

that all that is written in the Bible is approved by the Almighty, nor was it written for our imitation. Achan stole a Babylonian garment and a wedge of gold. God did not approve the theft, for we are told that he rebuked him 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 the virtues and the vices of men; they did not disguise the faults even of their eminent friends, nor did they always stop to pronounce condemnation upon such; but they recorded one stream of light, and one book there, that is my standard in this discussion, that 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 a 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 Sweden, and read in this land of liberty,—does that book sanction polygamy?

We now come to another important word,—namely does the Bible sanction? Sanction! By the term sanction we mean command, consequently the authority of positive, written, divine law, or whatever may be reasonably held as equivalent to such. It follows therefore, that toleration is not sanction. Suffrage is not sanction. Municipal legislation is not sanction. An historical statement of prevailing customs is not sanction. A faithful narrative of the life and example of eminent men is not sanction. The remission of penalty is not sanction. A providential blessing, bestowed upon general principles for an ulterior purpose, is not sanction. The only adequate idea of sanction is the divine and positive approbation, plainly expressed, either in definite statute or by such forms of conformation as constitute a full and clear equivalent. It is in this sense that we take the term sanction in the question before us.

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 For it is a well known principle of jurisprudence that if anything have been repealed in the supreme law of the land, which that law once authorized, then it no longer sanctions the matter in question.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could be proved that the Bible once sanctioned polygamy, in the sense accepted, and that this sanction has never been withdrawn, then we are bound to admit that the affirmative has been sustained; but supposing, on the other hand, that the Bible, as it is now, to-day, does not sanction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

There is another word, and one of importance, and that is the term polygamy. There are three words in this connection which should be referred to, the first is polygamy, which is from the Greek *polus*, and *gamos*; the former meaning "many," and the latter "marriage," and signifies a plurality of wives or husbands at the same time. When a man has more wives than one, or a woman more husbands than one at the same time, the offender is punishable for polygamy. Such is the fact in Christian countries. Polygamy is allowed in some countries, as in Turkey. Turn to Webster's Dictionary, page 844, and we shall find the word "polyandry" from *polus*, and *andros*, a man, meaning the practice of females having more husbands than one at the same time, or a plurality of husbands. Then there is another word,—polygyny, from the Greek *polus*, and *gynē*, woman or female, the practice of having more wives than one at the same time. The word, therefore, to be used is not polygamy, but polygyny, for polygyny signifies a man with more wives than one, or a woman with more husbands than one; and it seems to me that if a man can have more wives than

one woman has the same right to have more husbands than one. Then the true word is polygyny, and hereafter we will use the word polygyny, and use the true word polygyny.

This question involves or supposes two systems of marriage: What is commonly called polygamy and what is known as monogamy. On the one hand a man with more than one wife; and on the other, a man with only one wife. You observe therefore that these are two systems essentially and radically different and distinct, the one from the other, and especially so in this controversy. The material question to be decided is, which is the authorized system of marriage, polygamy, or a plurality of wives, or monogamy, or what is termed the one-wife system.

Let us glance for a moment at some of the grand features of monogamy; and we shall thereby see the distinction between the two systems of marriage. Take, for instance, the design of marriage, as originally established by the Almighty in the garden of Eden, in the time of man's innocence. That design was threefold:—companionship, procreation and prevention. Companionship is first: the soul is more than the body. The union of two loving hearts is more than the union of two bodies. Ere Eve was created or she beheld the apple or breathed its balmy atmosphere, God said "It is not good that man should be alone; I will make for him a helpmeet." The animals had passed in review before Adam; but neither among the doves that plumed their pinions in the air of Paradise; nor amid the fish of the deep or the beasts of the field, nor the reptiles of the earth could a companion be found for man. But a special exertion of divine power was put forth that this companion should be made. And she was made! A deep sleep is caused to come upon the first man. There lies Adam upon the ambrosial floor of Paradise, and out of his side a rib is taken, and out of that rib woman was created. And when somebody asked old Martin Luther "why did not God Almighty make the woman out of some other bone of a man than out of the rib?" the answer was:—"He did not make woman out of man's head, lest she should rule over him; He did not make her out of the bone of man's foot, lest he should trample upon her; but He made her out of his side, that she might be near his heart; from under his arm, that he might protect her." The grand primary object of marriage, therefore, is companionship—the union of two loving hearts.

The next design is procreation. It has pleased Almighty God to people the earth by the offspring coming from those united in marriage. This was His wisdom; this was His plan. It is an old saying that history repeats itself; and after the flood had swept away the antediluvians, and after that terrible storm had subsided, there, in the ark, was Noah and his sons and their wives—four men and four women. If Almighty God sanctioned polygamy in the beginning, and intended to sanction it afterwards, why did not He save in the ark a dozen wives for Noah and a dozen for each of his sons? But one wife for Noah, and one wife for each of his sons; and thus the Almighty repeats history.

