

GEORGE Q. CANNON.

EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Saturday, August 13, 1870.

THE DISCUSSION.

OUR readers, who were present at the Discussion yesterday, will agree with us that Messrs. Sloan and Evans have succeeded admirably in obtaining very excellent phonographic reports of the arguments of Prof. Pratt and Dr. Newman. We think that the friends of the latter gentleman will readily concede that full justice has been done to his argument in the report which Mr. Evans has made of it, and that it is as perfect a report of what was said as is possible for human skill to give. We do not believe that a single word has escaped the reporter. We are much gratified to have it in our power to do Dr. Newman this justice. Our numerous readers, and they comprise the people of every one of our settlements, shall not miss, if we can help it, a single word of his arguments. We want every Latter-day Saint in these mountains to know all he has to say. Yesterday, a very numerous audience, considering the brief time there was for circulating the notice, assembled in the New Tabernacle to hear the discussion. Handbills and placards were struck off at this office yesterday morning, after it was known that an arrangement for the discussion had been completed, and numbers of our citizens volunteered to carry them around to all parts of the city. Telegrams and messages have been sent to the neighboring settlements to inform the people of the discussion; and many have traveled in their wagons and carriages last evening and night from Utah County and from other places, and many more by rail this morning from the north, to be present to-day and to-morrow to hear the disputants. Before the discussion terminates Dr. Newman will have the opportunity of speaking to assemblies, larger by many odds, than he ever addressed, we presume, in his life before. The people are desirous of hearing for themselves; they are not afraid to have the principles they have espoused tested by the Bible.

One of the conditions of the discussion, which were signed by the representatives of Professor Pratt and Dr. Newman, was that there were to be no manifestations of dissent or approval during the progress of the discussion. We hope that this rule will be strictly observed and enforced. Whatever feelings may be aroused, let them be restrained. If utterance be given to improper remarks, let the umpires call the person making them to order, and let the audience maintain that decorum and good order for which meetings in the Tabernacles are remarkable.

COMING.—Our telegraphic dispatches inform us that Ex-Secretary Seward, arrived at Chicago last evening, on his way to California, from whence we understand, he will cross the Pacific Ocean, visit Japan and China and possibly India. We expect that the venerable statesman will pay a flying visit to this city on his way westward.

MUSEUM OF LIVING WONDERS.—Such is the title of an exhibition advertised in our columns to-day, to take place in the Social Hall in this city on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday next. The troupe consists of Miss Anna Swan, the tallest lady in the world, Miss Z. de la Lutz, a beautiful Circassian girl, Monsieur Joseph, the colossal French Giant, and Major Green, only thirty-eight inches high. The crowded state of our columns prevents us saying more on the entertainment in this issue.

OUR LATE ELECTION.—The Omaha Herald of the 10th inst. says:

"The victory of Hon. W. H. Hooper over Noxwell in Utah shows a majority of more than twelve to one. The theory is, of course, that a lawless Congress will hold Mormon votes void, and give Mr. Hooper's seat to Noxwell. Not at all. The will is good enough, but the thing will not be done. Usurpations are becoming odious."

MUSEUM AND MENAGERIE.—A very interesting and valuable collection of shells, corals, minerals, natural and other curiosities, chiefly illustrative of Scandinavia and Northern Europe, has been received at this institution from O. F. Due, Esq., of Copenhagen. These important additions to the European department of the Museum are in excellent condition, notwithstanding the difficulties incidental to transit from such a distance. They were brought here, as already noticed in our columns, by Jesse N. Smith, Esq., on his return from his Presidency over the Scandinavian Mission.

Our advertising patrons will please excuse us to-day, on account of a press of matter.

A FISH STORY.—The following comes amongst our Eastern telegrams:

"A remarkable discovery has been made by some sewer diggers in Monroe Street, Brooklyn. About twenty-four feet below the surface they discovered a petrified whale, within which they found an iron box, containing a small quantity of old Spanish gold coin."

Fishy, decidedly. Here is another:

"A petrified monster very like a whale, and weighing ten tons, has been discovered in Nevada. It lies on a high plateau in a position giving rise to the theory that its locale was once a great shoal, and the antediluvian leviathan flourished and perished on its surface as the water receded."

Where's our Mammoth now?

St. Louis, 12.—President Grant was presented with a petition, while visiting the Merchants exchange to-day, praying him to pardon O'Neil and other Fenian violators of the neutrality laws. He said he would give it his consideration.

"DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLY-GAMY?"

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

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—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 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 verses:

"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 bears him children, thou shalt not reckon the beloved's son as the first-born, but the son of the hated; for he is 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's 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 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, 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 family 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 maid-servant, 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 without money." I think from the nature of this passage that it certainly does have reference to the 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, as I have done, that 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 are now in the hands of 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 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 comes under 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 himself, 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; but he shall give her a dowry, as he gave her when he married her. My husband's brother refused 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 up to it, and say, I like not 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 him, because he refused to raise up unto 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.

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 in a permanent footing, equal in legality to that of a single wife. 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, thousands, of polygamists 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 side by side 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 marriages 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 in the land of Nod, Cain must have taken his wife with him, and there 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 us 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 Eve had been given to Adam to cultivate the garden of Eden, he was to 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 advised 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 men of Midianites; and having smote them, 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 the children of Israel, through the counsel 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 Midianite women being brought into the camp of Israel contrary to the law of God, not being wives; and Israel was punished 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? They might have them lawfully. Some might have been kept as servants and not as wives, but as I said there had not been great danger of Israel sinning again with so many thousands of 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 practiced among the children of Israel for 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 on her, and shall remain in thine house, as thou didst command."

"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 on her, and shall remain in thine house, as thou didst command."

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 Midianite 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 hath lain 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 a monogamist or a polygamist, if he committed this crime, if he found a maid and committed the crime then specified, of seduction, there is the law; he shall marry her, and shall not 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 of Christian nations—there is a vast amount of prostitution, houses of ill-fame, and prostitution of various forms; now, if this law, which God gave to Israel, had been re-enacted by the law makers 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 another 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"—("eleven minutes more.") Perhaps I may avail myself of the privilege hereafter in discussing these points, and pass on to some other passage.

The next passage which I will refer you to is in 2d Chronicles, 24th chapter, 23d, 34th, 35th and 36th verses:

"And Josiah 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 begat sons and daughters."

According to the ideas of monogamists Jehoiada must have been a very wicked man, and Josiah a "beastly polygamist" for taking two wives. We will take the man who received the wives first. Josiah, who received the wives from the highest authority God had on the earth, did "right in the sight of the Lord" 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 know 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; and hundred and thirty years old he was 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 to Josiah, 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 130 years, a very long age in those days.

But Josiah shall have to hasten on, which I had not time to quote. The next will be found in Hosea, 1st chap., 2d and 3d verses. "The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea." This was the introduction of Hosea as a prophet. No doubt he brought the evidence 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, who has 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 places the Lord pointed out who should not follow, 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 lay 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 for me 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; but because it is now commanded. (At this point the umpires said the time was up.)

Dr. J. P. Newman then arose and 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 the 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 eminent gentleman makes that the main manuscripts are lost, is a bagatelle. I throw 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 contained 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 become 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 done.]

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 minations; of laws and precepts, of promises and threatening; of poetry and of narrative; 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 imperfections and with all its excellencies, and he has spoken to us in terms by which we can understand his pleasure concerning us. But it is a great fact, my friends,

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