feelings. But, with the same wise counsel, he considers Mary and her feelings and gifts, showing to Martha that Mary was performing a duty also. In the same consolation to Martha He said, "But one thing is needful; and Mary hath chosen that good part which shall not be taken away from her." (Luke 10:42) Mary was seeking the principles of the gospel, the words of the Savior, and the understanding of the mission of her husband. Mary also was perhaps learning of her mission on the earth and the duties that she would have to bear when her Lord would be taken away to Calvary.

Six days before the Passover, as the conspiracy of betrayal began to take place, Jesus came again to Bethany. Here once more he came to the home of Martha and Mary. Jesus knew his hours were numbered upon the earth--His heart was torn in the agony of leaving His home, His wives, and His friends. How natural then to come to their home in Bethany to spend a few remaining and precious moments with those whom He loved.

Mary's love and devotion were as pure and as dear as any wife's could be. We read that she was anointing the feet of Jesus with ointment "very costly" and that she "wiped his feet with her hair." Who would be more qualified to anoint the Master than a wife? How much like a wife to weep and rest her head on the bosom of Jesus and anoint his body with costly oil with such profound devotion. Surely she knew of the approaching death of Jesus, and as a faithful wife, she paid this last devotional tribute to her husband--a love story demonstrating an eternal affection, which Jesus said, "shall not be taken away from her."

If He (Jesus) was never married, his intimacy with Mary and Martha and the other Mary also whom Jesus loved, must have been highly unbecoming and improper to say the best of it. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 4:259)

Joseph Smith spoke upon these passages to show that Mary and Martha manifested much closer relationship than merely a believer. (Journal of Wilford Woodruff, July 22, 1883)

That relationship had the closeness of a marriage contract. And that love which was so manifest on these occasions was to be perpetual; for a true love which evolves into marriage should become reciprocal--ever increasing with each manifestation of kindness and thoughtfulness. It is meant to form a bond which can never be broken in life or death. However, the empty contracts of marriages performed by the apostate Christian world today are no more binding or everlasting than those administered by the pagan and heathens.

In the marriage ceremony performed by the laws of the land and almost every Christian Church, the ceremonial words direct the couple to love each other "till death do you part." This implies that such love between them will also be dissolved at the time of death by each or both. But can death be the means of destroying love? Are not the feelings and emotions of the human soul to continue as long as the spirit and soul will exist? Of course; and perhaps with much greater purity and intensity in those heavenly realms where the darkness of a depraved world cannot dim nor tarnish that holy emotion.

If love, like a marriage alliance, were to be dissolved at death, a widow would have no tears at the funeral of her husband. But true love, like a true marriage, is not intended by God to be discarded or dissolved. A divine love and divine marriage is eternal in its nature, and as it is honored on earth, it will continue to grow and increase, expanding to newer and higher excellence in the eternities. Such is the revelation of God to the Prophet Joseph Smith concerning this Everlasting Covenant of marriage.

In the restoration of the new and everlasting covenant of marriage the Lord said that "no one can reject this covenant" and then be permitted to "receive a fullness of my glory." Instead they would "remain separately and singly to all eternity." He then justified His servants Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as also Moses, in having many bound in heaven. The wives of these ancient prophets would then be restored to them in heaven because of their obedience and faithfulness. And, if God's servants are faithful in honoring the commandments and laws of the new and everlasting covenant, they are promised even "a hundred fold." This is no less than the promise that Jesus made to Peter and the Apostles when He said that if they should sacrifice a wife or anything else for the sake of the Gospel, that He would bless them with a hundred more. (Mark 10:29-30)

If then, these faithful prophets and apostles shall come forth in the resurrection with their wives, is it reasonable that Jesus should be left "separately and singly forever and ever?" Was the love and affection which Mary, Martha, and the others had for Jesus meant to be ended at death? Did Jesus honor all of the laws and all of the ordinances with the exception of this new and everlasting covenant? Jesus was not an exception to any of the eternal laws of heaven; and to become a God, He like all others must honor and obey that everlasting covenant of marriage.

Matthew, Mark, and Luke made mention of the many women who attended and ministered to Jesus. The majority of these women were his own wives and they "ministered unto him of their substance" that they might assist Him in fulfilling His life's mission. Again later, at the time of the crucifixion, we find them following Jesus to Calvary and to the sepulchre.

And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him. (Matt. 27:55)

There were also women looking on afar off; among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses and Salome; who also, when he was in Galilee, followed

him, and ministered unto him; and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem. (Mark 15:40-41)

And there followed him a great company of people and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus turning unto them said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children." (Luke 23:27-28)

Another incident, recorded by Luke, gives increased insight to these women's identity. The nature of the situation indicates that they were wives.

*And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid. Now upon the first day of the week very early in the morning, **they** came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them. And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them in shining garments; and as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen; remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying, The Son of man must be delivered into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words, and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles. And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not. (Luke 23:55-56; 24:1-11)*

Now then, according to Jewish traditional laws, only members of the immediate family are permitted to attend to the body and enter into the sepulchre of the deceased. All of these women had to be the mother, sisters and wives of Jesus!

By the very nature and intent of God granting wives to the ancient prophets, He would also have to give wives to Jesus. One of the purposes of Jesus' life was to understand the feelings, the sufferings, and the trials of all men. He must know the love, the family ties, and the grief of losing honorable wives in death as the ancient prophets did. How could Jesus know the feelings and emotions of those ancient prophets who had lived plural marriage, with all of their trials and joys, the love and the sorrows connected therewith, unless He in like manner had obeyed the same laws and commandments from God?

It was absolutely necessary that he should pass through this state, and be subject to all the weaknesses of the flesh, that he should also be subjected to the buffetings of Satan the same as we are, and pass through all the trials incident to humanity, and thereby comprehend the weakness and the true character of human nature, with all its faults and foibles, that we might have a faithful High Priest that would know how to deliver those that are tempted. (John Taylor, J.D. 7:198)

Jesus was required to feel all of the paternal anguish and griefs of the human heart. If He was to know the pains of God's faithful prophets who had been torn from their homes and families by mobs, it was necessary that He experience those same trials. The Lord himself attests to this fact by revelation while the Prophet Joseph Smith was experiencing a similar circumstance in the dungeon of Liberty Jail. Said the Lord:

*If thou art accused with all manner of false accusations; if thine **enemies fall upon thee; if they tear thee from the society of thy father and mother and brethren and sisters; and if with a drawn sword thine enemies tear thee from the bosom of thy wife: * * * know thou, my son, that all these things shall give thee experience, and shall be for thy good. The Son of man hath descended below them all.** (D. & C. 122:6, 7, 8)*

This is an admission by the Lord that He had known and felt that same anguish--and even worse!

In ancient and modern times the general masses have retaliated against these principles. And, when the leading Pharisees contended against Jesus for these doctrinal views, he exhorted them that "if ye were the seed of Abraham, ye would **do the works of Abraham,**" but they refused! Today the modern Jew and the modern Christian will honor the name and the blood of Father Abraham; but it is his **works**--his marriages--which are looked upon as a most despicable incident. The cry is often made

that this system of marriage is one of the "relics of barbarism," regardless of the honorable men who had lived and taught that doctrine, and in many cases died to sustain it. If then the great prophets and patriarchs who had seen visions, communed with angels, and who saw and talked with God, had lived and sanctioned this principle, then who can declare it to be a "relic of barbarism?" Our modern pagan society has become as distracted from God and His laws as all the other Pharaohs and Pharisees of yesteryear.

