

“DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?”

Discussion between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J.P. Newman, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

First Day.

At two o'clock yesterday afternoon Professor Pratt and Dr. Newman, with their friends and the umpires, met in the stand of the New Tabernacle; the two former gentlemen prepared for the discussion of the question “Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?” An audience of three or four thousand—at least half of which was of the gentler sex assembled to hear the discussion. At a few minutes past two, the audience was called to order by Judge C.M. Hawley, the umpire of Dr. Newman on the Negative, he (fortunately we presume) being absent from his district at this juncture—and Elder John Taylor offered the opening prayer. The same umpire, who somehow or other had got the idea that he was the master of ceremonies on the occasion and that he would relieve the umpire of the Affirmative side from all his duties, then introduced Professor Pratt to the audience, which, as the Professor was so well known and the umpire almost unknown, created a slight titter, which, however, speedily subsided, and the assemblage listened quietly to the

ARGUMENT OF PROFESSOR ORSON PRATT.

I appear before this audience to discuss a subject that is certainly important to us, and no doubt is interesting to the country at large, namely: the subject of plurality of wives, or, as the question is stated: “Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?” I would state, by way of apology to the audience, that I have been unaccustomed, nearly all my life, to debates. It is something new to me. I do not recollect of ever having held more than one or two debates, in the course of my life, on any subject. I think the last one was some thirty years ago, in the city of Edinburgh. But, I feel great pleasure this afternoon in appearing before this audience for the purpose of examining the question under discussion. I shall simply read what is stated in the Bible, and make such remarks as I may consider proper upon the occasion.

I will call your attention to a passage which will be found in Deuteronomy the 21st Chapter, from the 15th to the 17th verse:

“If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born be hers that was hated: Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born: But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.”

Here is a law, in the words of the Great Law-giver himself, the Lord who spake to Moses; and it certainly must be a sanction of a plurality of wives, for it is given to regulate inheritances in families of that description, as well as in families wherein the first wife may have been divorced, or may be dead; wives contemporary and wives that are successive. It refers to both classes; and inasmuch as plurality of wives is no where condemned in the law of God, we have a right to believe from this law that plurality of wives is just as legal and proper as that of the marriage of a single wife. This is the ground we are forced to take until we can find some law, some evidence, some testimony to the contrary. They are acknowledged as wives in this passage, at least—"If a man have two wives." It is well known that the house of Israel at that time practiced both monogamy and polygamy. They were not exclusively monogamists; neither were they exclusively polygamists. There were monogamic families existing in Israel in those days, and therefore in the Lord giving this He referred not only to successive wives where a man had married after the death of his first wife, or if the first wife had been divorced for some legal cause, but to wives who were contemporary, as there were many families in Israel, which can be proved if necessary, that were polygamists. I might here refer, to the existence of this [column break, page 1 column 2] principle concerning the rights of the first-born in monogamic and polygamic families prior to the date of this law. This seems to have been given to regulate a question that had a prior existence, I will refer, before I proceed from this passage, to the monogamic family of Isaac, wherein we have the declaration that Esau and Jacob, being twins, had a dispute, or at least an ill-feeling, on the part of Esau, because Jacob at a certain time had purchased the right of the first born—that is his birth-right. The first-born, though twins and perhaps a few moments intervening between the first and second, or only a short time, had rights, and those rights were respected and honored centuries before the days of Moses. This was a monogamic family, so far as we are informed; for if Isaac had more than one wife, the Bible does not inform us. We come to Jacob who was a polygamist, and whose first-born son pertained to the father and not to the mother. There were not four first-born sons to Jacob who were entitled to the rights of the first-born, but only one. The first-born to Jacob was Reuben, and he would have retained the birth-right had he not transgressed the law of heaven. Because of transgression he lost that privilege. It was taken from him and given to Joseph, or rather to the two sons of Joseph, as you will find recorded in the fifth chapter of 1st Chronicles. Here then the rights of the first-born were acknowledged, in both polygamic and monogamic families, before the law under consideration was given. The house of Israel was not only founded in polygamy; but the two wives of Jacob and the two hand maidens that were also called his wives, were the women with whom he begat the twelve sons from whom the twelve tribes of Israel sprang; and polygamy having existed and originated as it were with Israel or Jacob, in that nation, was continued among them from generation to generation down until the coming of Christ; and these laws therefore were intended to regulate an institution already in existence. If the law is limited to monogamic families only, it will devolve upon my learned opponent to bring forth evidence to establish this point.

We will next refer to a passage which will be found in Exodus 21st chapter, 10 verse: (I suppose there are some gentlemen keeping time.) It may be well to read the three preceding verses commencing with the 7th: "And if a man sell his daughter to be a

maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her into a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he hath betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish.” Also the following verse, the 11th. “And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.” I think from the nature of this passage that it certainly does have reference to two lawful wives. It may be that objection will be taken to the word “wife”—“another wife”—from the fact that it is in Italics, and was so placed by the translators of King James, according to the best judgment they could form, taking into consideration the text. I do not intend at present, to dwell at any great length upon this passage, merely declaring, that this does sanction plurality of wives, so far as my judgment and opinion is concerned, and so far as the literal reading of the scriptures exhibit, it does sanction the taking of another wife, while the first is still living. If this word “wife” could be translated “woman” that perhaps might alter the case, providing it can be proved that it should be so from the original, which may be referred to on this point, and it may not. We have the privilege, I believe, of taking the Bible according to King James’ translation or of referring to the original, providing we can find any original. But so far as the original is concerned, from which this was translated, it is not in existence. The last information we have of the original manuscripts from which this was translated, they were made in the form of kites and used for amusement, instead of being preserved. With regard to a great many other manuscripts, they may perhaps agree with the original of King James’ translation, or they may not. We have testimony and evidence in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana that the original manuscripts contain a vast number of readings, differing materially one from the other. We have this statement from some of [page 1 column 3] the best informed men, that in several instances it has been stated that there are 30,000 different readings of these old original manuscripts from which the Bible has been translated. Men might dispute over these readings all the day, of their lives and there would be a difference of opinion, there are so many of them. This, then, is another law, regulating, in my estimation, polygamy.

I will now refer to another law on the subject of polygamy, in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy—I do not recollect the verse, but I will soon find it—it commences at the 5th verse. “If brethren dwell together”—Now, it is well enough in reading this to refer to the margin, as we have the privilege of appealing to it, so you will find in the margin the words “next kinsman,” or “brethren.” “If brethren—or next kinsmen—dwell together—

“If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband’s brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband’s brother unto her.

“And it shall be, *that* the firstborn which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother *which is* dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

“And if the man like not to take his brother’s wife, then let his brother’s wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband’s brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband’s brother.

“Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and *if* he stand *to it*, and say, I like not to take her;

“Then shall his brother’s wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother’s house.

“And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed.”

It may be asked, What has this to do with polygamy? I answer that as the law is general, it is binding upon brethren and upon all near kinsmen dwelling together. Not unmarried brethren, or unmarried kinsmen, but the married and unmarried. The law is general. If it can be proved from the original, or from any source whatever, that the law is not general, then the point will have to be given up. But if that cannot be proven, then here is a law that not only sanctions polygamy, but *commands* it; and if we can find one law where a command is given, then plurality of wives would be established on a permanent footing, equal in legality to that of monogamy. This law of God absolutely does command all persons, whether married or unmarried, it makes no difference—brethren dwelling together, or near kinsmen dwelling together—which shows that it is not unmarried persons living in the same house that is meant, but persons living together in the same neighborhood, in the same country in Israel; as it is well known that Israel in ancient days did so dwell together; and the law was binding upon them. This was calculated to make a vast number of polygamists in Israel from that day until the coming of Christ. And the Christian religion must have admitted these polygamists into the Church, because they would have been condemned if they had not observed this law. There was a penalty attached to it, and they could not be justified and refuse to obey it. Hence there must have been hundreds, perhaps thousands, of polygamists in Israel, when Jesus came, who were living in obedience to this law and who would have been condemned if they had disobeyed it. When the gospel was preached to them, if they could not have been admitted into the Christian Church without divorcing their wives God would have been unjust to them, for if they, through their obedience to God’s law, should have been cut off from the gospel, would it not have been both inconsistent and unjust? But as there is no law either in the Old or New Testament against polygamy, and as we here find polygamy commanded, we must come to the conclusion that it is a legal form of marriage. We cannot come to any other conclusion; for it stands on a par with the monogamic form of marriage; consequently, wherever we find either righteous men or wicked men, whatever may be their practices in the course of their lives, it does not affect the legality of their marriage with one wife or with two wives.

We may refer you to Cain who had but one wife, so far as we are informed. He was a monogamist. He was also a very wicked man, having killed his own brother. We find he was driven out into the land of Nod. Of course, as the Lord had not created any females

[page 1 column 4] in the land of Nod, Cain must have taken his wife with him, and there was born a son to him in that land. Shall we condemn monogamy and say it was sinful because Cain was a murderer? No; that will never do. We can bring no argument of this kind to destroy monogamy, or the one wife system, and make it illegal. We come down to the days of Lamech. He was another murderer. He happened to be a polygamist; but he did not commit his murder in connection with polygamy, so far as the scriptures give any information. There is no connection between the law of polygamy and the murder he committed in slaying a young man. Does that, therefore, invalidate the marriage of two persons to Lamech? No; it stands on just as good ground as the case of Cain who was a monogamist and a murderer also.

Adam was a monogamist. But was there any law given to Adam to prevent him taking another wife? If there was such a law, it is not recorded in King James' translation. If there be such a law recorded, perhaps it is in some of the originals that differ so much from each other. It may be argued in the case of Adam that the Lord created but one woman to begin the peopling of this earth. If the Lord saw proper to create but one woman for that purpose, he had a perfect right to do so.

The idea that that has any bearing upon the posterity of Adam because the Lord did not create two women would be a very strange idea indeed. There are a great many historical facts recorded concerning the days of Adam that were not to be examples to his posterity. For instance, he was ordered to cultivate the garden of Eden—one garden. Was that any reason why his posterity should not cultivate two gardens? Would any one draw the conclusion that, because God gave a command to Adam to cultivate the garden of Eden, to dress it and keep it, that his posterity to the latest time should all have one garden each and no more? There is no expression of a law in these matters; they are simply historical facts. Again, God gave him clothing on a certain occasion, the Lord himself being the tailor,—clothing to cover the nakedness of Adam and of Eve his wife; and this clothing was made from the skins of beasts. This is a historical fact. Will any one say that all the posterity of Adam shall confine their practice in accordance with this historical fact? or that it was an expression of law from which they must not deviate? By no means. If the posterity of Adam see fit to manufacture clothing out of wool, or flax, or cotton, or any other material whatever, would any one argue in this day that they were acting in violation of the law of the Divine Creator, of a law expressed and commanded in the early ages? Why, no. We should think a man had lost all powers of reason who would argue this way. As our Delegate remarked in his speech, Adam had taken all the women in the world, or that were made for him. If there had been more, he might have taken them; there was nothing in the law to limit him. (The speaker here inquired concerning the time, and learned he had twenty-seven minutes left.)

I would like to dwell upon this longer, but I have many other passages to which I wish to draw your attention. The next passage to which I will refer you will be found in Numbers, 31st chapter, 17th and 18th verses. This chapter gives us a history of the proceedings of this mixed race of polygamists and monogamists called Israel, at a certain time. They went out to battle against the nation of Midianites; and having smote the men, they took all the women captives, as you will find in the 9th verse. Commencing at the 15th verse:

“And Moses said unto them have ye saved all the women alive?” “Behold these caused the children of Israel, through the council of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord.”

You will recollect the case of some Midianitish women being brought into the camp of Israel contrary to the law of God, not being wives; and Israel with them sinned and transgressed the law of heaven, and the Lord sent an awful plague into their midst for this transgression. Now, here was a large number of women saved, and Moses finding they were brought into camp, said these had caused the children of Israel to sin; and he gave command: “Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves? How many were there of this great company that they were to keep alive for themselves? There was something very strange in this. If they had caused Israel to sin why spare them? or why keep them alive for themselves? That they might have them lawfully. Some may say, to have them as servants, not as wives. Some might have been kept as servants and not as wives, but would there not have been great danger of Israel sinning again with so many thousand servants, as they were the same women who had brought the plague into the camp of Israel before? How many were there of these women? Thirty-two thousand, as you will find in another verse of the same chapter. And these were divided up as you will also find, in the latter part of the same chapter, among the children of Israel. Those who stayed at home from the war took a certain portion—sixteen thousand in number; those who went to the war, including the Levites, took the remaining sixteen thousand.

Now to show that polygamy was practised among the children of Israel in taking captive women, let me refer you to another passage of scripture, in Deuteronomy, 21st Chapter, commencing at the 10th verse:

“When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive,

“And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife;

“Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;

“And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

“And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.”

Now this law was given to a nation, as I have already shown, which practiced polygamy as well as monogamy; and consequently if a polygamist saw a woman, a beautiful woman among the captives: or if a monogamist saw a beautiful woman among the captives; or if an unmarried man saw a beautiful woman among the captives, the law being general, they had an equal right to take them as wives. This will explain the reason why the Lord told Israel to save thirty-two thousand Midianitish women alive for themselves. It will be recollected that the Israelites had a surplus of women. I have no need to refer to the destruction of the males that had been going on for a long period of time—about eighty years until Moses went to deliver Israel from Egypt. During this time females were spared alive, making a surplus of them in the midst of Israel; but the Lord saw there was not enough, and He made provision for more by commanding them to spare these captive women and keep them alive for themselves. If my opponent who will follow me, can bring forth any evidence from the law of God, or from the passage under consideration, to prove that this law was limited to unmarried men, all right; we will yield the point, if there can be evidence brought forward to that effect. “When you go forth to war if you see a beautiful woman” – not you unmarried men alone, but all that go forth to war.

The next passage to which I will refer you, where God absolutely commands polygamy, will be found in Exodus 22d chapter, 16th and 17th verses.

“And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

“If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.”

There is the law of Exodus; now let us turn to the law of Deuteronomy, 22nd chapter, 28th and 29th verses, on the same subject:

“If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

“Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel’s father fifty *shekels* of silver, and she shall be his wife: because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.”

Does this mean an unmarried man? The law was given to a nation wherein both forms of marriage were recognized, and wherein single men existed. If it does mean single men alone, we would like to hear the proof. The law is general. Whether married or unmarried, whether a monogamist or a polygamist, if he committed this crime, if he found a maid and committed the crime there [page 7, column 2] specified, of seduction, there is the law; he shall marry her, and shall not only marry her, but shall pay a fine of fifty shekels of silver to the father. This was the penalty; not that they were justified in the act. It mattered not whether he was a polygamist, a monogamist, or an unmarried man, he must comply with the law as a penalty. That was another command establishing

and sanctioning polygamy, sanctioning it by Divine command. If this law could have been put in force in modern times, among modern Christian nations, what a vast amount of evil would have been avoided in the earth. It is proverbial that among all the nations of modern Europe, as well as in our own great nation—Christian nations—there is a vast amount of prostitution, houses of ill-fame, and prostitutes of various forms; now, if this law, which God gave to Israel, had been re-enacted by the lawmakers and legislatures and parliaments of these various nations, what would have been the consequence? In a very short time there would not have been a house of ill-fame in existence. Their inmates would have all been married off to their seducers, or, their patrons; for who does not know that females would far rather be married than prostitute themselves as they do at the present time? And they would lay in wait to entrap this man and that man and the other man, to get out of these brothels, and as the law is general, if the same law had existed in our day, it would soon have broken up houses of ill-fame. There might have been some secret evils; but it would have broken up the “social evil.” And here let me say—if I have time—(“eleven minutes more.”) Perhaps I may avail myself of the privilege hereafter in discussing these points, and pass on to some other passages.

The next passage which to I will refer you is in 2d Chronicles, 24th chapter, 2d, 3d, 15th and 16th verses:

“And Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest. And Jehoiada took for him two wives, and he began sons and daughters.”

According to the ideas of monogamists Jehoiada must have been a very wicked man, and Joash a “beastly polygamist” for taking two wives. We will take the man who received the wives first. Joash, who received the wives from the highest authority God had on the earth did “right in the sight of the Lord, all the days of Jehoiada the priest.” What! Did he do right when Jehoiada took two wives for him and gave them to him? Yes; so says the word of God, the Bible, and you now the question is “Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?” But what a dreadful priest that man must have been, according to the arguments of monogamists! Let us see what kind of a character he appears. In this same chapter, the 28th verse, if I recollect aright; (looking). No; in the 15th and 16th verses:

“But Jehoiada waxed old, and was full of days when he died; a hundred and thirty years old was he when he died, And they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both toward God, and toward his house.”

“Because he had done good in Israel, both toward God and towards His house,” they buried him among the kings; honored him in that manner; and the reason why they did bestow this great honor upon him was because he had done good. In the first place, he had given two wives of Joash, which was a very good act, for he was the highest authority God had upon the earth at that time; and God sanctioned polygamy by lengthening out the age of this man to 180 years, a very long age in those days.