The next design is prevention—namely to prevent the indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes. God loves chastity in man and in woman, and therefore He established marriage. It is a divine institution, lifting man above the brute. He would not have man as the male of the brute creation—mingling indiscriminately with the females; but He establishes an institution holy as the angels'—bearing upon its brow the signet of His approval, and sanctioned by the good and all ages. He establishes this institution that the lines may be drawn, and that the chastity of male and female may be preserved.

On passing from this question of design, let us go to the consideration of the very nature of marriage. It is two-fold. It is an institution, not a law; it is a state, not an act; something that has been originated, framed, built up and crowned with glory. It is not an act of mere sexual intercourse, but it is a state run parallel with the life of the married pair, unless the bonds of marriage are sundered by one crime—that is adultery. Then consider the grand fact that there are solemn obligations in this institution of marriage. Nay, more than this, the very essential elements of marriage distinguish it in its monogamic, from the institution of marriage in its polygamic condition. There is choice, preference of one man for one woman; and when we come to the question of the census that will demonstrate it clear as the sunlight; when we come to that question we will prove the equality of the sexes: we will prove that there is not an excess of marriageable women either in this or any other country. Therefore the grand advice of Paul: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." It is a fact, and every man is to have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, then I say that this great idea of choice is fully sustained, of preference on the part of a man, and also preference on the part of a woman. And around this institution God has thrown guards to protect it; indeed, He has surrounded it with the muniments which seem to be as high as heaven, and wherever the obligations, or so long as the obligations of marriage are observed, then these defenses stand impregnable and the gates of hell shall not prevail against marriage. First, there is its innocence; the union of a man with his wife, is an act as pure as the devotion of angels in heaven. Then comes the nobleness of marriage; the bed undefiled is honorable in all; but whoremongers and adulterers will God judge. Then notice the sanction of divine and human law that surrounds this institution; the law that was given amid the awful thunders of Mount Sinai is a grand muniment of this monogamic institution. In all civilized, Christian countries civil legislation has extended the arm of the law to protect marriage. Then recall the affinities of the sexes: the natural desire of man for woman, and the natural desire of woman for man. There may be some exceptions, but in general we find an old bachelor in the world; but a man without a wife is only half a man. Now and then we find a woman in the world who is styled an "old maid;" but a woman without a husband is only half a woman. Adam, in the beginning, was a perfect human, possessing the strength, dignity and courage of man, with the grace, gentleness and beauty of woman. After Eve's creation he retained the strength, dignity and courage; but lost, with Eve, the grace, beauty and gentleness; so that now takes the union of one man, with the sterner qualities, with

one woman, with the gentler graces, to produce one perfect humanity, and that is the type of marriage, as instituted by Almighty God, and as approved by His divine law.

And now, I desire to run the parallel between the two systems, showing how the one is destructive of the other. Take, for instance, the element, namely the design, and see how polygamy strikes at the institution of marriage in that regard. I now refer to companionship, the union of two loving hearts to the exclusion of a third. A man may love three or more friends; he may love three or more children; he may love three or more brothers or sisters; but God has so ordained the law of affinities between the man and the woman that companionship can only be secured to the exclusion of a third person. Ah! what a pleasure it is for a man when away from home to know, "I shall soon return to the bosom of my wife, and my little children will climb upon my knee and lap the child's welcome at my return." And he hastens from afar to the embraces of that wife. And then what an almost infinity of joy it is on the part of the woman, whose husband is far away, to know that he is coming. Says she, "I will stand in the doorway and will watch his returning footsteps." He is coming to me, to my embrace, to my home prepared for me. And with what pride and care the busy housewife arranges for his return! How neat and beautiful everything is! The bouquet of flowers is on the table, the best viands are spread on the board, and everything in the house is prepared with the utmost care! But oh! what a gloom comes down upon the poor woman's soul when she knows that he returns not to her, but returns to one, two, three, four, twelve, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or more. Then see how the system works against the next design,—namely procreation. It is a fact that in polygamous countries one sex or the other has preponderance in numbers. Some good authorities say the females preponderate, others say the males. I do not know, I do not care a rush which preponderates; all that I say is that in polygamous countries, there is a preponderance of one or the other; while in monogamic nations the great law of equality is brought out. According to some authorities the tendency of polygamy is to make all males; according to other authorities to make all females; and if either follow, then comes the destruction of the race, and within a hundred years the earth is depopulated and is a howling wilderness.