There is another class of individuals to whom I will briefly refer. Shall we call them Christians. They were Christians originally. We cannot be admitted into their social societies, into their places of gathering at certain times and on certain occasions because they are afraid of polygamy. I will give you their title that you may know whom I am talking about--I refer to the Freemasons.

*They have refused our brethren membership in their lodge, because they are polygamists. Who was the founder of Freemasonry? They can go back as far as Solomon, and there they stop. There is the king who established this high and holy order. Now was he a polygamist, or was he not? If he did believe in monogamy, he did not practice it a great deal, for he had seven hundred wives, and that is more than I have, and he had three hundred concubines, of which I have none that I know of. Yet the whole fraternity throughout Christendom will cry out against this order. "Oh dear, Oh dear, Oh dear," they all cry out; "I am in pain.... I am suffering at witnessing the wickedness there is in the land. Here is one of the `relics' of barbarism." Yes, one of the relics of Adam, of Enoch, of Noah, of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, of Moses, David, Solomon, the Prophets, **and Jesus and His Apostles.** (Brigham Young, Feb. 10, 1867, **Deseret News**)*

There is little doubt that a few of the Pharisees accepted a belief in that doctrine, but would not advocate or obey that principle. And when Jesus exhorted his disciples to "do the works of Abraham", he contended that the chief priests were guilty of this deliberate neglect, for he said, "they say and do not." Since these leading Elders of Israel would "say and do not," it would follow in short sequence that apostasy would overtake them. Leading historians admit that this had happened. One of the most profound scholars of early Church history, Eusebius, wrote a work entitled "History of the Christian Church" which became the--

*...most important ecclesiastical history of ancient times, and is written in the belief that **the old order of things was passing away** and with the apologetic purpose of exhibiting the history of Christianity as a proof of its divine origin and efficacy. (**Encyclopedia Britannica**)*

And, in his 15-volume work, entitled **Contra Hieroclem**, Eusebius devoted it entirely to the Christians for justification and acceptance of all the sacred writings and teachings of the Hebrews.

Through the corruptions and apostasy of early Christianity, the "plain and precious" truths were soon smothered and buried in the pages of the past--although a few marks of the original doctrines remain within the scriptures and old traditions. For example, the calling of nuns to be the "brides of Christ," and also in the scriptures that tell of the bridegroom coming to meet the ten virgins--both advocate the basic principle of plural marriage, regardless of the interpretations. But the most astounding factor in this plural marriage parable is that Jesus makes himself to be the bridegroom! He was speaking symbolically of an actuality!

Indeed, the Psalmist, David, prophesies in particular concerning the wives of the Son of God. We quote from the English version of the Bible, translated about three hundred and fifty years ago: "All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia; when thou comest out of the ivory palaces, where they have made thee glad, King's daughters were among thine honorable WIVES; upon thy right hand did stand the Queen in a vesture of gold Ophir? (Psalm 45:8, 9) That this passage has express reference to the Son of God and His wives, will be seen by reading the sixth and seventh verses which are as follows: "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness; therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." This Being, whom the Psalmist here calls God, is represented in the next verses as having "honorable wives". If any should still doubt whether this prophecy has reference to the Son of God, they may satisfy themselves by reading Paul's application of these passages in the eighth and ninth verses of the first chapter of his epistle to the Hebrews; "But unto the Son He saith. Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved

*righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." Paul applies the words of the Prophet David to the Son of God, to the anointed Messiah, who is called God, and whose "throne is forever and ever." Let it be remembered then, that the Son of God is expressly represented as having "honorable wives". King James' translators were not willing that this passage should have a literal translation, according to the former English rendering, lest it should give countenance to polygamy; therefore, they altered the translation to honorable women instead of wives; but any person acquainted with the original can see that the first translators have given the true rendering of that passage. Indeed, the very next sentence most clearly demonstrates this; for the Son of God is represented as having a "**queen**" standing upon His right hand, clothed "in a vesture of gold." This Queen is exhorted in the following endearing language: "Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; forget also thine own people, and thy father's house; so shall the King greatly desire thy beauty, for he is thy Lord; and worship thou Him." (verses 10, 11)*

*Notwithstanding the Queen is numbered among the "honorable wives" of the Son of God, yet she is called upon to worship Him as her Lord. If her husband were a mere man, she would not be exhorted to worship him; this therefore, is another evidence that He was truly, as Paul says, the Son of God. (Orson Pratt, *The Seer*, pp. 159-160)*

The historian, Farrar, said that Herod "issued his fell mandate to slay all the male children of Bethlehem and its neighborhood from two years old and under." (Farrar's **Life of Christ**, p. 30) Also an earlier historian named Macrobius, who lived in the third century, stated that "among the boys under two years of age whom Herod ordered to be slain in Syria, his own son also had been slain." (Ibid.)

The massacre of so many male children created a surplus of women, who were the same age as Jesus. It is quite certain that Christ and the Apostles would have accepted some of them as wives, offering them an opportunity to have families.

Some of the early Bibles are quoted here showing the original translations:

Psalms 45 from
The Geneva Bible,
London edition, 1599 AD

King James' translators were not willing that this passage <above> should have a literal translation, according to the former English rendering, lest it should give countenance to polygamy; therefore, they altered the translation to honorable women instead of wives; but any person acquainted with the original can see that the first translators have given the true rendering of that passage. (Orson Pratt, *The Seer*, p. 160)

The Book of Psalms from a
Church of England Bible,
published in London in 1636

The Apostle Orson Pratt continues to elaborate and substantiate these passages of scripture with references to the Messiah who was to have a plurality of wives:

*Inasmuch as the Messiah was to have a "plurality of wives", will they not all be Queens? Yes; but there will be an order among them. One seems to be chosen to stand at his right hand; perhaps she may have merited that high station by her righteous acts, or by the position she had previously occupied. It seems that she was one of the daughters of a king; for in the same Psalm it says, "The king's daughter is all glorious within; her clothing is of wrought gold. She shall be brought unto the King in raiment of needle work; the virgins her companions that follow her shall be brought unto Thee. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; they shall enter into the King's palace." (verses 13-15) It must be recollected that "**kings' daughters were among Thine honorable Wives.**" The kings here spoken of were no doubt those who through obedience to the*

gospel became kings and priests forever; for we cannot suppose that Christ would marry the daughters of the kings of this world who only reign under the pretended name of kings for this short life; such are not worthy to be called kings. Some of the daughters of those kings who are to reign on the earth forever and ever, and who are in reality kings, will be among His "honorable wives," one being chosen to stand as Queen at His right hand and worship Him, unto whom is made the following promise: "Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make Princes in all the earth. I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations; therefore, shall the people praise thee forever." (verses 16, 17)