But I shall have to hasten on, although there are many passages which I have not time to quote. The next will be found in Hosea, 1st chap., 2nd and 3rd verses. “The beginning of

the word of the Lord of Hosea.” This was the introduction of Hosea as a prophet. No doubt he brought the evidence as a prophet; and in the beginning of the word of God through Hosea, to the world, he must have come with great proof. The first thing the Lord said to him, was “Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms.” In the third verse it says: “So he went and took Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim.” If such a thing had occurred in our day; if a man had come forth, professing to be a prophet, and the first thing he said as a prophet was that the Lord had revealed to him that he was to go and take a wife of such a character, what would be thought of him? yet he was a true prophet. Was this the only wife God commanded Hosea to take? No. The Lord said “Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress” – See Chapter 3rd. What, love a woman, an adulteress, when he already had a wife of very bad character! Take wives of such disgraceful reputation! Yet God commanded this, and He must be obeyed. This did not justify any other prophet in doing so. Jeremiah would not have been justified in doing the same. But this was a command of God, given to Hosea alone. It was not given as a pattern for any other man to follow after, or for the people of this generation to observe. Yet it was given in this instance. But inquires one, does not the Lord require such characters to be put to death? Yes; but in this instance, it seems, the Lord deviated from this law; for He commanded a holy prophet to go and marry two women. This recalls to my mind the law given to Israel, recorded in Deuteronomy, where the Lord commanded the law of consanguinity to be broken. You will recollect that in two different chapters the Lord pointed out who should not marry within certain degrees of consanguinity; yet in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy He commanded brethren, who dwell together and near kinsmen to break that law, which was a justification in part to not regard the law of consanguinity. God has the right to alter His commands as He pleases. Go back to the days of Noah, and the command was given: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed;” yet the same God commanded Abraham, that good man who is up yonder in the kingdom of God, according to the New Testament, to take his son Isaac and slay him and offer him up as a burnt offering. Here is one command in opposition to another. Consequently, God does sometimes give a command in opposition to another; but they are not examples for you or I to follow. Supposing I should prove by ten thousand examples from the Bible that polygamy was practiced in ancient Israel, is that a reason why you and I should practice it? No; we must have a command for ourselves. God sometimes repeats a command. The Latter-day Saints in this Territory practice polygamy; not because God commanded it in ancient times; not because Moses gave laws to regulate it; not because it was practiced by good men of ancient times—

(At this point the umpires said the time was up.)

Judge C. M. Hawley then introduced Dr. J. P. Newman, who proceeded to deliver the following.

ARGUMENT.

HONORABLE UMPIRES AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The question for our consideration is “Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?” It is of the utmost importance that we proceed to the discussion of this question and the unfolding of its elements at once; and therefore, that we lose no time, we propose to analyze the question. I had desired nine hours to speak on this great subject; but by mutual consent the time has been reduced to three. In view of this fact I, therefore, proceed at once to the consideration of the elements of the question “Does the Bible sanction polygamy?” Every word is emphatic. Does the Bible—the Bible,—God’s word, whether in the original text or in the translation which is accepted by christendom, as the revealed will of God; this old book which has come down from the hoary past, this old book written by different men, under different circumstances, yet for one great and grand object; this book that comes to us under the authority of plenary inspiration, no matter what has become of the manuscripts, whether lost in the flood or consumed in the flame that burned the doomed Persepolis, no matter what has been their destiny, we have the original, the Hebrew, the Septuagint and the Greek translations; in the New Testament the Greek, which have been and are accepted by the most eminent Biblical scholars; therefore the point the gentleman makes that so many manuscripts are lost, is a bagatelle. I threw it away, as useless as a rush. Would he have me infer that because some manuscripts are lost, that therefore that book is not the authentic word of God and the revealed will of High Heaven? No; for him to assume that is to assume that that book is not God’s will. Supposing that the original revelation, the pretended revelation, that you, here, were to practice polygamy, was consumed in the flames by the wife of Joseph Smith, does that invalidate the preserved copy which Mr. Joseph Smith had in his bosom? certainly not. I hold therefore that that old book comes to us with authority; and that whatever has be- [page 7, column 4] come of the manuscripts which have been furnished, formed, arranged and handed down to us, that is our standard. [At this point a gentleman requested Dr. Newman to talk square to the audience, and not turn from side to side, as some of his remarks were inaudible when so doing.]

I am here to speak to the people, and I will be an organ to you in the name of the Lord.

But let us look at this Book. It is a book of history, and of biography, of prophecy and precepts; of promises and of miracles; of laws and precepts, of promises and threatenings; of poetry and of narrative. It is to be judged by the ordinary rules of grammar, of rhetoric and of logic. It is written in human language. There is a language spoken by the persons in the godhead, and had God revealed Himself in that language we could not have understood the terms. There is a language spoken by the angels that blaze before the throne; had God spoken to us in angelic language we could not have understood the terms. But he took human language, with all its poverty and imperfections, and with all its excellencies. He has spoken to us in terms by which we can understand his pleasure concerning us. But it is a great fact, my friends, that all that is written in the Bible is neither approved by the Almighty, nor was it written for our imitation. Achan stole a Babylonish garment and a wedge of gold. God did not approve the theft, nor are those acts recorded in the Bible for our imitation. We are to read Bible history as we read Xenophon, Tacitus, and Herodotus, and, in modern times, Hume, Gibbon and Bancroft, with this distinction:—when we take down Herodotus, Tacitus, or others I have not mentioned, we are not always sure that what we read is true, but we are sure that what is

recorded in the Bible is true, whether it be prophetic truth, mandatory truth or historic truth. We should therefore make a distinction, according to the kind of composition we are reading. If we are reading history, read it as history, and make a distinction between what is simply recorded as part and parcel of the record of a great nation, or part and parcel of the record or biography of some eminent man, and that which is recorded there for our imitation, for which we shall have to give an account at God's bar. So take the poetry of the Bible. Scriptural poetry is subject to the same rules as the poetry in Homer, Virgil, Milton or Young, with this exception,—that the poetry of the Bible is used to convey a grand thought; and there is no redundancy of thought or imagery in Bible poetry.

We come to biography, and to my mind it is a sublime fact, and one for which I thank God, that the inspired writers were impartial in the recording biographical history. They recorded the virtues and the vices of men; they did not disguise the faults even of their eminent friends, nor did they always stop to pronounce condemnation upon such; but they recorded one and the other, just as they came along the stream of time. It is this book therefore, that is my standard in this discussion, and it is composed of the Old and New Testament. The New Testament holds the relation to the Old testament, of a commentary, in a prominent sense. Christ comes along and gives an exposition of the law of Moses; comes and gives an exposition of some of those grand principles which underlie Christianity; and then his references to the law of Moses simply prove this,—that what Moses had said is true. Take his exposition of the Ten Commandments, as they were given amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, and you find that he has written a commentary on the Decalogue, bringing out its hidden meaning, showing to us that the man is an adulterer who not only marries more women than one, but who looks on a woman with salacious lust. Such is the commentary on the law, by the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now does this book, the Old testament and the New? Not what revelation has been made to the Latter-day Saints; that is not to be brought into this controversy; that is not the question in dispute. Whether Joseph Smith or any other member of the Church of Latter-day Saints has had a revelation from God; whether the holy canon was closed by the apocalyptic revelations to John on the Isle of Patmos,—even that question is not to be dragged into this controversy. Neither the Mormon Bible, nor the Book of Covenants, nor the revelations of yesterday or to-day, or any other day; but the grand question is does that old book,—read in Old England, read in Wales, read in Ireland, read in Norway and [page 9, column 1] Sweden, and read in this land of liberty,—does that book sanction polygamy?

We now come to another important word,—namely does the Bible sanction? *Sanction!* By the term sanction we mean command, consequently the authority of positive, written, divine law, or whatever maybe reasonably held as equivalent to such law. It follows, therefore, that toleration is not sanction. Sufferance is not sanction. Municipal legislation is not sanction. An historical statement of prevailing customs is not sanction. A faithful narrative of the life and example of eminent men is not sanction. The remission of penalty is not sanction. A providential blessing, bestowed upon general principles for an ulterior purpose, is not sanction. The only adequate idea of sanction is the divine and

positive approbation, plainly expressed, either in definite statue or by such forms of conformation as constitute a full and clear equivalent. It is in this sense that we take the term sanction in the question before us.

The next word in the question is “Does the bible sanction polygamy?” by which we mean, as it [the Bible] now stands. Not as it once was, but as it now is; that is, the Bible taken as a whole. The question is not, Did the Bible formerly sanction polygamy? but rather, Does it, at the present day, authorize and establish and approve it? Just as we may say of the Constitution of the United States, not, Did it sanction slavery? But, Does it now sanction it? For it is a well known principle of jurisprudence that if anything have been repealed in the supreme law of the land, which that law once authorized, then it no longer sanctions the matter in question. It is so here, precisely; for let us suppose for a moment that it could be proved that the Bible once sanctioned polygamy, in the sense accepted, and that this sanction has never been withdrawn, then we are bound to admit that the affirmative has been sustained; but supposing, on the other hand, that the Bible, as it is now, to-day, does not sanction polygamy, then we have sustained the negative of the question.

There is another word, and one of importance, and that is the term polygamy. There are three words in this connection which should be referred to, the first is polygamy, which is from the [remainder of column cut off] [page 9, column 2] –phere, God said “It is not good that man should be alone: I will make for him a helpmeet.” The animals had passed in review before Adam; but neither among the doves that plumed their pinions in the air of Paradise; nor amid the fish of the deep or the beasts of the field, nor the reptiles of the earth could a companion be found for man. But a special exertion of divine power had to be put forth that this companion should be made. And how was she made? A deep sleep is caused to come upon the first man. There lies Adam upon the ambrosial floor of Paradise, and out of his side a rib is taken, and out of that rib woman was created. And when somebody asked old Martin Luther “why did not God Almighty make the woman out of some other bone of a man than out of the rib?” the answer was: “He did not make woman out of man’s head, lest she should rule over him; He did not make her out of the bone of man’s foot, lest he should trample upon her; but He made her out of his side, that she might be near his heart; from under his arm, that he might protect her.” The grand primary object of marriage, therefore, is companionship—the union of two loving hearts.

The next design is procreation. It has pleased the Almighty God to people the earth by the offspring coming from those united in marriage. This was His wisdom; this was His plan. It is an old saying that history repeats itself; and after the flood had swept away the antediluvians, and after that terrible storm had subsided, there in the ark, was Noah and his sons and their wives—four men and four women. If Almighty God sanctioned polygamy in the beginning, and intended to sanction it afterwards, why did not He save in the ark a dozen wives for Noah and a dozen for each of his sons? But one wife for Noah, and one wife for each of his sons; and thus the Almighty repeats history. The next design is prevention—namely to prevent the indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes. God loves chastity in man and in woman, and therefore he established marriage. It is a divine institution, lifting man above the brutes. He would not have man as the male

of the brute creation—mingling indiscriminately with the females; but He establishes an institution holy as the angels—bearing upon its brow the signet of his approval and sanctioned by the good [remainder of column cut off]

[page 9, column 3]

Extended the arm of the law to protect marriage. Then recall the affinities of the sexes: the natural desire of man for woman, and the natural desire of woman for man. There may be some exceptions. Now and then we find an old bachelor in the world; but a man without a wife is only half a man. Now and then we find a woman in the world who is styled an “old maid;” but a woman without a husband is only half a humanity. Adam, in the beginning, was a perfect humanity, possessing the strength, dignity and courage of man, with the grace, gentleness and beauty of woman. After eve’s creation he retained the strength, dignity and courage; but lost, with Eve, the grace, beauty and gentleness; so that it now takes the union of one man, with the sterner qualities, with one woman, with the gentler graces, to produce one perfect humanity, and that is the type of marriage, as instituted by Almighty God, and as is approved by His divine law.

And, now, I desire to run the parallel between the two systems, showing how the one is destructive of the other. Take, for instance, the element, namely the design, and see how polygamy strikes at the institution of marriage in that regard. I now refer to companionship, the union of two loving hearts to the exclusion of a third. A man may love three or more friends; he may love three or more children; he may love three or more brothers or sisters; but God has so ordained the law of affinities between the man and the woman that companionship can only be secured to the exclusion of a third person. Ah! what a pleasure it is for a man when away from home to know, “I shall soon return to the bosom of my wife, and my little children will climb upon my knee and lisp the child’s welcome at my return.” And he hastens from afar to the embraces of that wife. And then what an almost infinity of joy it is on the part of the woman, whose husband is far away, to know that he is coming. Says she “I will stand in the doorway and will watch his returning footsteps. He is coming to me, to my embrace, to my home prepared for him!” And with what pride and care the busy housewife arranges for his return! How neat and beautiful everything is! The bouquet of flowers is on the table, the best viands are spread on the board, and everything in the house is prepared with the utmost care! But oh! what a gloom comes [remainder of column cut off]

[page 9, column 4]

To which that man has fallen who ruthlessly tears asunder these gentle tendrils of affection! What the ivy is to the oak, the woman is to the man; and is for the man, in his pride and glory, in his strength and energy, with his strong arm to protect her; and it is woman’s right to go to man for protection. But how is it possible under the system of polygamy for these rights to be preserved? It is true that the man retains his right and authority; this system augments and multiplies that authority. This system is one of usurpation, extending a right over the larger number that is not included in God’s law. But, on the other hand, where is the right of woman to protection? A whole soul for a

whole soul! A whole body for a whole body, and a whole life for a whole life! Just like the shells of the bivalve: they correspond with each other! Just like the two wings of a bird, male and female. So precisely this great idea of reciprocity, mutual affection and reciprocal love is developed in this idea of monogamous marriage. But polygamy, it seems to me, strikes down this right of woman; in other words, it divides the protecting power of man in proportion to the number of wives that he possesses; and it seems to me that in view of the distribution of worldly goods in this life a man can support and protect but one family. Kings, who can tax a whole people; Kings who can build palaces and rear pyramids; Kings who can marshal their armies on the banks of the Rhine and go to war, may have their harems—their plurality of wives; but the poor man, doomed to toil, with the sweat of labor on his brow, how is it possible for him to provide for more than one family? Yet if the king in his glory has the right to have a plurality of wives, so also has the poor man, who is doomed to toil, the same right; and God Almighty in making his law for a plurality of wives, if He has made it, which I, of course, question yet, if he has made it, then He has not made provision for the execution of that law; or, in other words, He has not made provision for its immunities to be enjoyed by the common people. It is a law exclusively for nabobs, for kings and high priests; for men in power, for men possessing wealth, and not for me, a poor man, or for you, [pointing to the audience] a poor laborer. God Almighty is just, and the king is no more before him than a peasant. The [remainder of column cut off]

[page 11, column 1]

Lamech will find that the murder which he committed grew out of his plurality of wives; in other words it grew out of the polygamy which he had attempted to introduce into the world. Said he to his wives, “I have slain a man;” and the inference is that this man had come to claim his rights.

My friend says that Cain was a murderer, and went down to the land of Nod but he don't exactly know the geography; but it was somewhere. And there he found a woman and married her. Now I affirm this, that when Cain killed his brother Abel he was not married, and he didn't go down to the land of Nod, then, therefore the murder he committed didn't grow out of monogamy, and seems to have had no relation to monogamy; but it grew out of this fact: these two brothers came before the Lord to present their offerings. Cain was a deist, a moralist as we may say, that is he had no sins to repent of. He therefore did not bring the little lamb as a sacrificial offering, but he came with the first fruits of the earth as a thank offering. He comes before God Almighty and says, “I have no sins to atone for, none at all; but here, I am conscious that thou hast created me and that I am dependent upon thee, therefore I present to thee the first fruits of the soil.” Abel comes with his thank offering. He brings his lamb and lays it upon the altar, and that lamb pre-intimated the coming of Jesus Christ, who is “the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;” and if there is any record that Abel brought a thank offering, it is a principle in theology and in scriptural exposition that the whole includes the part, just as Saint Paul says, “I beseech you, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice to God.” Do you think that he excluded the soul? No, he speaks of one as including the other. So the offering which Abel presented was an

offering sacrificial in its nature, pointing to Christ. Now, perhaps by sending down ire from heaven, or at all events in some significant manner, God recognized the righteousness of Abel, and expressed a preference for his offering, and Cain was wroth, and his pride belched forth and he slew his brother. The murder, therefore, had no reference, directly or indirectly to marriage, while the murder which the first polygamist mentioned in history committed grew out of the marriage relation.

Then my friend goes back to Adam, and says our first parents wore clothes made of skins, and therefore we must wear similar ones. Well, let us see. Our first parents were placed in a garden and were driven out of a garden, therefore we must be placed in a garden and driven out a garden. The first man was created out of the dust of the earth, therefore all subsequent men must be created out of the same material. The first woman was created out of man's rib, therefore all subsequent women must be made so. They would make very nice women, no doubt about that! Such is the logic of my friend! So you may follow on his absurdities. He has failed to make a distinction between what is essential to marriage and what is accidental to marriage; or in other words, he has failed to make a distinction between the creation and the fall of man, and between the institution and characteristics of marriage. One, therefore, is surprised at such arguments, and drawn from such premises!

Now, my friends, that first marriage in the garden of Eden is the great model for all subsequent marriages: one man and one woman. My friend says that God could have made more if he had chosen; but He did not do so; and it seems to me, if God Almighty had designed that all us men should be polygamists, and that polygamy should be the form of marriage, that in the very beginning He would have made a number of women for the first man. Ah! what a grand sanction that would be; but instead of that He makes one man and one woman, and says "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh."

This is not merely an historical fact; were it so I think the argument would be with my friend. But as I come along the stream of time I find this fact referred to as expressing a great law. I hear old Malachi repeating the same words, referring to this institution of marriage in the garden of Eden, reproving the Jews for their practice of polygamy, putting the pungent question to their conscience, "Why have ye dealt treacherously with the wife of your youth?"—Your first wife, the one with whom you went to the bridal altar and swore before high Heaven that you would forsake all others and cleave unto [page 11, column 2] her so long as you both live. "Ah!" that old prophet asks, "why have you dealt thus treacherously with the wife of your youth and the wife of your covenant?" God hates this putting away, says the prophet, and then he refers to Eden as a reason for his reproof. The reason is purely monogamous, and that in the beginning God created one woman for one man, and one man for one woman.

