

ing 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 Midianish 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

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 begat 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 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; 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 to 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 130 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 chapter, 2nd and 3rd 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 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 adulter-

ess"—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-

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 recording biographical history. They recorded the virtues and the vices of men; they did not disguise the fault 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 has 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