*We are not informed at what time Jesus was to be married to this king's daughter or to any of the rest of His wives. But from what John the Baptist says, He may have been married to some of them previous to that prophet's martyrdom. The passage is as follows: "**He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom;** but the friend of the Bridegroom, which standeth and heareth Him, rejoiceth greatly because of the Bridegroom's voice; this my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease." (John 3:29, 30) And again, "Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bridechamber mourn, as long as the Bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the Bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." (Matt. 9:15) John represents Jesus as already in the possession of the Bride; while the Saviour confirms what John says, by calling Himself "**the Bridegroom,**" and the disciples "**the children of the Bridechamber,**" but who the Bride was neither of them informs us. Whether Jesus had married any of His wives at that time or not, it is very evident that there will be a marriage of the Son of God at the time of His second coming; for Jesus said, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a certain king, which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and they would not come. Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold I have prepared my dinner; my oxen and fatlings are killed, and all things are ready:: come unto the marriage. But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise; and the remnant took his servants, and entreated them spitefully and slew them. But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth; and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city. Then saith he to his servants, the wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find bid them to the marriage. So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good; and the wedding was furnished with guests. And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment; and he saith unto him, Friend how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless. Then said the king to his servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few are chosen." (Matthew 22:1-14) All will admit that the king's son, here spoken of, is Jesus Christ, and that the last servants who are sent forth have a commission to gather together from the highways and hedges both bad and good; and that by this gathering, "**the wedding was furnished with guests.**" The Bridegroom, the servants, and the guests are all mentioned, but the parable does not inform us who the Bride is. John the Revelator describes the greatness, the glory, and the magnificence of this marriage celebration. He says, "And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia; for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad, and rejoice and give honor to him: for the Marriage of the Lamb is come, and His Wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints, And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." (Rev. 19:6-9) That the wife was to be a very good and holy woman, is very clearly indicated by her being clothed with "the righteousness of the saints," compared to fine linen, clean and white. Her raiment is more fully described in the Psalm already quoted, being composed of fine needle work of wrought gold, while many virgins were to be her attendants.*

That the Bride will continue to be the Wife of the Son of God in Eternity as well as time, is most clearly revealed in the twenty-first chapter of the Revelations, where St. John beheld the New Earth, and the angel said unto him, "Come hither, I will shew thee the Bride, the Lamb's Wife;" and he was carried in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and saw a great city called the holy Jerusalem, descending from the heavens upon the New Earth. This city contained the

throne of God and the Lamb, and was inhabited by a great nation of kings who were to "**reign forever and ever**," being Gods, as is evident from the name of God being written on each of their foreheads. The inscription upon their foreheads was not intended as a mere sham or mockery, but was in reality the name given to each, that all the inhabitants of eternity, when they saw GOD conspicuously inscribed upon all their foreheads, might know most assuredly that each one was a God, as the written title or name expressly declared. The grandeur and glory of this city are still further described; the city and the streets thereof were of pure gold, clear as glass, while the walls and the gates were of the most precious stones; and the glory of God enlightened the city, so that they had no need of the light of the sun or moon. This light was so great that all the nations that were saved that dwelt upon all the face of the New Earth, walked in the light of it. There was no night there, but the whole Earth was clothed in one eternal day. It was in the midst of this city that the King of kings and Lord of lords sat upon His throne, while upon His "right hand did stand the Queen," arrayed in the most costly apparel. In order that John might see the glory of God, the glory of His kingdom, and the glory of His Bride, it was necessary to show him, the Palace, the place of the Throne, and the city in which the Bride resided. It is expressly said, concerning this Queen, that her name should be remembered in all generations, and that the people should praise her forever and ever. (Psalm 45:17) As John saw in vision the Bride, the Lamb's Wife more than a thousand years after her marriage--after she and all the rest of the inhabitants of the earth had been raised from the dead and become immortal--it is quite certain that she was in reality a Wife after the resurrection as well as before, and that she will be the Lamb's Wife forever and ever; and in that capacity she will, as the Psalmist has said, be respected and praised by all the people forever and ever.

That the marriage will be celebrated at the second coming of the Messiah, is also clearly expressed in the parable of the ten virgins; for Jesus said, "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps, and went forth to meet the Bridegroom. And five of them were wise, and five were foolish. They that were foolish took their lamps, and took no oil with them; but the wise took oil in their vessels with their lamps. While the Bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him. Then all those virgins arose, and trimmed their lamps. And the foolish said unto the wise, Give us of your oil; for our lamps are gone out. But the wise answered, saying, Not so; lest there be not enough for us and you; but go ye rather to them that sell, and buy for yourselves. And while they went to buy, the Bridegroom came; and they that were ready went in with Him to the marriage; and the door was shut. Afterward came also the other virgins, saying, Lord, Lord, open to us. But He answered and said, Verily I say unto you, I know you not. Watch therefore, for you know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh." (Matt. 25:1-13) This parable, like that of the marriage of the King's son which we have already quoted, plainly shows that there will be a gathering out from among the nations--a going forth to meet the Bridegroom; but among those who gather, there will be some without a wedding garment--without oil in their lamps. But the five wise virgins who are ready will go in with the Bridegroom to the marriage, and the door will be shut. And here let us ask the following questions: Are these five wise virgins to be married unto the Bridegroom, or are they only the invited guests? And if they are guests, who constitutes the Bride? In the parable of the marriage of the King's son, it is said, "And the wedding was furnished with guests;" the guests being those who received the invitation of the servants and gathered together. If the five wise virgins constitute the guests, then the Bride must be some wise holy virgin, chosen to be the royal consort or Queen. On the other hand, if the five wise virgins represent all the saints, both male and female, and if they all constitute the Bride, then where will the guests come from, or who will they be? Again, if the five virgins are actually virgins or females who are to be married to the Bridegroom, then all the rest of the saints would constitute the guests. Are not these five wise virgins the "honorable Wives" which the Psalmist represents the Son of God as having taken from among king's daughters? (Orson Pratt, **The Seer**, pp. 169-172)

The faith, power, and gifts of the early Christian Church disappeared with its original doctrines. Through persecution from without and the semi-apostates who aspired from within, the Church of

Christ reverted to the institutions of paganism from which it had emerged. It was a desperate and futile struggle for the faithful few that contended for the gospel as revealed from the heavens. When sacerdotal overseers themselves perpetuated heresies and deceptions, disguised as the word and will of God, Christianity waned and slipped into apostasy. After being persecuted for adhering to truth, the priests turned their efforts to persecuting those who believed in those very same truths.

Freedom, sought so desperately by the Christians and which should be incorporated as part of their religion, soon became one of the most deficient articles of their faith. The martyrs' pyre and the bloody guillotine soon became one of the most active programs of the Church. Although spiritual disciples bore testimony to the truths of the scriptures, the Church found it necessary to hide and subterfuge the truth from the lay member. The Church, through the word of mortal man began to supplant, as well as suppress, the words of God.

Spiritual darkness and the forces of evil from without had half collapsed the Church through lion's dens, the crosses, and the rivers of blood. Then the balance of doctrinal purity became smothered by cunning artifice from within. The Church had sacrificed its doctrinal truths for the purchase of worldly honor and esteem. The result became a half-truth, socialized Christianity which has now become horrified at the original laws and principles which were taught and lived by prophets, apostles and the Lord Jesus Christ.

*There is another and more important question that should engage the attention of the churches of today. The Apostle Paul declares that "all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." (2 Tim. 3:12) Why is it, then, that persecution seems in a great degree to slumber? The only reason is that **the church has conformed to the world's standard, and therefore awakens no opposition.** The religion which is current in our day is not of the pure and holy character that marked the Christian faith in the days of Christ and His apostles. **It is only because of the spirit of compromise with sin, because the great truths of the word of God are so indifferently regarded,** because there is so little vital godliness in the church, that Christianity is apparently so popular with the world. Let there be a revival of the faith and power (and doctrines) of the early church, and the spirit of persecution will be revived, and the fires of persecution will be rekindled. (Ellen G. White, **The Great Controversy**, p. 53)*

The Latter-day Saints still acknowledge the doctrine of plural marriage as an everlasting covenant. It was never meant as a temporal commandment or a practical incident in Church history. This doctrine has always been declared to be an eternal principle of the fullness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

*A key: **Every principle proceeding from God is eternal** and any principle which is not eternal is of the devil. (T.P.J.S., p. 181)*

Eternal principles are given to man for him to obtain eternal blessings. To refuse or oppose them would cause man to lose not only eternal rewards but perhaps the priesthood of God.