When the Pharisees propounded a question to the Lord Jesus Christ, touching divorce, He refers to the same grand idea spoken of by the Prophet Malachi: "Have ye not read that in the beginning God created them male and female?" Thus re-enacting, as it were, the marriage law; thus lifting marriage, which had been stained by polygamy, from its

degradation, and re-establishing it in its monogamic purity. And then St. Paul, corroborating the words of Jesus, [at this point the umpires said the time was up] refers to the marriage in Eden, and says “God created them, male and female, one flesh.” This is the great truth brought out in the Bible.

Second Day.

After the opening with religious exercise Prof. Pratt commenced:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We again come before you this afternoon, being the second session of our discussion to examine the question: “Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?” I will here remark, that yesterday afternoon I occupied one hour upon the subject, and brought forth numerous evidences from the Bible to show that polygamy was a divine institution sanctioned by the Bible, and sanctioned by the Almighty who gave the laws contained in the Bible. Here let me observe that it is of the utmost importance to clearly understand the point under discussion. I perceive that in the arguments that followed me yesterday the subject is dwelt upon somewhat lengthily with regard to the meaning of the term polygamy—that it included both a plurality of wives and a plurality of husbands. Hence a new term was introduced by the reverend Doctor, who followed me namely polygyny, if I recollect the term, having reference to the plurality of wives. This seems to be the question under discussion. Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy? and as the word polygamy appears to be discarded and scouted, it would be: Does the Bible Sanction Polygyny? Perhaps I may not have the term aright; that is Does the Bible sanction plurality of wives? It was said by the speaker who followed me, in relation to the plurality of wives—perhaps I had better refer to some of his remarks from print, lest my memory should not serve me on the occasion. The first remark to which I will call your attention is in regard to the original of the Bible. I admit in this discussion the Bible called King James’ translation as authority. I admit the Bible in the original Hebrew, if it can be found. Of course we have Hebrew Bibles at the present day. I hold one in my hand; that is, a Bible in the Hebrew language. But there is no such thing in existence as the original copies of the Bible; neither secondary copies; and copies that might come in as the hundredth copy, I presume cannot be found, as, for instance, of the original law of Moses, written on tables of stone. Such tables and such original have not been in existence to our knowledge for the last eighteen hundred years. We cannot refer to them; we cannot refer to any copies only those that have been multiplied in modern times—that is, comparatively modern times. And inasmuch as these copies disagree one with the other, so much so that it is said there are thirty thousand different readings in the various manuscripts and copies, who is to decide whether this Hebrew Bible, translated from one of a number of manuscripts, is translated from the original or not? Certainly it would not do for me as an individual to set up my judgement in the matter; nor for any other learned man to set up his judgement. I would far rather take the translation known as King James’, made by the able translators chosen in his day; men of great learning who had studied the original languages, the Hebrew and the Greek, and had become extensively acquainted with manuscripts in existence; I say I would far rather take their judgment than one that might be advanced by myself, or by

any other learned man, however deeply he might be versed in the Hebrew or Greek. I do not by these remarks disparage the Bible, or set it aside. By no means I accept it as proof as it was translated by those [page 11, column 3] men who were chosen for the purpose. And hundreds of thousands, I may say scores of millions of copies of this bible have been circulated among all nations in various languages. They have been sent forth by millions among the inhabitants of the earth for their information.

We will pass along after having decided upon the nature of the Bible that is to be admitted as evidence and proof in regard to polygamy. It was stated in the course of the remarks of the reverend gentleman in relation to polygamy, or polygyny, which ever term we feel disposed to choose, that marriage with more than one woman is considered adultery. I will read one or two of Mr. Newman's sentences: "Take his exposition"—that is the Savior's—"Take his exposition of the ten commandments as they were given amid the thunders of Mount Sinai, and you find he has written a commentary on the Decalogue, bringing out its hidden meaning, showing to us that the man is an adulterer who not only marries more women than one, but who looks on a woman with salacious lust. Such is the commentary on the law by the Lord Jesus Christ."

With part of this I agree most perfectly. If a man, according to the great commentary of our Savior, looks upon a woman with a lustful heart and lustful desire, he commits adultery in his heart, and is condemned as an adulterer. With the other part, I do most distinctly disagree. It is merely an assertion of the reverend gentleman. No proof was adduced from the New Testament Scriptures; no proof was advanced as the words of the great commentator, the Lord Jesus Christ, to establish that position that a man who marries more than one woman is an adulterer. If there is such a passage contained within the lids of the New Testament, it has not come under my observation. It remains to be proved, therefore.

We will now pass on to another item, that is the meaning of the word "sanction:" "Does the Bible sanction polygamy?" I am willing to admit the full force and meaning of the word sanction. I am willing to take it in all of its expositions as set forth in Webster's unabridged edition. I do not feel like shirking from this, nor from the definition given. Let it stand in all its force. The only adequate idea of sanction, says Mr. Newman, is a divine and positive approbation, plainly expressed; for stated so definitely and by such forms of expression as to make a full and clear equivalent. It is in this way that we take the term sanction in the question before us. Admit that it must be expressed in definite terms, these terms were laid before the congregation yesterday afternoon. From the Bible, King James' translation, passage after passage was brought forth to prove the divine sanction of polygamy; direct commands in several instances, wherein the Israelites were required to be polygamists; and in one instance, especially, where they were required under the heaviest curse of the Lord: "Cursed be he that continueth not in all things written in this book of the law; and let all the people say Amen," was the expression. I say, under this dreadful curse and the denunciations of the Almighty, the people were commanded to be polygamists. Did this give authority and sanction to practice that divine institution? It certainly is sanction, or I do not understand the meaning of the word as defined by Webster, and the meaning of the arguments presented by my opponent. I waited in vain

yesterday afternoon for any rebutting evidence and testimony against this divine sanction. I was ready with my pencil and paper to record anything like such evidence, any passage from the Bible to prove that it was not sanctioned. I heard a remarkable sermon, a wonderful flourish of oratory. It certainly was pleasing to my ears. It fell upon me like the dews of heaven, as it were, so far as oratorical power was concerned. But where was the rebutting testimony? What was the evidence brought forth? Forty-nine minutes of the time were occupied before it was even referred to; forty-nine minutes passed away in a flourish of oratory, without having the proofs in rebuttal and the evidence examined which I had adduced. Then eleven minutes were left. I did expect to hear something in those eleven minutes that would in some small degree rebut the numerous evidences brought forth to establish and sanction polygamy. But I waited in vain. To be sure, one passage, and only one that had been cited, in Deuteronomy, was merely referred to; and then without examining the passage and trying to show that it did not command polygamy, another item that was referred to by myself with regard to Lamech [page 11, column 4] and Cain was brought up. Instead of an examination of that passage, until the close of the eleven minutes, the subject of Abel's sacrifice and Cain's sacrifice, and Cain's going to the land of Nod and marrying a wife, and so on, occupied the time. All these things were examined, and those testimonies that were brought forth by me were untouched.

Now, then, we will proceed to the fourth, or rather to the fifth positions he took: that is the first great form of marriage established in the beginning—"one woman created for one man." However, before I dwell upon this subject, let me make a correction with regard to Cain and Lamech; then we will commence on this argument. I did not state yesterday afternoon, as it was represented by the speaker who followed me, that Cain went to the land of Nod and there married a wife, for there is no such thing in the Bible. I stated that Cain went to the land of Nod, after having murdered his brother Abel. I stated that we were not to suppose that God had created any woman in the land of Nod, and that Cain took his wife in the land of Nod. We are not to suppose this; but we are to suppose that he took his wife with him. He went to and arrived in the land of Nod, and begat a child. So says the Bible. But what has all this to do with regard to the form of marriage? Does it prove anything? No. The murder that Cain committed in slaying his brother Abel does not prove anything against the monogamic form of marriage, nor anything in favor of it. It stands as an isolated fact, showing that a wicked man may be a monogamist. How in regard to Lamech? Lamech, so far as recorded in the Bible, was the first polygamist; the first on record. There may have been thousands and tens of thousands who were not recorded. There were thousands and tens of thousands of monogamists, yet, I believe, we have only three cases recorded from the creation to the flood, a period of some sixteen hundred years or upwards. The silence of scripture, therefore, in regard to the number of polygamists in that day, is no evidence whatever.

But it has been asserted before this congregation that this first case recorded of a polygamist brought in connection with it a murder; and it has been indicated or inferred that the murder so committed was in defence of polygamy. This I deny; and I call upon the gentleman to bring forth one proof from that Bible, from the beginning to the end of it to prove that murder had anything to do in relation to the polygamic form of marriage of

Lamech. It is true he revealed his crime to his wives, but the cause of the crime is not stated in the book. What, then, had it to do with the divinity of the great institution established called polygamy? Nothing at all. It does not condemn polygamy nor justify it, any more than the murder by Cain does not condemn the other form of marriage nor justify it.

Having disposed of these two cases, let me come to the first monogamist, Adam. Let us examine his character, and the character of his wife. Lamech “slew a young man to his wounding, a young man to his hurt.” That was killing one, was it not? How many did Adam kill? All mankind; murdered the whole human race! How? by falling in the garden of Eden. Would mankind have died if it had not been for the sin of this monogamist? No. Paul says “that as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.” It was by the transgression of this first monogamist and his monogamic wife, that all mankind have to undergo the penalty of death. It was the cause; and I presume it will be acknowledged on the part even of monogamists that it was a great crime. What can be compared with it? Was Cain’s crime, or Lamech’s crime to be compared with the crime of bringing death and destruction, not only upon the people of the early ages, but upon the whole human race? But what has all that to do with regard to the divinity of marriage? Nothing at all. It does not prove one thing or the other. But when arguments of this kind are entered into by the opponents of polygamy, it is well enough to examine them and see if they will stand the test of scripture, and sound reason, of sound argument and sound judgement. Moreover, Adam was not only guilty of bringing death and destruction upon the whole human race, but he was the means of introducing fallen humanity into this world of ours. Why did Cain slay Abel? Because he was a descendant of that fallen being. He had come forth from the loins of the man who had brought death unto the world. When we look abroad and see [page 13, column 1] all the various crimes, as well as murder, that exist on the face of the globe; when we see mankind committing them; see all manner of degradation and lust; see the human family destroying one another, the question might arise, What has produced all these evils among men? They exist because a monogamic couple transgressed the law of heaven.

The learned gentleman referred us to a saying of that great man, Martin Luther, concerning the relationship that exists between husband and wife. It was a beautiful argument. I have no fault whatever to find with it. And it is just as applicable to polygamy as to monogamy. The answer of Martin Luther to the question put to him. Why God took the female from the side of man is just as appropriate, just as consistent with the plural form of marriage as it is with the other form. He did not take the woman from the head. Why? The argument was that the man should be the head, or as Paul says, “Man is the head of the woman,” and that is his position. I believe my learned opponent agrees with me perfectly in this, so there is no dispute upon this ground. Why did He not take the woman from the foot? Because man is not to tyrannize over his wife, nor tread her under foot. Why did he take her from his side? Because the rib lies nearest to the heart, showing the position of woman. Not only one woman, but two women, five women, ten women, forty women, fifty women, may all come under the protecting head. Jesus says; “No man can serve two masters, “ because he may love the one and hate the other, cleave

unto the one and hate the other, cleave unto the one and turn away from the other; but it is not so with women under the protecting head.

Now let us examine polyandry, for that was referred to yesterday; and the reverend gentleman could not see why, if a man has the privilege of taking more wives than one, a woman should not have the same privilege. If that is expressed in the Bible we have not found it; the other is expressed there, and we have proved it, and call upon the reverend gentleman to show the opposite. When we come to polyandry, or the woman having more husbands than one, there is no sanction for it in the Scriptures. What is the object of marriage? Companionship, we are told. I agree with the gentleman. Another object he says is procreation. I agree with the gentleman also in the second object. Another was prevention. Here I agree with him so far as the argument is carried out in a true light. Let us examine the second, namely procreation. The Lord instituted marriage—the sacred bond of marriage—for the purpose of multiplying the human species here on the earth. Does polyandry assist in the multiplying of the human species, the woman having four, or five, or ten, or fifty or sixty husbands? Does it tend to rapidly increase the race? I think monogamists as well as polygamists, when they reflect, will say that a woman having more than one husband would destroy her own fruitfulness. Even if she did have offspring, there would be another great difficulty in the way, the father would be unknown. Would it not be so? All knowledge of the father would be lost among the children. Is this the case with a plurality of wives? No, by no means. If a man have fifty wives the knowledge of the father is as distinct as the knowledge of the mother. It is not destroyed therefore. The great principle of parentage on the part of the husband, on the part of the father, is preserved. Therefore it is more consistent, more reasonable, first for procreation and secondly for obtaining a knowledge of parentage, that a man should have a plurality of wives than that a woman should have a plurality of husbands.

Again; a man with a plurality of wives is capable of raising up a very numerous household. You know what the Scriptures have said about children, “Children are the heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is His reward.” This being the case, a faithful, righteous, holy man, who takes, according to the great, divine institution of polyandry, a plurality of wives, is capable of multiplying his offspring ten or twenty-fold more than he could by one wife. Can one wife do this by polyandry? No. Here then is a great distinction between the male and the female. Look at that great and good and holy man, called Gideon in the Scriptures; a man to whom the angel of God was sent, and who, among all the hosts of Israel was chosen to go forth as the servant of the Most High. For what purpose? To deliver Israel from their enemies, the Midianites and others that had gathered against them. Was he a polygamist? Yes. He had many wives. He [page 13, column 2] had seventy-two sons. How many daughters he had I do not know. Could any woman in polyandry conceive or bring forth seventy-two sons and perhaps an equal number of daughters? I do not know but there might be some efficacy in that herb called “mandrake,” or in some other miraculous herb that would give power and strength for one woman to bring forth seventy-two sons. Who knows, in a day of wonders like this! But a man has the ability, a man has the power to beget large families and large households. Hence we read of many of the great and notable men who judged Israel, that one man had thirty sons—his name was Jair; you will find it recorded in the Judges of

Israel; another had thirty sons and thirty daughters; while another judge of Israel had forty sons. And when we come to Gideon we have named, he had seventy-two. Now, we have nothing to do with the righteousness, in this connection. That has nothing to do with the marriage institution. God has established it by Divine command. God has given it His own sanction, whether it be the polygamic or the monogamic form. If Gideon afterwards fell into idolatry, as the reverend gentleman may argue, that has nothing to do with the matter. He had the power to beget seventy-two sons, showing he had a superior power to that of the female.

Right here, I may say, God is a consistent Being; a Being, who is perfectly consistent, and who delights in the salvation of the human family. A wicked man may take unto himself a wife, and raise unto himself a posterity. He may set before that wife and her posterity a very wicked example. He may lead those children by his drunkenness, by his blasphemy, by his immoralities, down to destruction. A righteous man may take fifty wives, or ten, as you choose; and he will bring up his children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; he will instruct them in the great principles of righteousness and truth, and lead them along and bring them up by his example and by his teachings to inherit eternal life at the right hand of God, with those polygamists of ancient times, Abraham and Jacob of old, who are up yonder in the Kingdom of God. Which of the two is the Lord most pleased with? The man who has five, or ten, or twenty wives, bringing up his children, teaching them, instructing them, training them so that they may obtain eternal life with the righteous in the Kingdom of God; or the monogamist that brings up his children in the manner of wickedness, and finally leads them down to hell? Which would you prefer with your limited wisdom when compared with that of the great Creator? Who among you would not prefer to entrust your offspring with your friends instead of your enemies? Would not God, therefore, upon the same principle, do the same? Does God delight in the marriages that exist among the wicked? Go to the antediluvian race. They married and were given in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark. They were not righteous men nor righteous women; and their children were taught in the wicked precepts of their fathers, who committed all manner of wickedness until all flesh had corrupted itself before the Lord. Therefore the Lord had to destroy those evil workers of iniquity that had received wives, but did not honor nor regard the Lord. Instead of those marriages consummated before the flood, the marriages and intermarriages among the sons of God and the daughters of men, being acceptable to the Most High, He was obliged to destroy those that were married and their offspring from the face of the earth. How much better it would have been had they been righteous polygamists who would have brought forth a pure offspring that the Lord could have exalted to eternal life. Consequently, when we examine the subject of polygamy in regard to this matter, we must acknowledge from these scriptures, and from various other testimonies, that the marriages of the wicked are not approved by the Heavens. There are many passages of scripture to support me in what I have now said. The Lord in one place commands the destruction of a people, parents and children, "lest they should fill the world with cities," lest all the world should be filled with people who had married contrary to His law. No person can pretend that a marriage consummated between an unrighteous man and an unrighteousness woman, is a marriage in which God has joined the parties together. You might as well take the ordinance of baptism, and say that Simon

Magus, when he went forward and was bap-[page 13, column 3] tized had complied with the ordinances of Heaven, while he yet remained in a condition of hardened sinfulness; and that because he had passed through the outward observance of the ordinance it was acceptable in the sign of Heaven. God never had anything to do with the marriages of the wicked only to permit them, perhaps for a wise purpose, as He permitted Joseph to be sold into Egypt by his brethren. He permitted the deed for His own wise purposes, but He did not justify the instruments who did the deed. So He permits these unauthorized marriages between wicked men and wicked women, to perpetuate the human race, because they will not hearken to Him, until the time shall come when He can have a pure people who will obey His laws, educating their posterity to honor and serve Him. He permits, but He does not sanction such marriages.