Take the influence of polygamy on what may be properly called the rights of marriage, and these rights are two-fold:—authority on the part of the man, and protection on the part of the woman. The man is the head of the family; the man is the legislator and executive; while he is endeavoring to perform the marriage ceremony without including that word when I address the woman "will thou obey the man?" That is God's authority, and every true and loving wife will obey her husband in the Lord as readily as she obeys the Lord Jesus Christ. But while man is the legislator and executive, while he is endeavoring with authority as his right, so on the other hand, protection belongs to, and is the natural and inalienable right of the woman. See that ivy as it entwines around the oak! That grand old oak has sent down its roots and takes hold of the very foundations of the earth, and its branches tower up towards the sky. See that ivy how it entwines itself gently, sweetly and beautifully around the old oak!

"A thing of beauty is a joy forever." So woman entwines herself, the tendrils of her affection go out and they entwine themselves around the man; and what must be the depth of the depravity to which that man has fallen who ruthlessly tears asunder these gentle tendrils of affection! What the ivy is to the oak, the woman is to the man; and it is for man, in his pride and glory, in his strength and energy, with his strong arm to protect her, but it is for woman, in her lowliness and protection. But how is it possible under the system of polygamy for these great rights to be preserved? It is true that the man retains his right and authority; this system augments and multiplies that authority. This system is one of usurpation, extending a right over the larger number that is not included in God's law. But, on the other hand, where is the right of woman? Where is the protection for a whole soul? A whole body for a whole body, and a whole life for a whole life! Just like the shells of the bivalve: they correspond with each other! Just like the two wings of a bird, male and female. So precisely this great idea of reciprocity, mutual affection and reciprocal love is developed in this idea of monogamous marriage. But polygamy, it seems to me, strikes down the right of woman; in other words, it divides the protecting power of man in proportion to the number of wives that he possesses; and it seems to me that in view of the distribution of worldly goods in this life a man can support and protect but one family. Kings, who can tax a whole people; Kings who can build palaces and rear pyramids; Kings who can marshal their armies on the banks of the Rhine, and who have their harems—their plurality of wives; but the poor man, doomed to toil, with the sweat of labor on his brow, how is it possible for him to provide for more than one family? Yet if the king in his glory has the right to have a plurality of wives, so also has the poor man, who is doomed to toil, the same right; and God Almighty in making this law for a plurality of wives, if He has made it, which I, of course, question, why did He make it, then He has not made provision for the execution of that law; or, in other words, He has not made provision for its immunities to be enjoyed by the common people. It is a law exclusively for nabobs, for kings and high priests; for men in power, for men possessing wealth, and not for me, a poor man, or for you, [pointing to the audience] a poor laborer. God Almighty is just, and the king is no more before Him than a poor man; the poorest of His creatures are as well as the highest; all are alike unto Him. I ask you, therefore, to-day, would He enact a law, sanctioning,—commanding a plurality of wives, without making a provision that every man should be in such financial circumstances as to have a plurality of wives and enjoy them? See, therefore, how these two systems of marriage are antagonistic one against the other! And, after hearing this exposition of the nature and the elements and the rights and the muniments of

marriage, it is for you to infer which is the system which God ordained in the beginning.

My distinguished friend has hastily reviewed many passages of Scripture, all of which, my friends, I shall notice. I will lift them to the bottom. My only regret is that my distinguished friend, for whose scholarship I have regard, did not deliberately take up one passage and exhaust that passage, instead of giving us here a passage and there a passage, simply skimming them over without going to the depths, and showing their philological relation and their entire practical bearing upon us. When my friend shall give us such an exegesis and analysis, whether he quotes Hebrew, Greek or Latin, I will promise him that I will follow him through all the mazes of his exposition and I will go down to the very bottom of his argument.

I feel bound, to-day, my friends, in my opening speech to give this analysis of the question and to present to you my ideas of marriage in contradistinction to the idea of marriage held here as polygamous.

Now I presume that I will pass to the consideration of a few of the salient points which my distinguished friend threw out.

Let us see in relation to the text he quoted, "If brethren dwell together," though he wanders back, and it was difficult for me to see what relation the antediluvians, and what relation old Adam had to this passage; but he referred to the antediluvians and to Adam, and he also referred to Lamech. Who was Lamech? He is the first polygamist on record, the first mentioned in the first two hundred years of the history of the world. He had two wives; and what else did he have? He had murdered in his heart and blood on his hand, and I aver that whoever analyzes the case of Lamech will find that the murder which he committed grew out of his plurality of wives; in other words it grew out of the polygamy which he had attempted to introduce into the world. Said he to his wives, "I have slain a man, and the inference is that this man had come to claim his rights."