*Now, briefly, the reason that the Lord, through the Prophet Joseph, introduced the doctrine of plural marriage, and the reason that the Church . . . has never and will never relinquish the doctrine of plural marriage, is simply this: the major purpose of the Church is to help man attain the great eternal destiny suggested in that couplet . . . **plural marriage is the patriarchal order of marriage lived by God and others who reign in the Celestial Kingdom. As well might the Church relinquish its claim to the Priesthood as the doctrine of plural marriage.** (Brigham Young and His Wives, by J. J. Stewart, p. 41)*

Throughout the centuries men have raised mobs or laws against those who have sustained the laws of God. The Saints of former-days and latter-days have found a common faith that brought them into jails or death. The Apostle Parley P. Pratt had faced them both and declared:

*Sir, I have yet to learn by what constitutional or moral right a local state sovereignty makes a crime of that which, rightly conducted, never has been recognized as a crime by God, or angels, prophets or apostles, or even **by the Saviour of the world.** (**Autobiography of Parley P. Pratt**, p. 420)*

Then his brother, Orson Pratt, who had been very familiar with the laws and attitudes of the modern Christian, also portrayed a vivid picture of the fate of those who persist in such prejudices.

*Jesus says "there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." (Luke 13:28) There are many in this generation so pious that they would consider themselves greatly disgraced to be obliged to associate with a man having a plurality of wives; would it not be well for such to desire a place separate from the kingdom of God, that they may not be contaminated with the society of these old polygamists? And then it would be so shocking to the modesty of the very pious ladies of Christendom to see Abraham and his wives, Jacob and his wives, Jesus and his honorable wives, all eating occasionally at the same table, and visiting one another, and conversing about their numerous children and their kingdoms. Oh, ye delicate ladies of Christendom, how can you endure such a scene as this? Oh, what will you do, when you behold on the very gates of the holy Jerusalem the names of the Twelve sons of the four wives of the Polygamist Jacob? If you do not want your morals corrupted, and your delicate ears shocked, and your pious modesty put to the blush by the society of polygamists and their wives, do not venture near the holy Jerusalem, nor come near the New Earth; for polygamists will be honored there, and will be among the chief rulers in that Kingdom. (Orson Pratt, **The Seer**, p. 172)*

Men must sooner or later, in this life or the next, learn the eternal truths of the new and everlasting covenant. And, if men have been given opportunities and privileges of gaining a knowledge and testimony of these principles in this life, but should forsake them through cowardice, compromise, or social honors while trusting in the arm of flesh, they shall barter an everlasting inheritance for a mess of pottage.

Popular traditions, customs and prejudices have always a profound effect upon the minds of men. These popular customs have almost always run counter to the laws of God; but God's laws are everlasting and unchangeable. Men, however, must learn the truths of God by testimony and then be willing to sacrifice popularity and social prestige for the eternal honors of heaven. But, there are many who fail in the cause of God, for Lehi saw **many** souls who had partaken of the gospel fruit but "after they had tasted of the fruit they were ashamed, because of those that were scoffing at them; and they fell away into forbidden paths and were lost." (1 Nephi 8:28) The Latter-day Saints of today have reason to be proud rather than ashamed of the heritage bestowed by their pioneer fore-fathers who sacrificed their wealth, their names and their lives to sustain the Everlasting Covenant of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. They dare not repudiate or condemn the principle of plural marriage without jeopardizing their salvation; and they should, with the valiancy of Paul the apostle, say that they "are not ashamed of the gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation."

Chapter 8

JESUS AND HIS POSTERITY

The true Messiah spoken of by all the ancient prophets was the personification and representation of all that is true and noble. One of man's most honorable estates is that of marriage and his family. The very thought of singleness and barrenness is generally repulsive and certainly not according to God's law which commands mankind to "be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth." (Gen. 1:28) Living things are designed to grow and be productive.

One of the most popular misconceptions about Jesus was His manliness. The common Christian has been taught about a Jesus with a femininity which is embarrassing if not revolting to anyone who understands His true character. The real Messiah labored and toiled with a genuine manly dignity. He walked many miles; He climbed and preached upon the mountainsides; He ate the most common food--and that among the poorest publicans and the worst of sinners. He wielded a whip across the backs of temple thieves and overturned their tables. Then with a dignity, majesty, and inner self-control that demanded the utmost strength, He silently and patiently withstood the beatings, the spitting and the sordid insults of a depraved humanity. Finally, He carried a burdensome cross through sweat and blood on the road to Calvary and suffered a tortuous death between two thieves.

This is not the character personified in the stained glass of the cathedrals--robed in costly garments, and glorious with a delicate and effeminate appearance. The Christ we adore and revere was

a real man--strong in character, body and mind. He was a man among men, a King of kings, and a Lord of lords. Yet He understood by experience every feeling, every weakness and strength, of each mortal man. He lived like a man, He understood and spoke as a man, but He possessed the dignity and wisdom of a God. This was the real Jesus--the true Messiah--the perfect example!

Among man's greatest honors and blessings is his home. For the security, the love, and the possessions of a family, man will make every sacrifice, toil to unending endurance, or fight upon any battlefield. The family is man's most valuable treasure--and the dearest to his heart. The basis of dignity and glory is for a man to have a continuation of seed--children that will revere his life and continue his name. No blessing could have been more precious to Abraham than the promise that his seed would become as numerous as "the stars and the sands of the sea." If Abraham was so honored because of his righteousness, then it is only reasonable that Jesus should also be granted a similar blessing. If mortal men may be blessed with such a numerous posterity, then how much more deserving should be the Christ!

Did Jesus have children? Paul said that Jesus took upon Him the seed of Abraham (Heb. 2:16), which means simply that He continued the lineage and posterity of Abraham.

*If these things have power to disturb the pure mind, we apprehend that even greater troubles than these may arise before mankind learn all the particulars of Christ's incarnation--how and by whom he was begotten; the character of the relationships formed by that act; the number of wives **and children** he had, and all other circumstances with which he was connected, and by which he was tried and tempted in all things like unto man. Whatever may prove to be the facts in the case, it certainly would exhibit a great degree of weakness on the part of anyone to indulge in fears and anxieties about that which he has no power to control. Facts still remain facts, whether kept or revealed. If there is a way pointed out by which all beings who come into this world can lay the foundation for rule, and a never-ending increase of kingdoms and dominions, by which they can become Gods, we are as willing the Lord Jesus Christ should enjoy them all as any other being, and we believe the descendants of such a sire would glory in ascribing honour and power to him as their God. The Apostle informs us that those who are redeemed shall be like Jesus; not to say, however, that they shall be wifeless and childless, and without eternal affections. (Samuel W. Richards, **Mill. Star**, 15:825)*

There is a law of procreation just as binding, just as eternal, and just as consistent in its demands and blessings as the law of baptism. The purpose and scope of marriage is to bear children. To say that Jesus did not need to comply with the law of marriage, and the propagation of children is as foolish as to say that He did not need to comply with the demands of any other law of the Gospel.