If we should argue with the reverend gentleman that the census shows an equality of males and females, this argument that I have now advanced will rebut the idea thus sought to be established. The idea is that because there may be made to appear an equality in numbers, therefore, every man must be confined to one wife and every woman must have one husband. Is that the way God dispenses His gifts and blessings to the human family? Does He give the same amount of blessings to the wicked that He does to the righteous? In some respects He does. He send the rain from heaven upon the just and the unjust. But there are many great and important blessings that are bestowed more abundantly upon the righteous than upon the wicked. God has holy designs to accomplish when he makes a distinction between the righteous and the wicked in dispensing His blessings. Therefore if the wicked take wives without their being joined together by divine authority, those wives have allied themselves to their husbands without the Lord's sanction. Because the Lord permits this does not prove that He sanctions it; and He would prefer that a people should be like Israel of old, a nation of polygamists as well as monogamists, and the blessings be dispensed between them, rather than have this so-called perfect equality between the males and females and a wicked generation be the result. To prove this I will refer you to the 37th Psalm. God in that psalm has expressly said, and repeated again and again, that the seed of the evil-doers should be rooted out of the earth, that they should not inherit the earth, while the righteous should inherit it and should prosper. He bestows His blessings upon the one and His curses upon the other.

I shall expect this afternoon to hear some arguments to refute those passages brought forward to sustain polygamy as well as monogamy; and if the gentleman can find no proof to limit the passages brought forward to sustain polygamy as well as monogamy; and if the gentleman can find no proof to limit the passages I have quoted to monogamic households, if there is no such evidence contained in the passages, and there is nothing in the original Hebrew as it now exists to invalidate them, then polygamy as a divine institution stands as firm as the throne of the Almighty. And if he can find that this form of marriage is repealed in the New Testament; if he can find that God has in any age of the world done away with the principle and form of plural marriage, perhaps the argument will rest with the other side. I shall wait with great patience to have some arguments brought forth on this subject. We are happy, here in this Territory, to have the learned come among us to teach us. We have embraced the Bible as a rule of faith; and if we misunderstand it, if we are acting contrary to its precepts, how very happy we should

be to have the learned come from abroad—people who are acquainted with the original languages—to correct us and set us right. I think this is generous on the part of those gentlemen; much more so than it would be to enact laws and incarcerate in dungeons those who practice a form of marriage laid down in this book; to sent them for three, or four, or five years to prison, tearing them from their poor wives and children, while their families would suffer hardship and hunger, being robbed of their natural protectors. We thank Mr. Newman and those who have come with him with their hearts full of philanthropy to enlighten us here in this mountain Territory, and if possible convince us of our errors. How much time is left me? (“Seven minutes.”)

I have many arguments that I have not drawn upon, not only to reason upon, but testimonies as well in favor of polygamy; but I am informed that only seven minutes of the time is granted to me. I cannot, therefore, pretend on this occasion to enter into these ar- [page 13, column 4] guments and examine them with that justice that should be expected before the people. Mr. Newman has said he would like nine hours to bring forth his arguments and his reasonings for the benefit of the poor people of Utah. I wish he would not only take nine hours, but nine weeks and nine months, and be indeed a philanthropist and missionary in our midst; and try and reclaim this poor people from being the “awful beastly” people they are represented abroad. We are very fond of the Scriptures. We do not feel free to comply with a great many customs and characteristics of a great many of those who call themselves Christians. Much may be said upon this subject; much too, that ought to crimson the faces of those who call themselves civilized, when they reflect upon the enormities, the great social evils that exist in their midst. Look at the great city of New York, the great metropolis of commerce. That is a city where we might expect some of the most powerful and learned theologians to hold forth, teaching and inculcating principles and lessons of Christianity. What exists in the midst of that city? Females by the tens of thousands, females who are debauched by day and by night; females who are in open day parading the streets of that great city! Why, they are monogamists there? It is a portion of the civilization of New York to be very pious over polygamy; yet harlots and mistresses by the thousands and tens of thousands walk the streets by open day, as well as by night. There is sin enough committed there in one twenty-four hours to sink the city down like Sodom and Gomorrah.

We read that there was once a case of prostitution among the children of Benjamin in ancient days. Some men came and took another man’s wife, or concubine, which ever you please to call her; some men took her and abused her all night; and for that ones in they were called to account. They were called upon to deliver up the offenders but they would not do it, and they were viewed as confederates. And what was the result of that one little crime—not a little crime,—a great one; that one crime instead of thousands? The Lord God said to the rest of the tribes of Israel, Go forth and fight against the tribe of Benjamin. They fought against Benjamin; and the next day they were again commanded to go forth and fight against Benjamin. They obeyed; and the next day they were again so commanded; and they fought until they cut off the entire tribe except six hundred men. The destruction of nearly the whole tribe of Benjamin was the punishment for one act of prostitution.

Compare the strictness that existed in ancient Israel with the whoredoms, the prostitution and even the infanticide practiced in all the cities of this great nation; and then because a few individuals in this mountain Territory are practising Bible marriage a law must be threatened to inflict heavy penalties upon us; our families must be torn from us and be driven to misery, because of the piety of a civilization in which the enormities I have pointed at exist.

How much more time Gentlemen?

(“One minute.”)

I cannot say much in that time. To close this argument I now call upon the reverend gentleman, whom I highly respect for his learning, his eloquence and ability; to bring forth proof to rebut the passages laid down in yesterday’s argument in support of the position that the Bible sanctions polygamy. I ask him to prove that those laws were limited. If they were limited—

(Here the umpires announced the time was up.)

DR. NEWMAN Rose and Said:

MESSRS. UMPIRES AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I understand the gentleman to complain against me that I did not answer his Scriptural arguments adduced yesterday. If I did not the responsibility is upon him. He, being in the affirmative, should have analyzed and defined the question under debate; but he failed to do that. It therefore fell to me, not by right, but by his neglecting to do his duty; and I did it to the best of my ability. It was of the utmost importance that this audience, so attentive and so respectable, should have a clear and definite understanding of the terms of the question; and I desire now to inform the gentleman, that I had the answers before me to the passages which he adduced and, had I had another hour, I would have produced them then. I will do it today. Now my learned friend will take out his pencil, for he will have something to do this afternoon.

A passing remark,—a word in regard to the original manuscripts, written by Moses, or Joshua, or Samuel, or the prophets. You sit down to write a letter to a friend; you take it into your head to copy that letter; [page 15, column 1] you copy that letter; the original draft you care nothing about,—whether it is given to the winds or the flames. What care I about the two tables of stone on which the original law was written, so that I have a true copy of this law? A passing remark in regard to Mother Eve. I will defend the venerable woman! If the Fall came by the influence of one woman over one man, what would have happened to the world if Adam had had more wives than one? More, if one woman, under monogamy, brought woe into the world, then a monogamist, the blessed Virgin Mary, brought the the Redeemer into the world, so I think they are even!

My friend supposes that the Almighty might have created more women than one out of Adam’s ribs; but Adam had not ribs enough to create fifty women. My friend speaks

against polyandry, or the right of woman to have more husbands than one. He bases his argument upon the increase of progeny. Science affirms that where polygamy or polygyny, or a plurality of wives prevails, there is a tendency to a preponderance or predominance of one sex over the other, either male or female, which amounts to an extermination of the race.

I will reply, in due time, to the gentleman's remarks in regard to Gideon and other Scriptural characters, and especially in regard to prostitution, or what is known as the social evil. But first, what was the object of the gentleman yesterday? It was to discover a general law for the sanction of polygamy. Did he find that law? I deny it. What is law? Law is the expression of the legislative will; law is the manner in which an act is performed. It is the law of gravitation that all things tend to a common centre. It is the law in botany that the flowers open their fan-like leaves to the light, and close them beneath the kisses of night. What is the civil law? Simply defining how the citizen should act. What is the moral law? Simply defining the conduct of God's moral subjects. Laws are mandatory, prohibitory, and permissive: commanding what should be done; prohibiting what should not be done, and permitting what may be done. And yet, where has the gentleman produced this general law, which he spent an hour in searching for yesterday? And then remember, that this law must sanction polygamy! Perhaps it is not necessary to repeat our definition of the word "sanction." My learned friend, for whom I have respect, agrees with me as to the definition of that term, therefore we need not spend a solitary moment further touching these two points.

There is another vital point in reference to the nature of law. In legislating upon any subject there must be a great, organic central principle, mandatory or prohibitory in reference to that subject; and all other parts of the particular law as well as of the general code must be interpreted in harmony therewith.

Now I propose to produce a law this afternoon, simple, direct and positive, that polygamy is forbidden in God's holy word. In Leviticus xviii and 18 it is written, "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." There is a law in condemnation of polygamy. It may be said that what I have read is as it reads in the margin, but that in the body of the text it reads, "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." Very well, *argum ntum ad hominem*, I draw my argument from the speech of the gentleman yesterday. Mr. Pratt said, in his comments upon the text, "If brethren dwell together,"—"Now it is well enough in the reading of this to refer to the margin, as we have the liberty, I believe, to do so, and you will find that in the margin the word brother is translated "near kinsman." I accept his mode of reasoning: he refers to the margin, and I refer to the margin; it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; it is a poor rule that will not favor monogamy if it favor polygamy. Such then is the fact stated in this law.

Now it is necessary for us to consider the nature of this law; and to expound it to your understanding, it may be proper for me to say that this interpretation, as given in the margin, is sustained by the most eminent biblical and classical scholars in the history of

Christendom,—by Bishop Jewell, by the learned Cookson, by the eminent Dwight and other distinguished biblical scholars. It is an accepted canon of interpretation that the scope of the law must be considered in determining the sense of any portion of the law, and it is equally binding upon us to ascertain the mind of the legislator, from the preface of the law when such preface is given. The first few verses of the 18th chapter of Leviticus are prefatory. In the 3rd verse it is stated that “After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whether I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.”

Both the Egyptians and the Canaanites practiced incest, idolatry, sodomy, adultery, and polygamy. From verse 6 to verse 17, inclusive, the law of consanguinity is laid down, and the blood relationship defined. Then the limits within which persons were forbidden to marry, and in verse 18 the law against polygamy is given:—“neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister,” but as we have given it, “neither shalt thou take one wife to another,” etc.

According to Dr. Edwards, the words which are translated a “wife” or “sister,” are found in the Hebrew but eight times and in each passage they refer to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, tenons, mortises, etc., and signify the coupling together one *to another*, the same as thou shalt not take one wife *to another*.

Such then is the law. Such were the ordinances forbidden, which the Egyptians and the Canaanites practiced. Now we propose to push this argument a little further. If it is said that this passage does not prohibit a man marrying two sisters at the same time, then such a marriage is nowhere in the Bible pronounced incestuous. That is the objection of my friend. To which I reply that such a marriage is forbidden by sequence and analogy. As for example, where the son, in the 7th verse, is prohibited from marrying his mother, it follows that the daughter shall not marry her father; yet it is not so given and precisely stated. In verse 14 it is said “thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father’s brother;” so I infer that it would be equally criminal to uncover the nakedness of a mother’s brother, though it is not so stated. In verse 16 it is said “thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother’s wife,” so I infer that a man shall not uncover the nakedness of his wife’s sister, that is, if two brothers shall not take the same woman, then two women shall not take the same man, for between one man and two sister, and one woman and two brothers is the same degree of proximity, and therefore both are forbidden by the law of God. Furthermore, if for argument’s sake, we consider this means two literal sisters, then this prohibition is not a permission for a man to take two wives who are not sisters; for all sound jurists will agree that a prohibition is one thing and a permission is another thing. Nay, more, the Mormons do or do not receive the law of Moses as binding. That they do not is clear from their own practices. For instance, in Leviticus, xx chap. And 14 verse, it is said that “And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they.”

Yet Mr. John Hyde, jr., page 56 of his work called "Mormonism," states that a Mr. E Bolton married a woman and her daughter; that Captain Brown married a woman and her two daughters. These are illustrations of the violation of the law. More than this, Leviticus xviii, 18, prohibits a man from marrying two sisters; yet Mr. Hyde informs us that a Mr. Davis married three sisters, and that a Mr. Sharkey married the same number. If the question is, Is the law of Moses obeyed here or not? and supposing this gentleman can prove that the text means two literal sisters, and two literal sisters are married here, then I affirm that you do not keep God's law, or that which you say is God's law, as given through His servant Moses. Nay, more than this: if it here means two literal sisters, and, whereas, Jacob married two sisters; and whereas, the great Mormon doctrine that God worked a miracle on Leah and Rachel that they might have children; and, whereas, it is here said that said miracles were an approval of polygamy, so also were such miracles an approval of incest; if it be true that God did not express this approval and Jacob having two wives, neither did he express disapproval of his having two sisters; therefore the divine silence in the one case is an offset to the Divine silence in the other case. Even you are driven to this conclusion, either my interpretation of this passage is correct,—neither shall a man take another wife,—two wives, or you must admit that this passage means two literal sisters, and in either case you live in violation of God's law. It is for my distinguished friend to choose which horn of the dilemma he pleases. I thank him for the compliment he paid me,—that I came here as a philanthropist. I have only kindness in my heart for these dear men and women; and had not this kindness filled my heart; had I believed in a crushing, iron, civil law. I could have remained in Washington. But I come here believing the truth as it is in Jesus, and I am glad to say that I have the privilege of speaking what I believe to be God's truth in your hearing.

The gentleman quoted Deuteronomy 21st, 15-17, which is the law of primogeniture, and is designed to preserve the descent of property:

"If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first born son be hers that was hated; "Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born:

"But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath: for he is the beginning of his strength: the right of the first-born is his."

How did he apply this law? Why he first assumed the prevalence of polygamy among the Jews in the wilderness, and then said the law was made for polygamous families as well as for monogamous. He says "inasmuch as polygamy is no where condemned in the law of God, we are entitled to construe this law as applying to polygamists. But I have shown already that Lev. 18, 18, is a positive prohibition of this law, and therefore this passage must be interpreted by that which I have quoted. I propose to erect the balance to day, and try every scriptural argument which he has produced in the scales of justice.

I have recited to you God's solemn law,—“Neither shall a man take one wife unto another;” and I will try every passage by this law. My friend spent an hour here [page 15,

column 3] yesterday in seeking a general law; in a minute I gave you a general law. How natural is this supposition that where a man has two wives in succession, that he may love the last a little better than the first! and I believe it is common out here to love the last a little better than the first. And how natural it is for the second wife to influence the father in the disposition of his property so that he will confer it upon her child! While the children of the first woman, perhaps dead and gone, are deprived of their property rights. But supposing the meaning of this passage is two wives at the same time, this can not be construed, by any of the accepted rules of interpretation, into a sanction of polygamy; if it can, I can prove that sheep stealing is just as divinely authorized. For it is as if Moses had said “for in view of the prevalence of polygamy, and that you have so far forgotten and transgressed God’s law of monogamy as to take two wives at the same time, therefore this shall not work the abrogation of the law of primogeniture, the firstborn son shall not thereby be cheated out of his rights.” Now it is said “if a man have two wives;” very well, if that is a privilege so also are these words, “If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep and kill it and sell it, he shall restore five oxen for the ox he stole, and four sheep for the sheep.” If the former assertion is a sanction of polygamy, then the latter assertion is a sanction for sheepstealing, and we can all go after the flocks this afternoon.

The second passage is Exodus 21st, 7th to 11th verses, referring to the laws of breach of promise. Mr. Pratt says this proves or favors polygamy, in his opinion; but he did not dwell long upon this text. He indulged in an episode on the lost manuscripts. Now let us inquire into the meaning of this passage.

“And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do.

“If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her.

“And if he had betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters.

“If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage, shall not diminish.

“And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.”

What are the significant points in this passage? They are simply these:—According to the Jewish law a destitute Jew was permitted to apprentice his daughter for six years for a pecuniary consideration; and to guard the rights of this girl there were certain conditions: First, the period of her indenture should not extend beyond six years; she should be free at the death of her master, or at the coming of the year of jubilee. The next condition was that the master or his son should marry the girl. What, therefore, are we to conclude from this passage? Simply this that neither the father nor the son marry the girl, but simply betrothed her; that is, engaged her, promised to marry her; but before the marriage relation was consummated the young man changed his mind, and then God Almighty, to indicate His displeasure at a man who will break the vow of engagement, then He fixes the following penalties, namely that he shall provide for this woman, whom he has wronged, her food, her raiment and her dwelling, and these are the facts; and the gentleman has not proved, the gentleman can not prove, that either the father or the son

marry the girl. He says the honored term “wife” is there. Honored term! God bless that term! It is an honored term, sacred as the nature of angels. Yet I have to inform my distinguished friend that the word wife is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek, but simply “if he take another,” that is if he betroth another, and then change his mind he shall do thus and so. Where then is the gentleman’s general law in approval of polygamy?

The next passage is recorded in Deuteronomy 25 chap., and from the 5th to the 10th verses, referring to the preservation of families:

“If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband’s brother shall go in unto her and take her unto him to wife and perform the duty of a husband’s brother unto her.

“And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead; that his name be not put out of Israel.

“And if the man like not to take his brother’s wife, then let his brother’s wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband’s brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband’s brother.

“Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;

“Then shall his brother’s wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his feet, and spit in the face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother’s house.

“And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed.”

What is the object of this law? Evidently the preservation of families and family inheritances. And now I challenge the gentleman to bring forward a solitary instance in the Bible where a married man was compelled to obey this law. Take the case of Tamar! Certainly the brother that was to have married her could not have been a married man, because she had to wait until he grew up. Then take the case of Ruth. You know how she lost her noble Mahlon afar off [page 15, column 4] beyond Jordan, and how she returned to Bethlehem, and goes to Boaz, a near kinsman, and demands that he shall marry her. Boaz says “there is another kinsman. I will speak to him.” It is asked “Didn’t Boaz know whether the nearer kinsman was married?” but yet that was not the business of Boaz. The divine law required that this man should appear at the gate of the city before the elders, and there either marry her or say that he was disqualified because he was already a married man; and there is no proof in the Bible that Boaz has been married; nay more than this, old Josephus, the Jewish historian, asserts that the reason why the near kinsman did not marry Ruth was that he had a wife and children already, so I judge that this law, which is said to be general, is that I laid down “Neither shall a man take one wife unto another,” etc. He refers me to Numbers 31st, 17th and 18th verses.

“Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him.

“But all the women-children that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.”

This passage has nothing whatever to do with polygamy. It is an account of the results of a military expedition of the Jews against the Midianites; their slaughter of a portion of the

people, and their reduction of the remainder to slavery,—namely the women for domestics. My friend dwells upon thirty-two thousand women that were saved! What were these among the Jewish nation,—a people numbering two and a half millions? He quotes Deuteronomy 21st, 10th and 13th verses;

“When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive,

“And seest among the captives a beautiful woman and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to be thy wife;

“Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house, and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;

“And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.”

This passage is designed to regulate the treatment of a captive woman by the conqueror who desires her for a wife, and has no more to do with polygamy than it has to do with theft or murder. Not a solitary word is said about polygamy, no mention is made that the man is married, therefore every jurist will agree with me that where we find a general law we may judge a special enactment by the organic, fundamental principle.

He quoted Exodus 22d chap., 16 and 17, and Deuteronomy 22, and 28 and 29.

“And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.

“If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.”

In Deuteronomy it is said:

“If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;

“Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel’s father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife: because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.”

My friend appeared to confound these two laws as if they had reference to the same crime; but the first is the law of seduction, while the second was the law of rape. In both cases the defiler was required to marry his victim; but in the case of seduction if the father of the seduced girl would not consent to the marriage, then the sum usual for the dowry of a virgin should be paid him and the offense was expiated. But what was the penalty of rape? In that case there was no ambiguity,—the ravisher married his victim and paid her father fifty pieces of silver besides. But what has this to do with polygamy? He says it is a general law and applies to married men. This cannot be so, because it is in conflict with the great law of Leviticus 18, 18.

I tell you, my friends, these are simple downright assumptions. The position is first taken, and therefore these passages are adduced to sustain that position; and this gentleman goes on to assume that all these men are married men. It is a tremendous tact, that if a

man seduced a girl or committed a rape upon her, he was bound to marry that girl. It is a tremendous fact that the same law gives to the father the right of the refusal of his daughter, therefore the father has the power to annul God's law of marriage.

The next passage is the 2nd Chronicles, 24th and 3rd, &c. It is the case of Joash the king, and when he began to reign Jehoiaada was high priest. He was more than that—he was regent. My friend in portraying the character of this great man said that because he took two wives for King Joash, he was so highly honored that when he died he was buried among the kings. But the fact is, he was regent, and there was royalty in his regency, and this royalty entitled him to be interred in the royal mausoleum. All that is said in Chronicles is simply an epitome,—a summing up, that King Joash had two wives. It does not say that he had them at the same time; he might have had them in succession. I give you an illustration: John Milton was born in London in 1609. He was an eminent scholar, a great statesman and a beautiful poet; and John Milton had three wives. There I stop. Are you to infer that John Milton had these three wives simultaneously? Why you might according to the gentleman's interpretation [page 2 column 1] of this passage. But John Milton had them in succession. But more than this, for argument's sake grant the position assumed by my friend, then the numerical element of the argument must come out, and a man can only have two wives but no more. Do you keep that law here? And yet that is the argument and that is the logical conclusion.

The last passage my friend referred to was the 1st Chapter of Hosea and 2d verse.

“The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea. And the Lord said to Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms; for the land hath committed great whoredom, *departing* from the Lord.”

That is, says Newcomb, a wife from among the Isrealites, who were remarkable for spiritual fornication. My friend is so determined on a literal interpretation that he gives a literal interpretation, whereas this distinguished biblical scholar says that it was not literal fornication, but rather spiritual; in other words, idolatry; for in the Scriptures, both the Old and the New Testament, idolatry is mentioned under the term fornication. God calls himself the husband of Israel, and this chosen nation owed Him the fidelity of a wife, Exodus the 34th Chapter and 15th verse:

“Lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land, and they go a whoring after their gods, and do sacrifice unto their gods, and one call thee, and thou eat of his sacrifice.”

The 14th verse of the same chapter says:

“For thou shalt worship no other god: for the Lord, whose name is jealous, is a jealous God.”

He therefore sees thee with indignation join thyself in marriage to one of those who had committed fornication or spiritual idolatry, lest they should raise up children who, by the power of example, might lay themselves under the terribleness of idolatry. The prophet is

directed to get a wife of whoredoms; and, after this, he is directed to go and love an adulterous woman. My friend cites these as examples where God makes an exception to a general law. He also cites the case of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the case of consanguinity, in Deuteronomy xxv, from 5th to 10th verse. Now the first three cases were merely typical; the first two were designed to set forth more impressively the relations between God and His people. The case of consanguinity has nothing to do with polygamy. It is only a modification or exception in special cases for the preservation of the families of Israel from extinction. Where, therefore, I ask, is the general law?

But my friend has forgotten this fact, that after having divorced the first wife for adultery, as he had a right to do, in chapter ii, 2d and 5th verses, he is then directed to go and take another wife. This is not polygamy. It was represented to us here, yesterday, that this prophet, Hosea, was first commanded to take a woman guilty of adultery or fornication, and then to take an adulteress, and the representation was made that he took them and had them at the same time; whereas, if Mr. Pratt had read a little further, he would find that the prophet divorced the first wife for adultery, and he had a right to do it; and after he divorced her, then he went and took a second wife.

Professor Pratt admits, mark you, admits, that none of these passages, nor all of them together can afford in this day a warrant for the practice of polygamy. Gives it up! Turns the Bible aside! I will read to you from his own words:

“Supposing that we should prove by a thousand evidences from the Bible, that polygamy was practiced by ancient Israel and was sanctioned by God in ancient days, would that be any reason that you and I should practice it! By no means. We must get a command independent of that, which we have received. God frequently repeats His commands, and His servants are required to obey His commands when they are given. The Latter-day Saints in this Territory practice polygamy; not because the law of Moses commands it; not because it was extensively practiced by the best of men we know of, mentioned in the Bible, the old patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob and others who are saved in the kingdom of God. We have no right to practice it because they did it.”

Then he yields the point! I respectfully ask him, if this is his position why does he attempt, in all his writings, and to establish it in that clever book, the *Seer!* Why did he, in his controversy with me in the New York *Herald!* Why has he from this stand attempted to prove that the practice of polygamy was right from the Bible! Why not, like a man, come out and say that we practice this system here, not because the Jews did it; not because the Divine law sanctioned it years ago; but because a certain man of the name of Smith received a revelation that this form of marriage was to be practiced! You my friends, can see the logical conclusion, or in other words the illogical bearing.

Now, I come to the assumptions by the gentleman. First, that there is no law condemning or forbidding polygamy. Has he proved that? Second, that the Hebrew nation, as it was in the wilderness, when the Mosaic code was given, was polygamous. Has he proved that? Can he find in the whole history of the Jewish nation from the time they left Egypt to the time they entered the land of Canaan, can he find more than one instance of polygamy?

Perhaps he may find two. I will be glad to receive that information, for I am a man seeking light, and to-day I throw down a challenge to your eminent defender of the faith, to produce more than two instances of polygamy, from the time the Jews left the land of Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. I will assist him in his research and tell him one, and that was Caleb. Now supposing that a murder should be committed in your city, would it be fair for Eastern papers to say that the Mormons are a murderous people? No, I would rise up in defence of you: I would say that that is a crime and an injury to the people here! Yet, during a period of forty years we find one man out of two millions and a half of people practicing polygamy, and my friend comes forward and assumes that the Israelites were polygamists.

Third, that these laws were given to regulate among them an institution already existing. Has he proved that? Supposing he could prove that Moses attempted, or did legislate for the regulation of polygamy, as it did exist in Egypt and elsewhere, would such legislation establish a sanction? Why in Paris they have laws regulating the social evil: is that an approval of the social evil? There are laws in most of the States regulating and controlling intemperance. Do excise laws sanction intemperance? Nothing of the kind. For argument's sake I would be willing to concede that Moses did legislate in regard to polygamy, that is to regulate it, to confine its evils; and yet my friend is too much of a legislator to stand here and assert that laws regulating and defining were an approval of a system.

Fourth, that these laws were general, applying to all men, married and unmarried. Has he proved that? I proved to the contrary to-day, showing that in the passages which he quoted there is not a solitary or remote intimation that the men were married.

Now, let us, in opposition to these assumptions, remember that monogamy was established by God in the innocence of the human race, and that polygamy, like idolatry, and slavery, blood revenge, drunkenness and murder came into existence after the apostasy of the human family, and that neither of these evils have any other origin so far as appears from the Bible than in the wickedness of man. We admit that polygamy existed among the corrupt nations, just as any other evil, or vice, or crime existed, and now when God had chosen the Hebrews for His own people, to separate them from the heathen, He gives them for the first time a code of laws, and especially on the subject of the commerce of the sexes. And what is the central principle of that code on this subject? Read Leviticus 18, 18—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another."

In this code the following things are forbidden: Incest, polygamy, fornication, idolatry, beastliness, &c., we therefore deny that the nation was polygamous at that time, deny it definitely, deny it distinctly, and on another occasion I will give you the character of the monogamists and polygamists of Bible times. The Jews had been four hundred years in slavery, and they were brought out with a strong hand and an outstretched arm.

We to-day then challenge for the proof that as a nation the Jews were polygamous. One or two instances, as I have already remarked, can be adduced. We may say again that if, as he assumes, these laws were given to regulate the existing system, this does not

sanction it any more than the same thing sanctions sheep-stealing or homicide. He said these laws were general, applying to all men, married or unmarried. Has he proved it? This is wholly gratuitous. There is no word in either of these passages which permits or directs a married man to take more than one wife at a time. I challenge the gentleman for the proof. It is no evidence of the sanction of polygamy to bring passage after passage, which, he knows, if construed in favor of polygamy, polygamy must be in direct conflict with the great organic law recorded in Leviticus 18, 18.

(At this point the Umpires announced that the time was up.)

‘DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?’

Discussion between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate.

Third and Closing Day.

PROF. ORSON PRATT.
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We have assembled ourselves in this vast congregation in the third session of our discussion, to take into consideration the Divinity of a very important institution of the Bible. The question, as you have already heard, is “Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?” Many arguments have already been adduced, on the side of the affirmative, and also on the side of the negative. This afternoon one hour is allotted to me in the discussion, to bring forth still further evidences, which will close the debate, so far as the affirmative is concerned; then to be followed by the Reverend Dr. Newman, which will finally close the discussion.

Polygamy is a question, or in other words, is an institution of the Bible; an institution established as we have already shown, by Divine Authority; established by law – by command; and hence, of course, must be sanctioned by the great Divine Lawgiver, whose words are recorded in the Bible.

Yesterday I was challenged by the reverend Doctor Newman to bring forth any evidence whatever to prove that there were more than two polygamist families in all Israel during the time of their sojourn in [page 6 column 3] the wilderness. At least this is what I understood the gentleman to say. I shall now proceed to bring forth the proof.

The statistics of Israel in the days of Moses show that there were of males, over twenty years of age, (Numbers 1st chapter 49th verse.)

“Even all they were numbered, were six hundred thousand, and three thousand, and five hundred and fifty.”

It was admitted yesterday afternoon, by Dr. Newman, that there were two and a half millions of Israelites. Now I shall take the position that the females among the Israelites were far more numerous than the males; I mean that portion of them that were over twenty years of age. I assume this for this reason, that from the birth of Moses down until the time that Israelites were brought out of Egypt, some eighty years had elapsed. The destruction of the male children had commenced before the birth of Moses; how many years before, I know not. The order of King Pharaoh was to destroy every male child. All the people, subject to the ruler, were commanded to see that they were destroyed and thrown into the river Nile. How long a period this great destruction continued is unknown; but if we suppose that one male child to every two hundred and fifty persons was annually destroyed, it would amount to the number of ten thousand yearly. This would soon begin to tell in the difference between the numbers of males and females. Ten thousand each year would only be one male child to each two hundred and fifty persons. How many would this make from the birth of Moses, or eighty years? It would amount to 800,000 females above that of the males. But I do not wish to take advantage in this argument by assuming too high a number. I will diminish it one half, which will still leave 400,000 more females than males. This would be one male destroyed each year out of every five hundred persons. The females, then, over twenty years of age would be 603,550, added to 400,000 surplus women, making in all 1,003,550 women over twenty years of age. The children, then, under twenty years of age, to make up the two and a half millions, would be 892,900, the total population of Israel being laid down at 2,500,000 people.

Now, then, for the number of families constituting this population. The families having first-born males, over one month old, see Numbers 3rd chapter and 43rd verse, numbered 22,273. Families having no male children over one month old we may suppose to have been in the ratio of one-third of the former class of families, which would make 7,424 additional families. Add these to the 22,273 with first-born males and we have the sum total of 29,697 as the number of the families in Israel. Now, in order to favor the monogamists' argument, and give them all the advantage possible, we will still add to this number to make it even, -- 303 families more, making thirty thousand families in all. Now comes another species of calculation founded on this data: Divide twenty-five hundred thousand persons by 22,273 first-born males, and we find one first-born male to every 112 persons. What a large family for a monogamist! But divide 2,500,000 persons by 30,000 and the quotient gives eighty-three persons in a family. Suppose these families to have been monogamic, after deducting husband and wife, we have the very respectable number of eighty-one children to each monogamic wife. If we assume the numbers of the males and females to have been equal, making no allowance for the destruction of the male infants, we shall then have to increase the children under twenty years of age to keep good the number of two and a half millions. This would still make eighty-one children to each of the 30,000 monogamic households. Now let us examine these dates in connection with polygamy. If we suppose the average numbers of wives to have been seven, in each household, though there may have been men who had no wife at all, and there may have been some who had buy one wife; an there may have been others having from one up to say thirty wives, yet if we average them at seven wives each, we would then have one husband, seven wives and seventy-five children to make up the average

number of eighty-three in the family, in a polygamic household. This would give an average of over ten children apiece to each of the 210,000 polygamic wives, when we deduct the 30,000 husbands from the 603,550 men over 200 years old we have 573,550 unmarried men in Israel. If we deduct the 210,000 married women from the total of 1,003,550 over twenty years of age, we have 793,550 left. This would be enough to supply all the unmarried men with one wife each, leaving still a balance of 226,000 unmarried females to live old maids or enter into polygamic households.

The law guaranteeing the rights of the first-born, which has been referred to in other portions of our discussion includes those 22,273 first-born male children in Israel that is, one first-born male child to every 112 persons in Israel; taking the population as represented by our learned friend, Mr. Newman, at two and a half millions. Thus we see that there was a law given to regulate the rights of the first-born, applying to over 22,000 first-born male children in Israel, giving them a double portion of the goods and inheritances of their fathers.

Having brought forth these statistics, let us for a few moments examine more closely these results. How can any one assume Israel to have been monogamic, and be consistent? I presume that my honored [page 6 column 4] friend, notwithstanding his great desire and earnestness to overthrow the Divine evidences in favor of polygamy, would not say to this people that one wife could bring forth eighty-one children. We can depend upon these proofs—upon these biblical statistics. If he assumes that the males and females were nearly equal in number, that Israel was a monogamic people, then let Mr. Newman show how these great and wonderful householders could be produced in Israel, if there were only two polygamic families in the nation. It would require something more wonderful than that herb called "*mandrake*," referred to by Dr. Newman in his rejoinder to my reply to him in the *New York Herald*. I think he will not be able to find, in our day an herb with such wonderfully efficacious properties, which will produce such remarkable results.

I have therefore established that Israel was a polygamic nation when God gave them the laws which I have quoted, laws to govern and regulate a people among whom were polygamic and monogamic families. The nation was founded in polygamy in the days of Jacob, and it was continued in polygamy until they became very numerous, very great and very powerful, while here and there might be found a monogamic family—a man with one wife. Now if God gave laws to a people having these two forms of marriage in the wilderness, He would adapt such laws to all. He would not take up isolated instances here and there of a man having one wife, but He would adapt His laws to the whole; to both the polygamic and monogamic forms of marriage throughout all Israel.

But we are informed by the reverend Doctor that the laws given for the regulation of matters in the polygamic form of marriage bear upon the face of it the condemnation of polygamy. And to justify his assertion he refers to the laws that have been passed in Paris to regulate the social evil; and to the excise laws passed in our own country to regulate intemperance; and claims that these laws for the regulation of evils are condemnatory of the crimes to which they apply. But when Parisians pass laws to regulate the social evil

they acknowledge it as a crime. When the inhabitants of this country pass laws to regulate intemperance, they thereby denounce it as a crime. And when God gives laws—or even when human legislatures make penal laws, they denounce as crimes the acts against which those laws are directed, and attach penalties to them for disobedience. When the law was given of God against murder, it was denounced as a crime by the very penalty attached, which was death; and when the law was given against adultery its enormity was marked by the punishment—the criminal was to be stoned to death. It was a crime, and was so denounced when the law was given. God gave laws to regulate these things in Israel; but because He has regulated many great and abominable crimes by law, has He no right to regulate that which is good and moral as well as that which is wicked and immoral? For instance, god introduced the law of circumcision and gave commands regulating it; shall we therefore say, according to the logic of the gentleman, that circumcision was condemned by the law of God, because it was regulated by the law of God? That would be his logic, and the natural conclusion according to his logic. Again, when God introduced the Passover. He gave laws how it should be conducted. Does that condemn the Passover as being immoral because regulated by law? But, still closer home God gave laws to regulate the monogamic form of marriage. Does that prove that monogamy is condemned by the law of God, because thus regulated? Oh, that kind of logic will never do!

