

TERMS FOR THE SEMI-WEEKLY:	
One Copy one year	\$5.00
Six months	\$3.00
Three months	\$1.50
TERMS FOR THE WEEKLY	
One Copy one year	\$10.00
Six months	\$6.00
Three months	\$3.00

**"DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLY-GAMY?"**  
Discussion between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate.

Second Day.

After the opening with religious exercises 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. 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 Polygyny? and as the word polygyny appears to be discarded and is not used, it would be better to use the word polygyny. Perhaps the Bible may not have the term right; 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 originals have not been in existence to our knowledge for the last eight or 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 judgment in the matter; nor for any other learned man to set up his judgment. I would rather take the translation known as King James', made by the able translators chosen in his day; men of 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 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 is translated by competent 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 polygyny, 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 lascivious 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 lascivious 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 extended as well as in its restricted and abridged application. I do not feel like shrinking 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; or 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 this Bible, King James' translation, passage after passage was brought forth to prove the divine sanction of polygamy; direct commands in several instances; where in 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 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 Polygyny? and as the word polygyny appears to be discarded and is not used, it would be better to use the word polygyny. Perhaps the Bible may not have the term right; 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 originals have not been in existence to our knowledge for the last eight or 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 judgment in the matter; nor for any other learned man to set up his judgment. I would rather take the translation known as King James', made by the able translators chosen in his day; men of 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 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 is translated by competent 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.

Now, then, we will proceed to the fourth, or rather to the fifth position he took; that is the great question of marriage established in the Bible. "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. He says the Bible, "Cain and Lamech, his wife, bore him a son and a daughter." I agree with the reverend gentleman. Another object he says is procreation. I agree with the reverend 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 polygamy assist in the multiplying of the human species? If 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. In this 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 procreation on the part of the husband, on the part of the father, is preserved. Therefore it is more consistent, were reasonable, first, for a man to permit marriage of the wicked only to permit marriage, perhaps for a wise purpose, 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 law, 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 number, that every man must have 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 sends 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 with

the cause; and I presume it will be a knowledge 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 judgment. 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 the 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 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 it is to 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 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 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 the principle in the Bible we have not found it; the other is expressed there, and we have proved it, and will 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 reverend gentleman. Another object he says is procreation. I agree with the reverend 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? If 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. In this 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 procreation on the part of the husband, on the part of the father, is preserved. Therefore it is more consistent, were reasonable, first, for a man to permit marriage of the wicked only to permit marriage, perhaps for a wise purpose, 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 law, 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 number, that every man must have 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 sends 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 with

polygamy 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 the Gileadites, we have named, he had seventy-two. Now, we have nothing to do with the righteousness of these men, or their unrighteousness, 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 polygamist or the monogamic form. If Gileadites 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 all 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. There 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 Lord. Moses, I think, 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 scriptures, that the marriages of the wicked are not approved by the Lord. 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 unrighteous woman is a marriage in which God has joined the two together. You might as well take the ordinance of baptism, and say that Simon Magus, when he went forward and was baptized had complied with the ordinance 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 sight of Heaven. Reasonable, is it not? Would he permit the marriage of the wicked only to permit marriage, perhaps for a wise purpose, 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 law, 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 number, that every man must have 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 sends 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 with

out 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 it 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 themselves and families 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 forth 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 the Bible to be 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 arguments 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 the poor people from being the "awful beastly" people they are represented to be. 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 the 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 it; 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 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 intemperance practiced in all the cities of this great nation; and then because a few individuals in this mountain Territory are practicing 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 plea 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 umpire announced the time was up.)

DR. NEWMAN Rose and Said:

MESSES, 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. If, 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 it is to me the responsibility 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 have done for before me to the passages which he adduced, and had I another hour, I would have produced them then. I will do to-day. Now my learned friend will take out his pencil, for he will have something to do this afternoon.

My friend supposes, that the Almighty might have created more women than one out of Adam's rib; but Adam had no more than one wife. 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 regarding to Gilead 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. He said that 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 center. It is the law in botany that the flowers open their funnels to receive 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? He has produced no law 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 word, therefore, I will not spend another 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 natural principle, mandatory or prohibitory in reference to that subject; and 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, namely, a general principle, that polygamy is forbidden in God's holy word in Leviticus xviii and is it 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 adum ad Americanum*. 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, and to say, 'besides the other, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time.' 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 favors 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 Cookes, by the eminent Dwight Adams, 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 seek the meaning of the law 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, ye did not do; and after the doings of the land of Canaan, wherein ye walked ye did 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, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." etc.

(Continued on last page.)