*Jesus Christ never omitted the fulfilling of a single law that God has made known for the salvation of the children of men. It would not have done for him to have come and obeyed one law and neglected or rejected another. He could not consistently do that and then say to mankind, "Follow me." (Joseph F. Smith, **Mill. Star**, 62:97)*

Jesus honored and obeyed every law of the gospel, including marriage and raising a posterity. Indeed, it is through obedience to this divine law that gives the greatest honor to man, for this was the first law and commandment given to men. Jesus said that He came to "fulfill the law," and the first positive commandment of the Bible according to Rabbinical law (Maimonides, *Minyan ha-Mitznet*, p. 212) is the propagation of the human race.

*The Jewish morality insists that a man who does not assume the social responsibility for the continuation of society, lives a life that is not complete. (Rabbi Hirsch, **My Religion**, p. 44)*

Jewish tradition and rabbinical law declare the promised Messiah is to be a married High Priest with children. To better understand human nature with its weaknesses, problems, and trials, a High Priest was required to be married and raise a family. In such a position he could, from his own experience, be better prepared to give counsel and advice in assisting others who may have similar problems. With the experience of marriage, and the raising of a large family, coupled with the inspiration of heaven, he then was qualified to act in that holy calling for his fellow men.

Although through many centuries, priests and popes disregarded the law of marriage and substituted the doctrine of celibacy, the supposed first pope, the Apostle Peter, was a married man.

(Matt. 8:14; Mk. 1:30; Lk. 4:38) Indeed, he may well have been a polygamist, rather than a celibate, for he had two homes--one in Bethsaida, (John 1:44) and another home in Capernaum (Mark 1:29). Now, if there be a perversion in the original history of the lives of the Apostles, how much more had it been tampered in the life of the true Messiah?

For years before Christ's coming, the Jews believed in a Messiah who would have children:

The Messiah will die, and his son will become king in his stead, and there will be no immortality, but the people will live much longer... (The Messiah Idea in Jewish History, Greenstone, p. 147)

After nearly two thousand years of historical juggling, true facts will sound like fairy tales. American history, in an enlightened age with only a couple hundred years to draw from, is being constantly re-exposed to the amazement of her citizens. How delicately we must expose the truth from many, many centuries.

In 1853 the Apostle Orson Hyde dared to deliver a lecture revealing incidents in the life of Christ which affirmed His marriage and children. This news scattered like wildfire throughout the country and editors made literary war upon the apostle. Said Orson Hyde a few months later:

*I discover that some of the Eastern papers represent me as a great blasphemer, because I said, in my lecture on marriage, at our last conference that Jesus Christ was married at Cana of Galilee, that Mary, Martha, and others were his wives, and that **he begat children**.*

*All that I have to say in reply to that charge is this--they worship a Savior that is too pure and holy to fulfill the commands of his Father. I worship one that is just pure and holy enough "to fulfill all righteousness;" not only the righteous law of baptism, but the still more righteous and important law "**to multiply and replenish the earth**." Startle not at this, for even the Father himself honored that law by coming down to Mary, without a natural body, and begetting a son; and if Jesus begat children he only "did that which he had seen his Father do." (Apostle Orson Hyde, J.D. 2:210)*

The ancient prophet Isaiah had written more on the life and the expected Messiah than any other prophet. In one of these prophecies he said the great Redeemer would see his children.

When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed. (Isaiah 53:10)

This scripture indicates that when Jesus would be making "his soul an offering for sin" that he would see his children. No doubt this event did occur--which would make His offering more heart-rending and the trial more severe. Perhaps Luke recorded this very event--for at the time that Jesus was being taken to the cross at Calvary, Luke said:

*There followed him a great company of people, **and of women** which also bewailed and lamented him. But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, **and for your children**. (Luke 23:27-29)*

These women were wives and mothers who "bewailed and lamented" because Jesus was going to the cross. But, Jesus knew that his mortal mission was nearly over--it was the end of the suffering for him, but it was not the end of the trials for those mothers and their children. And, Jesus continued to explain their situation by adding, "If they do these things in the green tree, what shall they do in the dry?" Jesus knew the sorrows that would continue for those women and children because the persecutors would not stop at the death of Jesus. They would continue to destroy his children, his relatives and his disciples. Then said Jesus, "the days are coming, in the which they shall say, blessed are the barren and the wombs that never bare" because the destroyers would, like Herod, seek their destruction. Persecution became so severe that every apostle (with the exception of John) and most of the disciples were killed.

Man's honor and glory is obtained by woman. Alone and single, man fades into insignificance, but through women and children, his glory is extended and perpetuated. For this reason Paul said that "the woman is the glory of the man." (I Cor. 11:7) Jesus was not the exception to this principle. Before He died he said to the Father:

*Father, the hour has come; glorify thy Son that thy Son may also glorify thee; * * * **I have***

glorified thee on the earth; I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. (John 17:1, 4)

The Lord continued to reveal further light on this subject in a revelation to the Prophet:

*For they are given unto him **to multiply and replenish the earth**, according to my commandment, and to fulfill the promise which was given by my Father before the foundation of the world, and for their exaltation in the eternal worlds, **that they might bear the souls of men; for herein is the work of my Father continued, that He might be glorified.***

This promise is yours also, because ye are of Abraham, and the promise was made unto Abraham; and by this law is the continuation of the works of my Father, wherein he glorifieth himself. Go ye, therefore, and do the works of Abraham; enter into my law and ye shall be saved. (D. & C. 132:63, 31, 32)

Hence, God is "glorified" by the commandment to "multiply and replenish the earth." It is evident Jesus had a posterity by His admission that He "glorified" the Father on earth.

The grand blessing of honor which was given to Abraham was his family and his posterity. This was the glory of Abraham.

But to continue with the scripture of Isaiah:

What did the old Prophet mean when he said (speaking of Christ) "He shall see his seed, prolong his days, etc.?" Did Jesus consider it necessary to fulfill every righteous command or requirement of His Father? He most certainly did. This he witnessed by submitting to baptism under the hands of John. "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," said he. Was it God's commandment to man, in the beginning, to "multiply and replenish the earth?" None can deny this, neither that it was a righteous command; for upon an obedience to this, depended the perpetuity of our race. Did Christ come to destroy the law or the prophets, or to fulfill them? He came to fulfill. Did he multiply, and did he see his seed? Did he honour his Father's law by complying with it, or did he not? Others may do as they like, but I will not charge our Saviour with neglect or transgression in this or any other duty. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 4:260)

When Christ came in the Meridian of time, He came to fulfill all of the gospel laws; He further fulfilled all of the ancient prophecies concerning the life of the promised Messiah. Isaiah the prophet saw the Messiah seated upon the throne of the temple:

In the year that King Uzziah died I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up. and his train filled the temple. (Isa. 6:1)

In this instance the "train" was not a robe--for it "filled the temple". This "train" implies more than just disciples; the term referred to relations or family members; and this was the interpretation taken by President Brigham Young.

The scripture says that He, the Lord, came walking in the temple, with His train; I do not know who they were unless His wives and children.... (B. Young, J.D. 13:309)

That he did take upon himself the responsibilities of a family is also inferred by the Apostle Paul who said that he "took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Orson Pratt refers to this scripture as follows:

From the passage in the forty-fifth Psalm, it will be seen that the great Messiah who was the founder of the Christian religion, was a polygamist, as well as the Patriarch Jacob and the prophet David from whom He descended according to the flesh. Paul says concerning Jesus, "Verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." (Heb. 2:16) Abraham the polygamist, being a friend of God, the Messiah chose to take upon himself his seed; and by marrying many honorable wives himself, show to all future generations that he approbated the plurality of wives under the Christian dispensation, as well as under the dispensations in which His polygamist ancestors lived.