Now, then, we come to that passage in Leviticus, the 18th chapter and the 18th verse; the passage that was so often referred to in the gentleman's reply yesterday afternoon. I was very glad to hear the gentleman refer to this passage. The law, according to King James' translation, as we heard yesterday afternoon, reads thus: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life-time." That was the law according to King James' translation. My friend, together with Doctors Dwight and Edwards, and several other celebrated commentators, disagree with that interpretation; and somebody, I know not whom, some unauthorized person, has inserted in the margin another interpretation; recollect, in the margins and not in the text. It is argued that this interpretation in the margin must be correct, while King James' translators must have been mistaken. Now, recollect that the great commentators who have thus altered King James' translation were monogamists. So were the translators of the Bible; they, too, were monogamists. But with regard to the true translation of this passage, it has been argued by my learned friend that the Hebrew, -- the original Hebrew,-- signifies something a little different from that which is contained in King James' translation. These are his words, as will be found on his sermon preached at Washington, upon the same subject. "But in verse 18 the law against polygamy is given; 'Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister,' or as the marginal reading is, 'Thou shalt not take one wife to another.' And this rendering is sustained by Cookson, by Bishop Jewell and by Drs. Edwards and Dwight," four eminent monogamists, interested in sustaining monogamy. According to Dr. Edwards, the words which we translate 'a wife to her sister' are

[page 8, column 1] found in the Hebrew but eight times. Now, we have not been favored with these authorities we have had no access to them. Here in these mountain wilds it is

very difficult to get books. In each passage they refer to inanimate objects; that is, in each of the eight places where the words are found. We have searched for them in the Hebrew and can refer you to each passage where they occur. And each time they refer to objects joined together, such as wings, loops, curtains, &c., and signify coupling together. The gentleman reads the passage “Thou shalt not take one wife to another,” and understands it as involving the likeness of one thing to another, which is correct. But does the language forbid, as the margin expresses it, the taking of one wife to another? No: We have the privilege according to the rules or articles of debate, which have been read this afternoon, to apply to the original Hebrew. What are the Hebrew words—the original—that are used, Veishahel-ahotah lo tikkah; this when literally translated and transposed is “neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister,” veishah being translated by King James’ translators “a wife,” el-ahotah being translated “to her sister;” lo is translated “either;” while tikkah is translated by King James’ translators “shalt thou take.” They have certainly given a literal translation. Appeal to the Hebrew and you will find the word ishah occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated “wife.” The word ahotah translated by King James’ translators “a sister,” occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated “sister.” But are these the only translations,—the only renderings? ishah, when it is followed by ahot has another rendering. That is when “wife” is followed by “sister” there is another rendering.

Translators have not right to give a double translation to the same Hebrew word, in the same phrase; if they translate veishah *one* they are not at liberty to translate the same word in the same phrase over again and call it *wife*. This Dr. Edwards, or some other monogamist has done, and inserted this false translation in the margin. What object such translator had in deceiving the public must be best known to himself; he probably was actuated by a zeal to find some law against polygamy, and concluded to manufacture the word “*wife*” and place it in the margin without any original Hebrew word to represent it. Ahot, when standing alone, is rendered *sister*; when preceded by ishah, is rendered *another*. The suffix ah, attached to ahot, is translated “*her*;” both together (ahot-ah) are rendered “*her sister*,” that is *sister’s sister*; when ahot is rendered “*another*,” its suffix ah represents “*her*” or more properly the noun *sister* for which it stands. The phrase will then read: Veishah (one) el-ahotah (sister to another) lo (neither) tikkah (shalt thou take) which, when transposed, reads thus: *Neither shalt thou take one sister to another*. This form of translation agrees with the rendering given to the same Hebrew words or phrase in the seven other passages of Scriptures, referred to by Dr. Newman and Dr. Edwards. (See Exodus xxvi, 3,5; Ezekiel I, 9, 11, 23; also II, 13.)

It will be seen that the latter form of translation gives precisely the same idea, as that given by the English translators in the text. It also agrees with the twelve preceding verses of the law, prohibiting intermarriages among blood relations, and forms a part and parcel of the same code, while the word “*wife*” inserted in the margin is not, and cannot, by any possible rule of interpretation; be extorted from the original in connection with the second form of translation.

Why should King James’ literal translation “*wife*” and “*sister*” be set aside for “*one to another*?” Because they saw necessity for it. There is this difference; in all the other seven

passages where the words *Veishah el-ahotah* occur, there is a noun in the nominative case preceding them, denoting something to be coupled together. Exodus 26th chapter, 3rd verse contains *ishah elahotah* twice, signifying to couple together the curtains one to another, the same words being used that are used in this text. Go to the fifth verse of the same chapter, and there we have the loops of the curtains joined together one to another, the noun in the nominative case being expressed. Next go to Ezekiel, 1st chapter, 9th, 11th and 23d verses; and these three passages give the rendering of these same words, coupling the wings of the cherubim one to another. Then go again to the 3d chapter of Ezekiel and 13th verses, and the wings of the living creatures were joined together one to another. But in the text under consideration no such noun in the nominative case occurs; and hence the English translators concluded to give each word its literal translation.

The law was given to prevent quarrels which are apt to arise among blood relations. We might look for quarrels on the other side between women who were not related by blood; but what are the facts in relation to quarrels between blood relations? Go back to Cain and Abel? It was a blood relation, his brother. Who was it that cast Joseph into the pit to perish with hunger, and afterwards dragged him forth from his den and sold him as a slave to persons trading through the country? It was blood relations. Who slew the seventy sons of Gideon upon one stone? It was one of their own brothers that hired men to do it. Who was it that rebelled against King David and caused him with all his wives and household, excepting ten concubines, to flee out of Jerusalem? It was his blood-relation, his own son Absa- [page 8, column 2] *lom*. Who quarreled in the family of Jacob? Did Bilhah quarrel with Zilpah? No. Did Leah quarrel with Bilhah or Zilpah? No such thing is recorded. Did Rachel quarrel with either of the handmaidens? There is not a word concerning the matter. The little, petty difficulties occurred between the two sisters, blood relations, Rachel and Leah. And this law was probably given to prevent such vexations between blood relations—between sister and sister.

Having effectually proved the marginal reading to be false, I will now defy not only the learned gentleman, but all the world of Hebrew scholars; to find any word in the original to be translated "*wife*" if *ishah* be first translated "*one*." (The speaker was here informed he had only fifteen minutes left.)

I am informed I have only fifteen minutes. I was not aware I had spoken a quarter of the time. I shall have to leave this subject and proceed to another.

The next subject to which I shall call your attention is in regard to the general or unlimited language of the laws given in the various passages which I have quoted, If a man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other, is the language of these passages. Will any person pretend to say that a married man is not a man? And if a married person is a man, it proves that the law is applicable to married men, and if so it rests with my learned friend to prove that it is limited. Moreover, the passage from the margin in Leviticus was quoted by Dr. Newman as a great fundamental law by which all the other passages were to be overturned. But it has failed; and, therefore, the other passages quoted by me, stand good unless something else can be found by the learned gentleman to support his forlorn hope.

Perhaps we may hear quoted in the answer to my remarks the passage that the future king of Israel was not to multiply wives to himself. That was the law. The word multiply is construed by those opposed to polygamy to mean that twice one make two, and hence that he was not to multiply wives, or in other words, that he was not to take two. But the command was also given that the future king of Israel was not to multiply wives, or in other words, that he was not to take two. But the command was also given that the future king of Israel was not to multiply horses any more than wives. Twice makes two again. Was the future king of Israel not to have more than one horse? The idea is ridiculous! The future king of Israel was not to *multiply* them; not to have them in multitude that is, only to take such a number as God saw proper to give them.

We might next refer you to the uncle of Ruth's dead husband, old Boaz, who represented himself as not being the nearest kin. There was another nearer who had the Divine right to take her, and this other happened to be the brother of Boaz, perhaps a little older. Josephus tells us, according to the learned gentleman, that this oldest brother was a married man. Suppose we admit it. Did Boaz not know his brother was married when he represented him as the nearest of kin and had the right to marry her. This, then, we arrive at by the assistance of Josephus; and it proves that married men were required to comply with the law. I have no further time to remark on this passage; I wish now to examine a passage that is contained in Matthew, in regard to divorces, and also in Malachi, on the same subject, Malachi, or the Lord by the mouth of Malachi, informs the people that the Lord hated putting away. He gave the reason why a wife should not be put away. In the beginning the Lord made one, that is a wife for Adam that he might not be alone. Woman was given to man for a companion, that he might protect her, and for other holy purposes, but not to be put away for trivial causes; and it was cause of condemnation in those days for a man to put away his wife. But there is not a word in Malachi condemnatory of a man marrying more than one wife. Jesus also gives the law respecting divorces, that they should not put away their wives for any other cause than that of fornication; and he that took a wife that was put away would commit adultery. Jesus says, in the 5th chapter, that he that putteth away his wife for any other cause than fornication causes her to commit adultery. Then the husband is a guilty accomplice, and if he puts away his wife unjustly he is guilty of adultery himself, the same as a confederate in murder is himself a murderer. As an adulterer he has no right to take another wife; he has not the right to take even one wife. His right is to be stoned to death; to suffer the penalty of death for his sin of adultery. Consequently, if he has not right to even life itself he has no right to a wife. But the case of such a man, who has become an adulterer by putting away his wife, and has no right to marry another, has no application, nor has the argument drawn from it any application, to the man who keeps his wife and takes another. The law referred to by my learned opponent, in Leviticus 18 and 18, shows that polygamy was in existence, but was to be kept within the circle of those who were not blood relations.

Concerning the phrases, "duty of marriage," occurring in the passage, "If a man take another wife, her food, her raiment and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish." The condition here referred to is sometimes more than mere betrothal. It is something showing that the individual has been not merely previously betrothed, but is actually in

the married state, and the duty of marriage is clearly expressed. What is the meaning of the original word? It does not mean dwelling nor refuge as asserted in the *New York Herald* by Dr. Newman. Four passages are quoted by him in which the Hebrew word for dwelling occurs, but the word translated “duty” of marriage, is entirely a distinct word from that used in the four passages referred to. Does not the learned Dr. know the difference between two Hebrew words? Or what was his object in referring to a word elsewhere in the Scripture that does not even occur in the text under consideration? In a Hebrew and English Lexicon, (published by Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M., Prof of Sacred Liter. in the Theology School in Yale College,) page 160, it refers to this very Hebrew word and to the very passage, Ex. xxxi:10, and translates it thus:—“cohabitation,” —“duty of marriage.” “Duty of marriage,” than is “cohabitation.” thus God commands a man who takes another wife, not to diminish the duty of cohabitation with the first. Would God command undiminished “cohabitation” with a woman merely betrothed and not married?

While I have a few moments left let me refer you to Hosea. I wish all of you when you go home, to read the second chapter of Hosea, and you will find with regard to Hosea’s having divorced his first wife because of her whoredoms, that no such thing is recorded as stated by Mr. Newman yesterday. The Lord tells Hosea to go and speak to his brethren, (not to his son); to his sisters, (not his daughter,) of the house of Israel, and tell them what the Lord will do; that he may not acknowledge them any longer as a wife. Hosea bore the word of the Lord to Israel whom his own two wives represented, saying that their whoredoms, their wickedness and idolatries had kindled the anger of the Lord against them.

Having discussed the subject so far I leave it now with all candid persons to judge. Here is the law of God; here is the command of the Most High, general in its nature, not limited, nor can it be proved to be so. There is no law against it, but it stands as immovable as the Rock of Ages, and will stand when all things on the earth and the earth itself shall pass away.

DR. J. P. NEWMAN Said:

REPECTED UMPIRES, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I had heard prior to my coming to your city that my distinguished opponent was eminent in mathematics, and certainly his display to-day confirms that reputation. Unfortunately, however, he is incorrect in his statements. First, he assumes that the slaying of all the male children of the Hebrews was continued through eighty years; but he has failed to produce the proof. To do this was his starting point. He assumes it; where is the proof, either in the Bible or in Josephus? And until he can prove that the destruction of the male children went on for eighty years, I say this argument has no more foundation than a vision. Then he makes another blunder: the 303,550, the number of men above twenty years of age, mentioned in this case, were men to go to war; they were not the total population of the Jewish nation, and yet my mathematical friend stands up here to-day and declares that the whole male population above twenty years of age consisted of 303,550, whereas it is a fact that this number did not include all the males.

Then again the 22,273 first born do not represent the number of families in Israel at that time, for many of the first born were dead. These are the blunders the gentleman has made to-day, and I challenge him to produce the contrary and prove that he is not guilty of these numerical blunders. Then he denies the assertion made yesterday that there could not be brought forward more than one or two instances of polygamy in the history of Israel from the time the Hebrews left Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. Has he disproved that? He has attempted to prove it by a mathematical problem, which problem is based on error: his premises are wrong, therefore his conclusions are false. Why didn't he turn to King James' translation? I will help him to one polygamist, that is Caleb. Why didn't he start with old Caleb and go down and give us name after name and date after date of the polygamists recorded in the history of the Jews while they were in the wilderness? Ladies and gentlemen, he has none to give, and therefore the assertion made yesterday is true, that during the sojourn of the children of Israel in the wilderness there is but one instance of polygamy recorded.

Now we come to the law that I laid down yesterday—"Neither shall thou take one wife to another." I reaffirm that the translation in the margin is perfect to a word. He labors to show that god does not mean what He says. That phrase, "one wife to another," may be equally rendered one woman to another, or one wife to her sister. The very same phrase is used in the other seven passages named by Dr. Dwight. For example Exodus 26, 3, Ezekiel 1, 9, etc. he admits the translation in these passages to be correct. If it is correct in these passages, why is it not correct in the other? His very admission knocks to pieces his argument. Why then does he labor to create the impression that the Hebrew *ishau* means woman, or wife? What is the object of the travail of his soul? The word *ahoot*, he contends, means sister; but sister itself, is a word which means a specific relation, and a generic relation. Every woman is sister to every other woman, [page 8, column 4] and I challenge the gentleman to meet me on paper at any time, in the newspapers of your city or elsewhere, upon the Hebrew of this text. I reaffirm it, reaffirm it in the hearing of this learned gentleman, reaffirm it in the hearing of these Hebraists, that as it is said in the margin is the true rendering, namely "neither shalt thou take one wife to another." But supposing that is incorrect, permit me, before I pass on, to remind you of this fact, he refers, I think, in his first speech to the "margin;" the "margin" was correct then and there, but it is not here. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways: correct when he wants to quote from the "margin;" but not when I want to do so. He quoted from the margin, and I followed his illustrious example.

And now, my friends, supposing that the text means just what he says, namely "neither shalt thou take a wife unto her sister to vex her." Supposing that is the rendering, and he asserts it is and he is a Hebraist, I argued and brought the proof yesterday that this law of Moses is not kept by the Mormons, in other words there are men in your very midst who have married sisters. Where was the gentleman's solemn denunciation of the violation of God's law? Why did he not lift his voice and vindicate the divine law? But not a solitary word of disapproval is uttered! Yesterday he pronounced a curse—"cursed is he that confirms not to the words of this law, to do them." Does not the curse rest upon him and upon his people. I gave him the liberty to choose whether this text condemned polygamy,

or whether it condemned a man for marrying two sisters; he must take his choice, the horns of the dilemma are before him. For the sake of saving polygamy he stands up here, in the presence of the Almighty God and His holy angels, and before this intelligent congregation he admits that in this church, and with this people, God's holy law is set at defiance. What respect, therefore, can we have for the gentleman's argument, drawn from the teachings of Moses, in support of polygamy?

He refers us to the multiplication of horses. I suppose a king may have one horse or two, there is no special rule; but there is a special rule as to the number of wives. Neither shall the king multiply wives. God, in the beginning, gave the first man one wife, and Christ and Paul sustain that law as binding upon us. And now supposing that that is not accepted as a law, what then? Why there is no limit to the number of wives, none at all. How many shall a man have? Seven, twenty, fifty, sixty, a hundred? Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife he shall have a hundred. Well, he ought to go one forsaking; for if he will forsake a hundred he will have ten thousand; and if he forsake ten thousand he will have so many more in proportion. It is his business to go on forsaking. That is in the Professor's book called the *Seer*. Such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating women for him.

I regret very much that I have not time to notice all the points which have been brought forward. I desired to do so. I plead for more time; my friends plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour. Now, I propose to follow out the line of argument which I was pursuing yesterday when my time expired, and I propose to carry out and apply the great law brought forward yesterday, "Neither shall a man take one wife to another," and in doing this we call your attention to the fact that in the bible there are only twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases of polygamy, all told, out of thousands and millions of people. I say twenty-five or thirty specially recorded cases, which polygamists of our day claim in support of their position. I propose to take up, say half a dozen of the most prominent ones. I divide the period, before the law and after the law. I take up Abraham. It is asserted that he was a polygamist. I deny it. There is no proof that Abraham was guilty of polygamy. What are the facts? When he was called of the Almighty to be the founder of a great nation, a promise was given him that he should have a numerous posterity. At that time he was a monogamist, had but one wife,—the noble Sarah. Six years passed and the promise was not fulfilled. Then Sarah, desiring to help the Lord to keep His promise, brought her Egyptian maid Hagar, and offered her as a substitute for herself to Abraham. Mind you, Abraham did not go after Hagar, but Sarah produced her as a substitute. Immediately after the act was performed Sarah discovered her sin and said "My wrong be upon thee." "I have committed sin, but I did it for thy sake, and therefore the wrong that I have committed is upon thee." Then look at the subsequent facts: by the Divine command this Egyptian girl was sent away from the abode of Abraham by the mutual consent of the husband and the wife, by the Divine command. It is said that she was recognized as the wife of Abraham, but I say you can not prove it from the bible; but it is said that she was promised a numerous posterity. It was also foretold that Ishmael should be a wild man,—“his hand against every man and every man's hand against him.” Did that prediction justify Ishmael in being a robber and a murderer? No, certainly not; neither did the other prediction, that Hagar should have

numerous posterity, justify the action of Abraham in taking her. After she had been sent away by Divine command, God said unto Abraham “now walk before me and be thou perfect.”