We have now clearly shown that God the Father had a plurality of wives, one or more being in eternity, by whom He begat our spirits as well as the spirit of Jesus His First Born, and another being upon the earth by whom He begat the tabernacle of Jesus, as His Only Begotten in this

*world. We have also proved most clearly that the Son followed the example of his Father and became the great Bridegroom to whom kings' daughters and many honorable wives were to be married. We have also proved that both God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ inherit their wives in eternity as well as in time; and that God the Father has already begotten many thousand millions of sons and daughters and sent them into this world to take tabernacles; and that God the Son has the promise that "of the increase of his government there shall be no end;" it being expressly declared that the children of one of His Queens should be made Princes in all the earth. (See Psalm 45:16) (Orson Pratt, **The Seer**, p. 172)*

As Jesus entered the Garden of Gethsemane, He knew of the conspiracy of death that loomed upon the near horizon. Diabolical men and demons were allying their means and powers to destroy the prospects of the Son of God; and with this premonition, Jesus sank to His knees and cried. No mortal man, no human heart ever felt the anguish, the sorrow, and the despair that came from that little garden that lonely night. And why? Because He prayed and felt as a mortal man--as a husband and a father. He loved His home as dear as any man ever loved a home. He knew the warmth of a family's love beside a fireplace, the smiles and laughter of His children, the tender embrace of a loving wife. Was there ever a blessing or a joy in a human heart that He should be deprived of? And conversely, was there ever a sorrow, a pain, or an anguish that other men had suffered that He too must not share?

With the seeds of mortality coursing through the veins of Jesus, He had experienced the emotions and feelings of every other mortal--yet with a nature that was divine He neither sinned nor erred. No mortal was ever more entitled to a home and family than he. No man had greater reason to remain alive than did Jesus--and for these He prayed. Death could deprive Him of all these deserving blessings. In a gushing of tears and sweat He was pleading to His Father for a continuation of His life. He loved His wives, His children and His disciples; and in the despair of leaving them, He said, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death." In the darkness of the night and the blackness of his future, He attempted to arouse His apostles three times to assist Him in this petition for His life; and He cried, "Father, all things are possible unto Thee; take away this cup from Me; nevertheless, not what I will but what Thou wilt." (Mark 14:36)

His soul was torn between the affectionate ties on the earth and the will of His Father in heaven. But, like many of God's prophets who had been robbed of their homes and families to perish in the prime of life, so too Jesus must suffer through this same trial and temptation; "for we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb. 4:15)

Attention must again be drawn to the revelation of March 1839 to the Prophet Joseph Smith during his incarceration in the Liberty Jail. The Lord indicates this trial of Joseph's was for his good and would give him experience--then indicates that He too had undergone the same heartfelt sorrow of being separated from his offspring--and also much worse.

*If thou art accused with all manner of false accusations; if thine enemies fall upon thee; if they tear thee from the society of thy father and mother and brethren and sisters; and if with a drawn sword thine enemies tear thee from the bosom of thy wife, **and of thine offspring**, and thine elder son, although but six years of age, shall cling to thy garments, and shall say, "My father, my father, why can't you stay with us? O, nay father, what are the men going to do with you?" And if then he shall be thrust from thee by the sword, and thou be dragged to prison, and thine enemies prowl around thee like wolves for the blood of the lamb; . . . know thou my son, that all these things shall give thee experience, and shall be for thy good. The Son of Man hath descended below them all. Art thou greater than He? (D. & C. 122:6, 7, 8)*

Understanding the feelings of the heart can only be obtained by experience. As the taste of salt and sugar cannot be known but by the taste of the tongue, so also must the joys and sorrows of the heart be known by experience. Jesus knew happiness, sorrow, disappointment, and every other emotion and feeling of a husband, a father, and a man. He experienced them all that he might understand our feelings and lead us to eternal life.

In the light of new revelation and new archaeological findings these little known facts are finding their way to discovery. In 1875 an archaeologist by the name of Ganneau discovered these facts in ancient records. The written commentary of the learned M. Zvi Udley are most revealing:

Did Jesus have children? There seems to be evidence that such was the case; in 1873 M.

Clermont Ganneau discovered near Bethany on the Mount of Offense certain sarcophagi of extremely ancient times. On these were small crosses, but none of the usual symbols of Jewish burials, "which leaves no doubt of the religion of the persons whose remains were preserved in them." M. Clermont Ganneau, writing of these discoveries in the **Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly**, 1874, pp. 7-10, notes the following to have been buried there: Salome, wife of Judah; Judah, son of Eleazar (Lazarus), Eleazar, the son of Nathan, Martha, daughter of Pesach; **Simeon, son of Jesus**; Salomzion, daughter of Simeon. Other sarcophagi had been destroyed earlier. Concerning them writes Clermont Ganneau: "By singular coincidence, which from the first struck me very forcibly, these inscriptions, found close to the Bethany road, and very near the site of the village, contain nearly all the names of the personages in the Gospel scene which belonged to the place; Eleazar (Lazarus), Simon, Martha . . . a host of other coincidences occur at the site of all these evangelical names...."

The "Simeon, son of Jesus" was called in one of the inscriptions "the Priest" (H-Kohan) and M. Clermont Ganneau concluded: ". . .this Simeon might very well be the second Bishop of Jerusalem. But then would arise . . . the grave question of the marriage of Christian priests, since Simeon has a daughter named Salomzion." M. Clermont Ganneau's French name suggests him to be Catholic, and bound to the doctrines of celibacy; however, the first 15 Bishops of Jerusalem were circumcised Jews, and the earlier ones, at least, certainly obeyed the marriage commandments! It seems the only reason Clermont Ganneau did not candidly state his beliefs was the question of a married clergy, for throughout his article he suggests this Simeon to have been the Bishop of Jerusalem. He promised to write a complete paper on the subject when he had more carefully examined all the find. It was an important find from the standpoint of archaeology, for it was the first actual discovery of the name "Martha" which "would alone be sufficient to make this collection important from an exegetic point of view;" yet, his promised paper was never published. Why? Was it because a full study of the find disclosed that this "Simeon the Son of Jesus" was the Bishop of Jerusalem? I fully believe this to be the case. Orthodox Christians have purposely destroyed valuable historical evidences which would prove embarrassing to them; that such was probably the case here is suggested by the fact that several ancient writers imply that Simeon the Bishop of Jerusalem, and President of the Church, (died c. 106 A.D.), was of the family of Jesus. It would be only natural for Jesus' son, when he was old enough to succeed James, the brother of the Lord, on his death, to the Presidency of the Church. In all probability Simeon was a son of Jesus and Martha, and was that child who appeared at the crucifixion. (M. Zvi Udley, Ph.D.)

Other ancient manuscripts may have been found which would contribute additional evidence concerning the marriage and family of Jesus. However, our present attitudes forbid validity and disclosure of such evidence because they tear asunder all of our home-spun traditional teachings. Historical sources may yet some day bring further light and information on this subject.

From an ecclesiastical point of view we know that Jesus came to honor, teach and obey the laws of the priesthood. And when Jesus became "an high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. 6:20), He obeyed every law and ordinance pertaining to that order and priesthood. Not only did He sustain those laws, but He became the perfect example for others to follow in like manner. One of the primary laws of this priesthood order was for the priests to bear children. It was essential for men who bore the priesthood to have a continuation of seed by bearing children under that covenant. A high priest who had no children was considered accursed, while those who had a numerous posterity were called blessed.

The children who were born under the covenant of the priesthood were blessed with a fatherly or patriarchal blessing. Prophecies were uttered upon their heads for their future and the future of their posterity, for many generations. Isaiah prophesied concerning the posterity of Jesse (father of David) and that from his loins should come someone known as the "stem"; another as the "rod" and one as the "branch". The identity of these persons was sought for by the Prophet Joseph Smith who inquired of the Lord. The disclosure concerning the "stem" was made known in the following revelation:

"Who is the Stem of Jesse spoken of in the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th verses of the 11th chapter of Isaiah?" "Verily thus saith the Lord; it is Christ." (D. & C. 113:1-2)

Since Christ was identified as the "Stem", it is interesting to note that the "Stem" was to have posterity; according to Isaiah--

. . . there shall come forth a **Rod out of the Stem of Jesse** and a Branch shall grow out of his roots. (Isa. 11:1)

This is evidence that the "Stem" or the Christ would have children because these great servants known as the "Rod" and the "Branch" were to come forth through His lineage!

The "Rod" has been identified as the Prophet Joseph Smith. Prophecy designates the "Rod" as one who would hold "the keys of the kingdom, for an ensign, and for the gathering of my people in the last days." (D. & C. 113:6) And Isaiah said that he should be the means of establishing an "ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek." (Isa. 11:10)

Since Joseph Smith did hold the keys of the kingdom in the last days, (D. & C. 64:5, 65:2, 115:19) and was the "Rod" from the loins of the Stem of Jesse, he would have the blood of Abraham, Jesse, and the Savior, according to the testimony of scripture and revelation. It would be evident that Joseph Smith should also know these facts. The Prophet did understand them--and more--but he was reluctant to tell them because of the traditions and ideologies of modern Christianity. Once he hinted:

*Would to God, brethren, I could tell you who I am! Would to God I could tell you what I know! But you would **call it blasphemy**, and want to take my life! (Joseph Smith, **Life of Heber C. Kimball**, p. 333)*

But the royal blood lineage of the prophets and the Savior was not confined to the few select individuals described by Isaiah. Other notable leaders, such as those chosen to assist in the restoration of the Gospel in these last days, were also instilled with the blood and the spirit of their Lord, and these valiant souls were commissioned to establish this "ensign" for the work of the "gathering of my people in the last days."

Among the notable and valiant leaders of this last dispensation was President Heber C. Kimball. Here was a noble man, a prophet, and a true apostle of Jesus Christ who possessed all of the powers and gifts of the ancient apostles. The story of his life, his character, and his labors was patterned after the similitude of the Savior. The spiritual gifts and endowments which God had blessed him with became so abundantly manifest that thousands flocked to hear and see this latter-day prophet. On one occasion in England, crowds of people greeted him with flowers, songs, and offerings of kindness. The Apostle Orson F. Whitney commented on this occasion by making a parallel in the life of the Savior:

A rare scene, indeed, and a suggestive one, for the parallel of which the mind must leap backward nigh two thousand years:

"On the next day much people that were come to the feast, when they heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem, took branches of palm trees, and went forth to meet Him, and cried, Hosanna; Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.

"The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold, the world is gone after him."

So was it with this servant of Christ, this brother of Jesus in the British Isles. The hireling, the pharisees of Christendom, prevailed nothing. The "word went after him" whole villages at a sweep, singing praises, and shouting in tones of rapture; "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

*There was divine harmony in all this. In Heber, his character, manner and methods--we say it reverently--**there was much of the Christ**; the might of the lion, with the meekness of the lamb. **His, also, was the Savior's lineage**; in his heart a kindred spirit, **in his veins the self-same blood**. Where causes are similar, should there not spring similar results? (**Life of Heber C. Kimball**, p. 185)*

Heber C. Kimball understood the paternal nature of this ancient blood royalty. At a conference in 1857 he was impressed to publically reveal information concerning this sacred lineage and perhaps he knew the time had arrived when these things should be made known for the light and understanding of the Saints. If they could comprehend and treasure this information it would inspire them to live a more Sainly life.

Are you ever going to be prepared to see God, Jesus Christ, His angels, or comprehend His servants, unless you take a faithful and prayerful course? Did you actually know Joseph Smith? No. Do you know Brother Brigham? No. Do you know Brother Heber? No, you do not. Do you know

*the Twelve? You do not; if you did, you would begin to know God, and learn that those men who are chosen to direct and counsel you **are near kindred to God and Jesus Christ**, for the keys, power, and authority of the kingdom of God **are in that lineage**. (Heber C. Kimball, J.D. 4:248)*

The Prophet Joseph Smith had previously and privately revealed some of these things to a few select individuals. It was in the early 1840's that Joseph made a similar disclosure.

While visiting with Zina, she related a conversation that occurred between her and a Sister Repshire upon events in Nauvoo, where the Prophet Joseph Smith sealed her, Sister Repshire, to a Judge Adams of Springfield, Illinois.

*The Prophet stated to her (Repshire) that **Judge Adams was a literal descendant of Jesus Christ**. The judge died in Nauvoo and Sister Repshire, his wife, who had been married before to Repshire, died at Hill Creek, Utah. (Oliver B. Huntington Journal, p. 259)*

In a solemn assembly held in the Salt Lake Temple, July 2, 1899, more information pertaining to the descendants of Christ was divulged. The Apostle George Q. Cannon made the disclosure after which the President of the Church, Lorenzo Snow, confirmed his statement:

*President George Q. Cannon also spoke on the law of tithing. Among the other things, he said, "There are those in this audience who are descendants of the old Twelve Apostles--and shall I say it, yes, **descendants of the Savior Himself. His seed is represented in this body of men.***

Following Pres. Cannon, President Snow arose and said that what Bro. Cannon had stated respecting the literal descendants among this company of the old apostles and the Savior himself is true--the Savior's seed is represented in this body of men. (Journal of Pres. Rudger Clawson, pp. 374-375)

But Kimball, Young, Adams and other apostles were not the only exceptions in possessing the literal blood of Christ. Other members of the Church and congregation were also descendants of this grand royalty.

There are men in this congregation who are descendants of the ancient Twelve Apostles and shall I say it, of the Son of God Himself, for He had seed, and in the right time they shall be known. (Anthony W. Ivins Journal, p. 21)

What became of the descendants and the children of Jesus? Would they not, as Abraham's seed be a blessing to all the nations of the earth? According to prophecy, the choicest seed of the earth will be gathered in the last days to prepare for the second coming of the Savior.

The Apostle Orson Hyde comments on this blood lineage:

We say it was Jesus Christ who was married, to be brought into the relation whereby he could see his seed, before He was crucified. "Has he indeed passed by the nature of angels, and taken upon himself the seed of Abraham, to die without leaving a seed to bear his name on the earth?" No. But when the secret is fully out, the seed of the blessed shall be gathered in, in the last days; and he who has not the blood of Abraham flowing in his veins, who has not one particle of the Savior's in him, I am afraid is a stereotyped Gentile, who will be left out and not be gathered in the last days; for I tell you it is the chosen of God, the seed of the blessed, that shall be gathered. I do not despise to be called a son of Abraham, if he had a dozen wives; or to be called a brother, a son, a child of the Savior, if he had Mary, and Martha, and several others, as wives; and though he did cast seven devils out of one of them, it is all the same to me.