These are the facts my friends. I know that some will refer you to Keturah; but this is the fact in regard to her: Abraham [page 10, column 1] lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah; the energy miraculously given to Abraham’s body for the generation of Isaac was continued after Sarah’s death; but to suppose that he took Keturah during Sarah’s life time is to do violence to his moral character. But it is said he sent away the sons of Keturah with presents during his life time, therefore it must have been during his lifetime, therefore it must have been during the life time of Sarah. He lived thirty-eight years after the death of Sarah, and he sent these sons away eight years before his death, and they were from twenty-five to thirty years old. Then this venerable Patriarch stands forth as a monogamist and not as a polygamist.

Then we come to the case of Jacob. What are the facts in regard to him? brought up in the sanctity of monogamy; after having robbed his brother of his birth-right, after having lied to his blind old father, he then steals away and goes to Padan-aram and there falls in love with Rachel; but in his bridal bed he finds Rachel’s sister Leah. He did not enter polygamy voluntarily, but he was imposed upon. As he had taken advantage of the blindness of his father and thereby imposed upon him, so also was he imposed upon by Laban in the darkness of the night. But I hold this to be true that Jacob is nowhere regarded as a saintly man prior to his conversion at the brook Jabbok. After that he appears to us in a saintly character. It is a remarkable fact that Jacob lived 147 years all told, eighty-seven of which he lived before he became a polygamist. He lived twenty-two years in polygamy, he lived forty years after he had abandoned polygamy, so that out of 147 years there were only twenty-two years during which he had any connection with polygamy.

I wish my friend had referred to the case of Moses. In his sermon on celestial marriage he claims that Moses was a polygamist, and he declares that the leprosy that was sent upon Miriam was for her interference with the polygamous marriage of Moses. What are the facts? There is no record of a second marriage. Zipporah is the only name given as the wife of Moses. What, then, is the assertion made? Simply this: It is recorded, and Moses was content to dwell with Jethro. He gave Moses Zipporah, his daughter. Josephus speaks of Jethro having two daughters, and distinctly says that he gave Moses one of them. In Numbers xii, and 1st it is said:

“And Miriam and Aaron spake against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman.”

Not it is affirmed that two women are here mentioned, whereas nothing can be more untrue. Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman are one and identical; it is one and the same person called by different names. Let us see: The father of Zipporah was the priest of Midian; and according to the best authorities Midian and Ethiopia are identical terms, and apply to that portion of Arabia where Jethro lived. So the appellation Midian, Ethiopia and Arabia are applied to the Arabian peninsula. See Appleton’s American Encyclopedia,

volumes 6, 7 and 11. Then Moses, the Jewish lawgiver, stands forth as a monogamist, having but one wife. Moses was not a polygamist. Surely the founder of a polygamist nation and the revealer of a polygamist law, as this gentleman claims, should have set an example, and should have had a dozen or a hundred wives. This son of Jochbed: he was a monogamist, and stands forth as being a reproof to polygamists in all generations. Now, we come to Gideon. And what about this man? An angel appeared to him, that is true; but if the practice of polygamy by Gideon is also a law to us. If there is silence in the Bible touching the polygamy of Gideon, there is also silence in the Bible touching his idolatry, and if one is sanctioned so also is the other.

I wish my friend had brought up the case of Hannah, the wife of Elkanah. I can prove to a demonstration that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah; but being barren Elkanah takes another wife. But Hannah, in the anxiety of her heart pleads to the Almighty, and God honored her motherhood by answering her prayer. It is asked "Is not this a sanction of polygamy?" Nay, a sanction of monogamy, because she was the first wife of Elkanah, and because Elkanah had been guilty of infidelity and married another wife, was that a reason why Hannah should not have her rights from High Heaven, why God Almighty should not answer her prayer? You ask me why did not she pray before. Can you tell me why Isaac did not pray twenty years sooner for his wife Rebecca that she might have children? I can not tell, and you can not tell, all that I assert is that Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah, and God honored and blessed the beautiful Samuel.

Now we come to David. Why did not my friend bring up David, the great warrior, king and poet, the ruler of Israel. He might have mentioned him, with ten wives all told; he might also have mentioned him as the adulterer, who committed one of the most premeditated cold-blooded murders on record simply to cover up his crime of adultery. How often do you hear quoted the words "and I gave thy master's wives into thy bosom!"? Is this an approval of polygamy? If you will read on you will find also that God also promised to give his (David's) wives to another, and that another should lie with them in the sight of the sun. Surely if one is an approval of polygamy the other is an approval of rebellion and incest! David lived to be seventy-five years old. He was twen-

[page 10, column 2]
t-seven years old when he took his first wife Michael, the daughter of Saul. For the next forty years we find him complicated with the evils, crimes and sorrows of polygamy; and the old man, seeing its great sin, thoroughly repented of it and put it away from him, and for the last eight years of his life endeavored to atone, as best he could, for his troubled and guilty experience.

And what of Solomon? He is the greatest polygamist,—the possessor of a thousand wives! Had this gentleman told me that Solomon's greatness was predicated, and therefore his polygamic birth was approved, and his polygamic marriage also approbated, I can remind him of the fact that the future greatness of Christ was foretold; but the foretelling of the future greatness of the Lord Jesus Christ was not an approval of the betrayal by Judas and the crucifixion by the Jews. Neither was the mere foretelling of the future greatness of Solomon an approval of the polygamic character of his birth.

I suppose the gentleman on this occasion would have referred to the law of bastardy and have said, if my doctrine is true, then Solomon and others were bastards. I could have wished that he had produced that point. He did quote and declare in his temple, not long since, in reference to the law touching bastardy, that a bastard should be branded with infamy to the tenth generation. But it is plain that he has misunderstood the law respecting bastards, as contained in Deuteronomy 23d and 2d. It is known from history that the same signification has not always been attached to this term. We say a bastard is one born out of wedlock, that is monogamous matrimony. In Athens, in the days of Pericles, five centuries before Christ, all were declared bastards by law who were not the children of native Athenians. And we here assert to-day that the gentleman can not bring forward a law from the book of Jewish laws to prove that a child born of a Jew and Jewess, whether married or not, was a bastard. The only child recognised as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman; therefore the objection falls to the ground, and Solomon and others, who were not to blame for the character of their birth, are exonerated.

This geometrical progression of evil in this system of polygamy is seen in the first three kings, Saul, David and Solomon. Saul had a wife and a concubine,—two women; David had ten women, Solomon had a thousand, and it broke the kingdom asunder. God says it was for that very cause. He had multiplied his wives to such an extent, that they had not only led him astray from God into idolatry, but the very costliness of his harem was a burden upon the people too heavy for them to bear. I said the other day that polygamy might do for kings and priests and nabobs, and could not do for poor men; it costs too much and the people are taxed too much to support the harem.

Ah! you bring forward these few cases of polygamy! Name them if you please. Lamech the murderer; Jacob, who deceived his blind old father, and robbed his brother of his birthright; David, who seduced another man's wife and murdered that man by putting him in front of the battle, and old Solomon, who turned to be an idolater. There are some polygamists! Now let me call the roll of honor: There were Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Aaron, Joshua and Joseph and Samuel and all the prophets and apostles. You are accustomed to hear, from this sacred place, that all the patriarchs and all the kings and all the prophets were polygamists. I assert to the contrary, and these great and eminent men whom I have just mentioned, belonging to the roll of honor, were monogamists.

Yesterday the gentleman gave me three challenges; he challenged me to show that the New Testament condemned polygamy. I now proceed to do it. I quote Paul's words, 1st Corinthians, 7th chap., 2d and 4th verses:

“Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

“The wife hath not power of her own body but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.”

Marriage is a remedy against fornication, and this is the subject of the chapter. This is the opinion of Clark, Henry, Whitby,—Langley and others. One great evil prevailed at Corinth,—a community of wives, which the apostle here calls fornication. St. Paul strikes at the very root of the evil and commands that every man have his own wife and that every woman have her own husband; that is, let every man have his own peculiar, proper and appropriate wife, and the wife her own proper, peculiar and appropriate husband. In this there is mutual appropriation and exclusiveness of right, and this command of Paul agrees with the law of Moses in Leviticus 18, 18, “Neither shalt thou take one wife unto another,” and the two are one statute, clear and unquestionable for monogamy and against polygamy. The apostle teaches the reciprocal duties of husband and wife, and the exclusive right of each. In verse four it is distinctly affirmed that the husband has exclusive power over the body of his wife, as the wife has exclusive power over the body of her husband. It is universally admitted that this passage proves the exclusive right of the husband to the wife, and by parity it also proves the exclusive right of the wife to the husband. These relations are mutual, and if the husband can claim a whole wife, the wife can claim a whole husband. She has just as good a right to a whole husband as he has right to a whole wife. First Corinthians, 6th chap., 15th, 16th and 17th verses, says:

“Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of [page 10, column 3] Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.

“What! know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two (saith he) shall be one flesh.

“But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.”

This passage is brought against the idea, but where are the facts? It is objected that if one flesh is conclusively expressive of wedlock, that St. Paul affirms that sexual commerce with a harlot is marriage. For argument’s sake I accept the assertion. The passage in question is: “What? know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body?” “For two,” says he, “shall be one flesh, but he which is joined to the Lord is one spirit.” Now look at the facts of the position, showing the true relation of the believer to Christ. It is illustrated under the figure of marriage. The design of this figure is to show that the believer becomes one with Christ; and the apostle further explains, in reproof of the Corinthians mingling with idolaters and adulterers, that by this mingling they become assimilated and identical. He brings up an illustration that if a man is married to a harlot, not simply joined, but cohabit with or married to a harlot he becomes identical with her; in other words one flesh.

There is a passage which declares that “a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife.” It is asserted that he must have one wife anyhow and as many more as he pleases. It is supposed that this very caution indicates the prevalence of polygamy in that day; but no proof can be brought to bear that polygamy prevailed extensively at that time; on the contrary I am prepared to prove that polygamists were not admitted into the Christian Church, for Paul lays down the positive command, “Let every man have his own wife and every woman have her own husband;” so that if you say the former applies to the

priest, and the latter applies to the layman, what is good for the priest is good for the layman, and *vice versa*.

How often is it asserted here that monogamy has come from the Greeks and Romans. But look at the palpable contradiction in the assertion. It is asserted that monogamy came from those nations; it is also asserted that polygamy was universal at the time of Christ and His apostles. If monogamy came from the Greeks and Romans, then polygamy could not have been universally prevalent, for it is admitted that at that time the Romans held universal sway, and wherever they held their sway their laws prevailed, hence the two statements cannot be reconciled.

Now we come to the words of the Savior, Matthew v, 27 and 28; and xix, 8 and 9, and Mark x and 11 and 12. At that time when the Savior was discoursing with the Pharisees, as recorded in Matthew xix, the Jews were divided as to the interpretation of the law of Moses touching divorce: when a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it comes to pass that she finds no favor in his eyes because he has found some uncleanness in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement. Upon the meaning of the word uncleanness, the Jews differed; some agreed with the school of Rabbi Hillel: that a man might dismiss his wife for the slightest offence, or for no offence at all, if he found another woman that pleased him better; but the school of Rabbi Shammai held that the term uncleanness means moral delinquency. The Pharisees came to Christ, hoping to involve Him in this controversy; He declined, but took advantage of the opportunity to give them a discourse on marriage, and in doing so, he refers to the original institution, saying "have ye not read that in the beginning God made them male and female?" Thus He brings out the great law of monogamy. Grant that the allusion is incidental, nevertheless, it is all important as falling from the lips of the Great Master.

I was challenged to show that polygamy is adultery. The gentleman challenged me, and I will now proceed to prove it. As adultery is distinguished in scripture from whoredom and fornication, it is proper to ascertain the exact meaning of the words as used by the sacred writers. The word translated whoredom is from the Hebrew verb *Zanah* and the Greek *pornica*, and means pollution, defilement, lewdness, prostitution and in common parlance, for whoredom, the prostitution of the body for gain. The word translated fornication is from the same Hebrew verb, and, in general, signifies criminal, sexual intercourse without the formalities of marriage. Adultery is from the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moicheia* and is the criminal intercourse of a married woman with another man than her husband, or of a married man with any other woman than his wife. This is indicated by the philological significance of the term *adulterate*, compounded of two words meaning *to another*, as the addition of pure and impure liquors, or of an alloy with pure metal. Adulterer is from the Hebrew *Naaph* and the Greek *Moiches* which means above.

The material question to be settled is, Is the Hebrew word *Naaph* and the Greek word *Moichos* or *Moicheia* confined to the criminal sexual intercourse between a man, married or unmarried, with a married woman? This is the theory of the Mormon polygamists, but I join issue with them and assert that the scriptures teach that adultery is committed by a

married man who has sexual intercourse with a woman other than his wife, whether said woman is married or unmarried. It is conceded that he is an *adulterer* who has carnal connection with a woman married or betrothed. Thus far we agree.

Now can it be proved that the sin of adultery is committed by a married man [page 10, column 4] having carnal connection with a woman neither *married* nor *betrothed*? To prove this point I argue.

First, that the Hebrew word *Naaph*, translated in the seventh commandment, adultery does include all criminal sexual intercourse. It is a generic term and the whole includes the parts. It is like the word kill in the sixth commandment, which includes all those passions and emotions of the human soul which lead to murder, such as jealousy, envy, malice, hatred, revenge. So this word *Naaph* includes whoredom, fornication, adultery, and even salatial lust. Matthew 5th, 27, 29.

Second. The term adultery and fornication are used interchangeably by our Lord, and mean the same thing. A *married woman* copulating with a man other than her husband is admitted to be adultery, but the highest authority we can bring forward calls the act fornication, Matthew 5th, 3, 2. Romans 7th, 2, 3; 1st Corinthians 7th 1, 4.

Third. The carnal connection of a man with an unmarried woman is positively declared to be adultery in God's holy word. It is so recorded in Job 24, from the 15th to the 21st verse; and in Isaih 57 and 3rd it is taught that the adulterer commits his sin with the whore. Therefore I conclude that the term *Naaph*, as used in the seventh commandment comprehends all those modification of that crime, down to the salatial lust that a man may feel in his soul for a woman.

But it may be asked: If this is so why then, does the Mosaic law mention a married woman? We deny that such a distinction is made. We do admit, however, that special penalties were pronounced on such an action with a married woman, but for special reasons. What were they? To preserve the genealogy, parentage and birth of Christ from interruption and confusion, which were in imminent danger when intercourse with a married woman was had by a man other than her husband. And no such danger could arise from the intercourse with a married man with an unmarried woman. That law was temporary, and was abolished and passed away when Christ came. Under the Jewish dispensation he that cohabited with a woman other than his wife was responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment; the woman was also responsible to God for the violation of the seventh commandment and this special law. But here you say if this be true, then some great men in Bibletimes were guilty of the violation of the seventh commandment. I say they were; but they were not all polygamists: that I have demonstrated to you to-day. But take the facts: Abraham, when convinced of his sin put away Hagar; Jacob lived several years out of the state of polygamy; David put away all his wives eight years before he died; and if there is no account that Solomon put away his, neither is there the assurance that he abandoned his idolatry.

This then, my friend, is the argument; and as a Christian minister, desiring only your good, I proclaim the fact that polygamy is adultery. I do it in all kindness, but I assert it as a doctrine taught in the Bible.

I am challenged again to prove that polygamy is no prevention of prostitution. It has been affirmed time and time again, not only in this discussion, but in the written works of these distinguished gentlemen around me, that in monogamic countries prostitution, or what is known as the social evil, is almost universally prevalent. I perceive that I have not time to follow out this in arguments; but I am prepared to prove, and I will prove it in your daily papers, that prostitution is as old as authentic history; that prostitution has been and is to-day more prevalent in polygamic countries than in monogamic countries. I can prove that the figures representing prostitution in monogamic countries are all overdrawn. They are overdrawn in regard to my native city, that the gentleman brought up, New York, and of the million and over of population he can not find six thousand recorded prostitutes. I can go, for instance, to St. Louis, where they have just taken the census of the prostitutes of that city, and with a population of three hundred thousand, there are but 650 courtesans. You may go through the length and breadth of this land, and in villages containing from one thousand to ten thousand inhabitants, you cannot find a house of prostitution. The truth is, my friends, they would not allow it for a moment. Those men who assert that our monogamous country is full of prostitutes put forth a slander upon our country.

Our distinguished friend referred to religious liberty, and claimed that he had the right under the Federal Constitution to enjoy religious liberty and to practise polygamy. I am proud as he is that we have religious liberty here. I rejoice that a man can worship God after his own heart; but I affirm that the law of limitation is no less applicable to religious liberty than it is to the revolution of the heavenly bodies. The law of limitation is as universal as creation, and religious liberty must be practised within the bounds of decency, and the wellbeing of society; and civil authority may extend or restrict this religious liberty within due bounds. Why, the Hindoo mother may come here with her *Shasta*—with her Bible—and she may throw her babe into your river or lake, and the civil authority, according to your theory, could not interpose and say to that mother “You shall not do it.” That is the theory. You say it is murder, I say it is not. I say the [page 12, column 1] act is stripped of the attributes of murder; it is a religious act. She turns to her bible or *Shasta*, and says “I am commanded to do this by my bible.” What will you do? You will turn away from the *Shasta* and say, “the interests of society demand that you shall not murder that child.” So civil government has the right to legislate in regard to marriage, and restrict the number of wives to one, according to God’s law. But I am not an advocate of stringent legislation. I agree with my friend, that the law should not incarcerate men, women and children in dungeons! No, my friends, if I can say a word to induce humane and kind legislation towards the people of Utah I shall do it, and do it most gladly. But I assert this principle that civil government has the right to limit religious liberty within due bounds.