Well, then, he shall see his seed, and who shall declare his generation, for he was cut off from the earth? I shall say here, that before the Savior died, he looked upon his own natural children, as we look upon ours; he saw his seed, and immediately afterwards he was cut off from the earth; but who shall declare his generation? They had no father to hold them in honorable remembrance; they passed into the shades of obscurity, never to be exposed to mortal eye as the seed of the blessed one. For no doubt had they been exposed to the eye of the world, those infants might have shared the same fate as the children in Jerusalem in the days of Herod, when all the children were ordered to be slain under such an age, with the hopes of slaying the infant Savior.

History is replete with circumstances of neck-or-nothing politicians dyeing their hands in the blood of those who stood in their way to the throne or to power.

That seed has had its influence upon the chosen of God in the last days. The same spirit

inspires them that inspires their father, who bled and died upon the cross after the manner of the flesh. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 2:82-83)

Two years later this learned Apostle again continued to expound on the blessings of this chosen seed:

Abraham was chosen of God for the purpose of raising up a chosen seed, and a peculiar people unto his name. Jesus Christ was sent into the world for a similar purpose, but upon a more extended scale. Christ was the seed of Abraham, so reckoned. To these, great promises were made; one of which was, that in Abraham, and his seed, which was Christ, all the families of the earth should be blessed. When? When the ungodly or those not of their seed should be cut off from the earth, and no family remaining on earth except their own seed. Then in Abraham and in Christ, all the families and kindreds of the earth will be blessed--Satan bound, and the millennium fully come. Then the meek will inherit the earth, and God's elect reign undisturbed, at least, for one thousand years.

Is there no way provided for those to come into this covenant relation who may not possess in their veins, any of the blood of Abraham or of Christ? Yes! By doing the works of Abraham and of Christ in the faith of Abraham and of Christ; not in unbelief and unrighteousness, like the wicked world who have damned themselves in their own corruption and unbelief. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 4:260)

What would today's ministers of Christianity say about Jesus if He came into our society traveling with a large group of women? What would they say if they saw Him eating and staying overnight in the home of a couple of young women? Our modern ministers think that Mary Magdalene was a prostitute and consider Christ's association with her in that relationship as more acceptable than if she were his wife. It takes a special bending of the mind to reach some of the conclusions of our counterfeit Christian ministry. It is certainly more respectful to Christ to consider his association with Mary as a wife rather than a prostitute; and scriptural evidence leans more toward that conclusion.

It is strange indeed to think that Jesus should be able to understand and obey, or "fulfill", every law and commandment of God, yet be exempt from obeying that law which commands man to multiply and replenish the earth.

Chapter 9

CONCLUSION

Neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man in the Lord. (I Cor. 11:11)

When Jesus was alive, general public opinion was in error about His divine mission. Today it is in error concerning His marital status. The concept of His celibacy was promoted by celibates and became popular through the mother church of Catholicism. Celibate priests believed that unmarried men were more righteous than those who were married.

But Jesus advocated the laws of Judaism, not the alien apostate doctrines that were influencing the early Christian church. The Apostle Paul warned the Church against these influences, but their ultimate victory over true Christian doctrines is evident.

To any reader of the Bible it is obvious that God's first law to man was to be fruitful and multiply, and the first marriage of record was solemnized by God Himself. Never has He, from that day to this, promoted or advocated the laws of celibacy nor barrenness for righteous men and women. Believing that Jesus was married, according to divine law, is logical and reasonable.

Propagation of species is a law of nature. It is a divine principle ordained for all living things. Can it be sanctioned in the lives of animals, plants, fowls and fish, and not for mankind? Yet it is considered by some to be too base, carnal and sinful for Christ and His disciples.

Perhaps our modern, immoral, and sinful world is too filled with wickedness to make a proper judgment. They may be too carnal-minded to understand anything virtuous. But then they have only the basis of an apostate form of Christianity upon which to make their judgment.

There is a divine law of marriage ordained and commanded by God, and Jesus came to fulfill that "law". He could not teach men to be fruitful and multiply, and then become celibate Himself. Could He reach one thing and live another? He was the Good Shepherd advocating all men to follow him, for He said, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill." His life, including obedience to the marriage covenant, was the only "perfect" example set for all mankind to follow.

If Protestant and Catholic ministers believe that Jesus was a celibate priest, then they, too, should follow that life style. If they think that celibacy is a law so honored by Christ, then they are hypocrites for being married; neither should they perform marriage ceremonies for others.

A great many important and solemn truths have been buried and forgotten throughout the centuries of the past. These truths would remain forever dead if we were to depend solely upon the philosophy of men to restore them. Man-handled teachings which pass through the generations of time seldom if ever bring forth any new disclosures. It is only through the revelations of God, or the discovery of ancient documents that such knowledge can be restored. For this reason new revelation has always aroused the wrath and resentment of the tradition-bound populace. That Jesus was married is just such an antagonizing doctrine.

At this doctrine the long-faced hypocrite and the sanctimonious bigot will probably cry, blasphemy! Horrid perversion of God's word! Wicked wretch! He is not fit to live! etc., etc. But the wise and reflecting will consider, read, and pray. If God be not our Father, grandfather, or great grandfather, or some kind of a father in reality, in deed and in truth, why are we taught to say, "Our Father who art in heaven?" How much soever of holy horror this doctrine may excite in persons not impregnated with the blood of Christ, and whose minds are consequently dark and benighted, it may excite still more when they are told that if none of the natural blood of Christ flows in their veins, they are not the chosen or elect of God. Object not, therefore, too strongly against the marriage of Christ, but remember that in the last days, secret and hidden things must come to light, and that your life also (which is in the blood) is hid with Christ in God. (Orson Hyde, J.D. 4:260)

Without the evidence of ancient papyrus, the conclusiveness of the scriptures, or the light of new revelation, reason alone should convince the mind that Jesus was married. Believing in a Christ who lived a life without the personal feelings of a father toward his children or a husband for his wife, is nearly unimaginable. It requires a perverted Christianity to believe in a god without body, parts, or passions, and it also requires a similar superstition to believe in a lonely, secluded, celibate Christ.

Jesus often prayed and taught about "Our Father in Heaven," which signified a family relationship. And, if there is a Father and children, it is positive evidence that there is a husband and wife! The family framework is the building element for adding glory to man and the Gods! A family union, just as the principle of love, can become an everlasting blessing to man.

The tender ties of the heart and the sacred ordinances of the gospel are meant to blend into a perpetual unity for all eternity. Why should a man's feelings of love for his family be subjected to the short duration of mortality? Who dares to imagine that a mother's love for her child, or a husband's love for his wife will instantly vanish at the grave? Is there the least possibility that these divine passions are meant to be cut asunder at death, leaving a family doomed separation and singleness forever? The very thought is repulsive!

When God created man, He made the decree that "it is not good that man should be alone" and so He created woman. "And God said, Let US make man in OUR image, after OUR LIKENESS," and "so God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him male and female created he them." The mold of man and woman was patterned after the image and likeness of the Gods!

Such a creation of man and woman had a divine purpose. It is the charm and loveliness of a wife that is among the purest and most heavenly influences to touch the heart of man. The delight and attractiveness of a good woman will motivate and inspire man to a love of all that is good. Every attribute and characteristic of man and woman was created for a continuation in eternity. Every qualification which will render them happy in mortality will be increased and perfected into a majesty,

glory, and excellence that will lead them to greater dominions, principalities and powers forever and ever.

Surely, if man was created to inherit such an honorable destiny, it is only logical to assume that Jesus will inherit as much. Both reason and evidence compel us to admit that Jesus was married!