There was another point that I desired to touch upon, and that is as to the longevity of nations. We are told repeatedly here, in printed words, that monogamic nations are short-lived, and that polygamic nations are long-lived. I am prepared to go back to the days of

Nimrond, come down to the days of Ninus, Sardanapalus, and down to the days of Cyrus the Great, and all through those ancient polygamic nations, and show that they were short-lived; while on the other hand I am prepared to prove that Greece and Rome outlived the longest-lived polygamic nations of the past. Greece from the days of Homer down to the third century of the Christian era; and Rome from seven hundred and fifty years before the coming of Christ down to the dissolution of the old empire. But that old empire finds a resurrection in the Italians under Victor Emanuel and Garibaldi; and England, Germany and France are all proofs of the longevity of monogamic nations. Babylon is a ruin to-day, and Babylon was polygamic. Egypt, to-day, is a ruin! Her massy piles of ruin bespeak her former glory and her pristine beauty. And the last edition of the polygamic nations—Turkey—is passing away. From the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, from the Danube, and the Jordan and the Nile, the power of Mahomedanism is passing away before the advance of the monogamic nations of the Old World. Our own country is just in its youth; but monogamic as it is, it is destined to live on, to outlive the hoary past, to live on in its greatness, in its beneficence, in its power; to live on until it has demonstrated all those great problems committed to our trust for human rights, religion, liberty and the advancement of the race.

My friends, these are the arguments in favor of Monogamy; and when they can be overthrown, then it will be time enough for us to receive the system of Polygamy as it is taught here. But until that great law that we have quoted can be proved to be not a law; until it can be proved that there is no distinction between law and practice; until it can be proved that there is a positive command for polygamy; until it can be proved that Christ did not refer to the original marriage; until it can be proved that Paul does not demand that every man shall have his own wife and every woman her own husband; until it can be proved that polygamy is a prevention of prostitution; until it can be proved that monogamic nations are not as long-lived as polygamous nations; until it can be proved that monogamy is not in harmony with civil liberty; until all these points can be demonstrated beyond a doubt; until then, we can't give up this grand idea that God's law condemns polygamy, and that God's law commends monogamy; that the highest interests of man, that the dearest interests of the rising generation, that all that binds us to earth and points us to heaven are not subserved and promoted under the monogamic system. All these great interests demand the practice of monogamy in marriage,—one man and one wife. Then indeed shall be realized the picture portrayed in the scriptures of the happy family—the family where the wife is one and the husband is one, and the two are equivalent; then, when father and mother, centered in the family, shall bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord,—when the husband provides for his family—and it is said that the man who does not is worse than an infidel,—then indeed monogamy stands forth as a grand Bible doctrine.

THE THREE DAYS' DISCUSSION.

The discussion of the question “Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?” between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate, closed yesterday afternoon, according to arrangement. The arguments on the affirmative and the negative appear in our columns, having been reported in full. The audience on Saturday was much

larger one than Friday's; and yesterday there were fully eleven thousand persons present—the people from the surrounding settlements having come from their homes to listen to the discussion. We should have been pleased to have seen Vice-President Colfax present at this discussion. He would have had an opportunity of properly estimating [page 12, column 2] the act, for which his admirers praised him so much last summer—the making of a few remarks to a few score persons in front of the Townsend House one evening. He had caused, or at least suffered, the impression to prevail that he had performed a wonderfully brave act in making that speech—indeed “bearded the lion in his den;” when the truth was, if he had made his wishes known, instead of selecting a time when nobody excepting a few stragglers, and a few other persons were present to hear him, he might have had the Tabernacle to speak in, and the whole people as listeners.

The fact demonstrated by this discussion, and which we view as being of far higher importance than the discussion itself, is one that has always existed, but which has been repeatedly denied, namely, that free speech on certain topics, especially polygamy, did not exist in Utah. The spectacle witnessed at this discussion was thoroughly unique. We do not state it too strongly when we say that we do not believe it can be paralleled in any part of Christendom. In what other place, or among what other people would a church, chapel or hall be gratuitously furnished to any opponent, and the people suspend business and labor, at a very busy season of the year, and assemble from the surrounding settlements to listen patiently to an assailant of a doctrine which they hold sacred? In what other place could eleven thousand people be gathered together, who would listen as quietly as the audience did yesterday to the condemnation by an opponent of a religious doctrine as firmly believed in and as widely understood as the doctrine of patriarchal marriage is by the Latter-day Saints? We mentally drew the contrast yesterday between the treatment the elders of this church had received in so-called Christian and free cities and commonwealths, not for denouncing existing institutions and doctrines, but for advocating the pure principles of the gospel—the first principles—and we thanked God that a day had, at last, come when the Latter-day Saints could set the world an example in this as in other respects.

There are a few points in Dr. Newman's argument yesterday to which we wish to make reference, because we think that it would be doing Professor Pratt and the cause he advocated great injustice to suffer them to pass in silence. Dr. Newman said, yesterday, “I plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour.” A hearer, or a reader of this remark would imagine that Dr. Newman did not have all the time he wanted to discuss this question; which would be simply untrue. Professor Pratt's propositions, as we have already published, were for each disputant to occupy half an hour alternately, or an hour alternately. Dr. Newman chose the latter. But Professor Pratt placed no limit upon the length of time that should be occupied in the discussion. This Dr. Newman did himself. He proposed that the discussion should hold three days—commence on Friday, end on Sunday. Now, we listened to his remarks yesterday, which we have quoted, and we viewed them as designed to create a false impression.

Another point that created a painful sensation throughout the audience was the light, burlesque style in which he alluded to the words of Jesus. The Doctor said: "Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife, he shall have a hundred. Well he ought to go on foraking. * * * Such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating women for him."

The passage thus ridiculed is found in Matthew 19th chapter, 27-30, also Luke 28th chapter, 28-30, and reads:

"Then answered peter and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee: what shall we have therefore?"

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.

"But many that are first shall be last; and the last shall be first."

He labored hard to show that Midian and Ethiopia were the same country, and therefore, that Moses' Ethiopian and Midianitish wives were one and the same person, and that Moses was a monogamist. The Doctor thinks Josephus good authority; yet that historian informs us that Moses married a daughter of the king of Ethiopia, and that, too, before he fled to Midian and took Jethro's daughter. He plainly shows that, in the days of Moses, Midian and Ethiopia were distinct lands, as separate as the United States and Mexico now are.

This brings us to another point that he endeavored to make respecting bastardy. He said: "The only child recognized as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman."

This he bases on the law of Athens, that those children were bastards who were not born of native Athenians. What, then, according to this definition, were the children of Moses and the Ethiopian and the Midianitish women and those of Boaz and Ruth? Were they kept out of the congregation for ten generations?"

Respecting Abraham he wished his hearers to understand that Hagar was the only woman whom Abraham had children by, excepting Sarah and Keturah. He would have us believe that it was Sarah's anxiety to help the Lord to keep his promise that led Sarah to give him her maid as a wife, and that poor Abraham took the maid because it was Sarah's arrangement; but that he afterwards sent her away by divine command, and then conformed to Dr. Newman's idea of piety and had no more wives; in other words, experienced a change of heart. But, unfortunately for the symmetry of this theory, the Bible says, Genesis 25th chapter, 6th verse:

"But unto the son of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, (while he yet lived) eastward unto the east country."

Was Sarah still anxious to help the Lord to keep His promise, and not satisfied with giving him Hagar, gave him these other concubines? or was this an anxiety of Keturah on the same point? Strange that the ladies in those days should be so anxious to give their husbands wives and concubines. The wives among the Latter-day Saints resemble them marvelously in this respect. But Dr. Newman denies that Abraham was a polygamist, and Dr. Newman ought to be authority; we suppose he is in some places. And this brings us to another point.

We have heard of the wickedness and bagnios of Washington, how that many men occupying high places debase themselves and corruption reigns too widely, but after hearing the arguments of this popular preacher from there, we cease to wonder at this debauchery. He asserts that Abraham, despite his commerce with more than one living wife at a time, was not a polygamist—that he did not have wives by God’s command and permission; but had wives and concubines in violation of God’s law. Jacob, also, had his wives contrary to the same law. Caleb, also, the mighty prince, pre-eminent in Israel for his fidelity; the only one, besides Joshua, who left Egypt a man and lived to enter Canaan, was equally a transgressor; besides numbers of others whose names we need not mention. Yet, in praying, the Doctor offers his petitions to the God of Abraham and Jacob,—to the God who called Abraham his friend and whose highest [page 12, column 4] promise to mankind is that they shall go, if faithful to Him, to Abraham’s bosom! Now if Abraham and Jacob could thus have commerce with women, outside of divine and lawful wedlock, as Dr. Newman says they had, and still be called the friend of God and have their names associated with His who rules eternity, is it any wonder that where ministers labor who teach such monstrous doctrines men has mistresses, frequent houses of ill-fame, and commit every other species of vileness? “Oh! Yes, follow Abraham and Jacob’s examples as I teach them—take mistresses, keep them as long as you please, only take care that when you get old and the fires of life burn low—as Jacob did, eight years before you die—do not have connexion with them, and repent and say you wish you had not done it, and all will be right. Abraham and Jacob have got to heaven, and why not you?”

Are we too severe in drawing these conclusion? We think not. We think the premises warrant them. At any rate we are thankful that such doctrine is so rarely taught in the hearing of the youth of this land.

Another point: Is it fair to call every man a monogamist whose marriage is not mentioned? Why should it not, with equal propriety, be asserted that they were polygamists? If the founders of the nation were polygamists, the heads of the tribes sons of polygamists, would not the nation follow their example? and if because polygamous marriages are not frequently mentioned, neither are any kind of marriage, shall it be concluded, therefore, that there were no marriages?

Space precluded, to-day, the further notice of the points that are open to criticism, and we must forbear.

[page 18, column 1] Correspondence. Between Rev. Dr. Newman
Pastor of the metropolitan Methodist Church, Washington, D. C. and President Brigham
Young.

Salt Lake City, Aug. 8, 1870.

To President Brigham Young,

Sir:—Your last note, delivered to me on Sunday morning, and to which, of course, I
would not on that day reply, does not at all surprise me.

It will be, however, impossible for you to conceal from the public the truth, that will the
full knowledge of my being present in your city for the purpose of debating with you for
your representative the question of Polygamy, you declined to enter into any
arrangements for such a discussion; and after this fact was ascertained, I felt at liberty to
comply with a subsequent request from other parties, which had been fully arranged
before the reception of your note of invitation to preach in your Tabernacles.

I must frankly say that I regard your professed courtesy, extended under the
circumstances, as it was, a mere device to cover, if possible, your unwillingness to have a
fair discussion of the matter in question in the hearing of your people.

Your comments upon “disclaiming and declining the discussion” are simply a reiteration
of the *disclaimer*; while, in regard to your notice of my construction of the article in the
Telegraph of May last, I have only to leave the representations you have seen fit to make
to the judgment of a candid public sure to discover who it is that has been resorting to
“subterfuge” in this affair. Your intimation that Elder Sloan, Prof. Pratt, or hundreds of
other Mormon elders, would be willing to discuss the question of Polygamy with me
from a Bible standpoint, and your impertinent suggestion that I tarry here as a missionary
for that purpose, I am compelled to regard as cheap and safe attempts to avoid the
appearance of shrinking from such discussion by seeming to invite it after it had, by your
own action, been rendered impossible. As to the elders you speak of, including yourself,
being ready to meet me in public debate, I have to say that I came here with that
understanding and expectation, but it was rudely dispelled, on being definitely tested.
Were it possible to reduce these vague suggestions of yours to something like a distinct
proposition for a debate, there is still nothing in your action, so far, to assure me of your
sincerity, but, on the contrary, everything to cause me to distrust it.

I have one more point of remark. You have insinuated that my motive is a thirst for
“notoriety.” I can assure you that if I had been animated by such a motive you give me
small credit for good sense by supposing that I would employ such means. Neither you,
nor the system of which you are the head, could afford me any “notoriety” to be desired.

But, to show how far I have been governed by merely personal aspirations, let the simple
history of the case be recalled.

You send your Delegate to Congress who, in the House of Representatives and in sight and hearing of the whole Nation, throws down the gauntlet upon the subject of Polygamy as treated in the Bible. Being Chaplain of the American Senate, and having been consulted by several public men, I deemed it my duty to preach upon the subject. The discourse was published in the New York *Herald*, and on this reaching your city one of your Elders published an article which is generally construed as a challenge to me to debate the question with you, or some one whom you should appoint, here in your Tabernacle. Acting upon this presumption, I visit your city, taking the earliest opportunity to inform you, as the head of the Mormon Church, of my purpose and suggesting the steps usual in such cases. You then reply, ignoring the whole subject, but without a hint of your “pleasure” about my preaching in the Tabernacle.

Subsequently other arrangements were made which precluded by accepting any invitation to speak in your places of worship. The day passed away, and after sunset I received your note of invitation, my reply to which will answer for itself. And this you intimate is an attempt on my part to obtain an “unenviable notoriety.”

Sir, I have done with you—make what representation of the matter you think proper, you will not succeed in misleading the discriminating people either of this Territory or of the country generally by any amount of verbiage you may choose to employ.

Respectfully, &c.,
J. P. Newman.

[The communication referred to in the letter below was addressed to Dr. Newman by five persons, who asked him whether it was a fact that he was unwilling to debate the question of polygamy now and here, as that was the impression, they say, the DESERET EVENING NEWS and Salt Lake *Herald* conveyed.]
SALT LAKE CITY, AUG. 9, 1870.

To Mr. Brigham Young:

Sir:—In view of the enclosed communications, received from several citizens of this place, asking whether I am ready *now* and *here* to debate the question “Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?” with you, as the Chief of the Church of Latter-day Saints, and in view of the defiant tone of your Church journals of last evening and this morning; and in view of the fact that I have been here now four days waiting to have you inform me of your willingness to meet me in public discussion on the above question, but having received no such intimation up to this time of writing, therefore, I do now and here challenge you to meet me in personal and public debate, on the aforesaid question. I respectfully suggest that you appoint two gentlemen to meet Rev. Dr. Sunderland and Dr. J. P. Taggart, who represent me, to make all necessary arrangements for the discussion.

Be kind enough to favor me with an immediate reply.

Respectfully,
J. P. NEWMAN.

Residence of Rev. Mr. Pierce.

SALT LAKE CITY, U. T.

August 9th, 1870.

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—Your communication of to-day's date, with accompanying enclosure, was handed to me a few moments since by Mr. Black.

In reply, I will say that I accept the challenge to debate the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" Professor Orson Pratt or Hon. John Taylor acting as my representative, and in my stead in the discussion. I will furnish the place of holding the meetings, and appoint two gentlemen to meet Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to whom you refer as your representatives, to make the necessary arrangements.

I wish the discussion to be conducted in a mild, peaceable, quiet spirit, that the people may receive light and intelligence and all be benefitted; and then let the congregation decide for themselves.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

CITY, Aug. 9th 1870.

REV. DR. J.P. NEWMAN:

Sir:—I have appointed Messrs. A. Carrington and Jos. W. Young to meet with Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart, to arrange preliminaries for the discussion.

Respectfully,

BRIGHAM YOUNG.

SALT LAKE CITY, Aug. 9, 1870

TO MR. BRIGHAM YOUNG:

Sir:—I challenged *you* to a discussion and not Orson Pratt or John Taylor. *You* have declined to debate personally with me. Let the public distinctly understand this fact, whatever may have been your reasons for so declining. Here I think I might reasonably rest the case. However, if Orson Pratt is prepared to take the affirmative of the question. "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I am prepared to take the negative, and Messrs. Sunderland and Taggart will meet Messrs. Carrington and Young to-night at 8 o'clock at the office of Mr. Taggart to make the necessary arrangements.

Respectfully, &c.,

J.P. NEWMAN

SALT LAKE CITY, U.T.,

August 10th, 1870

REV. DR. J. P. NEWMAN:

Sir.—I am informed by Messrs. Carrington and Young that at their meeting last evening with Drs. Sunderland and Taggart they were unable to come to a decision with regard to the wording of the subject of debate.

Bearing in mind the following facts: Firstly, That you are the challenging party. Secondly, That in a sermon delivered by you in the city of Washington, before President Grant and his Cabinet, Members of Congress and many other prominent gentlemen, you assumed to prove that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," it certainly seems strange that your representatives should persistently refuse to have any other question discussed than the one, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" It appears to the representatives of Mr. Pratt that if Dr. Newman could undertake to prove in Washington that "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," he ought not to refuse to make the same affirmation in Salt Lake City. Mr. Pratt, I discover, entertains the same opinion, but rather than permit the discussion to fall, he will not press for your original proposition, but will accept the question as you ow state it, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?"

I sincerely trust that none of the gentlemen forming the committee will encumber the discussion with unnecessary regulations, which will be irksome to both parties and unproductive of good, and that no obstacles will be thrown in the way of having a free and fair discussion.

Respectfully,
BRIGHAM YOUNG.
Residence of Rev. Mr. Pierce.

[*Deseret News*, Aug. 17, 1870]

[Transcribed by Erin McAllister, DeeAnn T. Pratt, and Mauri Pratt Oct. 2012]