My friend says that Cain was a murderer, and went down to the land of Nod; but he doesn't exactly know the geography; but it was somewhere. And there he found a woman and married her. Now I affirm this, that when Cain killed his brother Abel he was not married, and he didn't go down to the land of Nod; therefore the murder he committed didn't grow out of monogamy, and seems to have had no relation to monogamy; but it grew out of this fact: these two brothers came before the Lord to present their offerings. Cain was a deist, a moralist as we may say, that is he had no sins to repent of. He therefore did not bring the little lamb as a sacrificial offering, but he came with the first fruits of the earth as a thank offering. He came before God Almighty and says, "I have no sins to atone for, none at all; but here, I am conscious that thou hast created me and that I am dependent upon thee, therefore I present to thee the first fruits of the soil." Abel comes with his thank offering. He brings his lamb and lays it upon the altar, and that lamb pre-empted the offering of Cain, who is "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;" and if there is any record that Abel brought a thank offering, it is a principle in theology and in scriptural exposition that the whole includes the part, just as Saint Paul says, "I beseech you, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice to God; Do you think that he excluded the soul? No, he speaks of one as including the other. So the offering which Abel presented was an offering sacrificial in its nature, pointing to Christ. Now, perhaps by sending down fire from heaven, or at all events in some significant manner, God recognized the righteousness of Abel and expressed a preference for his offering over Cain's; and his pride belched forth and he slew his brother. The murder, therefore, had no reference, directly or indirectly to marriage, while the murder which the first polygamist mentioned in history committed grew out of the marriage relation.

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

Now, my friends, that first marriage in the garden of Eden is the great model for all subsequent marriages: one man and one woman. My friend says that God could have made more if He had chosen; but He did not do so; and He signed that all us men should be polygamists, and that polygamy should be the form of marriage, that in the very beginning He would have started right, that is, He would have made a number of women for the first man. Ah! what a grand sanction that would be; but instead of that He makes one man and one woman, and says "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." This is not merely an historical fact; were it so I think the argument would be with my friend. But as I come along the stream of time I find this fact referred to as expressing a great law. I hear old Malachi repeating the same words, referring to this institution of marriage in the garden of Eden, reproving the Jews for their practice of polygamy, putting the pungent question to their conscience, "Why have ye dealt treacherously with the wife of your youth?"—Your first wife, the one with whom you went to the bridal altar and swore before high Heaven that you would forsake all others and cleave unto her so long as you both live. "Ah!" that old prophet asks, "why have ye dealt thus treacherously with the wife of your youth and the wife of your covenant?" God hates this putting away, says the prophet, and then he refers to Eden as a type for his proof. The reason is purely monogamous, and that

in the beginning God created one woman for one man, and one man for one woman.

When the Pharisees propounded a question to the Lord Jesus Christ, touching divorce, He refers to the same grand idea spoken of by the Prophet Malachi: "Have ye not read that in the beginning God created them male and female?" Thus re-enacting, as it were, the marriage law; thus lifting marriage, which had been stained by polygamy, from its degradation, and re-establishing it in its monogamic purity. And then St. Paul, corroborating the words of Jesus, [at this point the umpire said the time was up] refers to the marriage in Eden, and says "God created them, male and female, one flesh." This is the great truth brought out in the Bible.

[SPECIAL TO THE DESERET NEWS.]  
**By Telegraph.**

Per WESTERN UNION Telegraph Line.

**FRANCE.**

PARIS 12.—The Journal of Metz publishes McMahon's report to the Emperor. The report says the enemy in the attack at 7 o'clock on Saturday morning. The first attack having been repulsed about noon the enemy reopened the contest throwing forward numerous sharpshooters, protected by six guns in a commanding position. Masses of infantry were then brought up and at four o'clock in the afternoon McMahon was forced to order a retreat, which was effected in good order. The enemies pursuit being without vigor and by no means troublesome. The Marshal was able to send only a partial list of killed and wounded.

A dispatch from Metz, dated Aug. 11, at 8.15, p.m. says, it has rained all day. The army is concentrated in and around this place being re-located and reinforced. The retreat of McMahon has been fully accomplished in excellent order. Bazaine is visiting and inspecting the troops under his command. Reports that the Prussians occupy Nancy and Metz.

The Tribune's special from Chalons, Wednesday, writes: "The road is lined with stragglers and drunken soldiers, belonging to the Garde Mobile. The latter are being drilled with the greatest dispatch, only a portion are armed, the remainder are exercised with sticks. The camps are full of wounded from the front. It is believed that Prussia has offered peace. No news is allowed to reach the front, and constant suspicions are expressed. The wounds made by the Prussian guns are not severe, but the effects of the metralliers are fearful. The same correspondent writes on Thursday morning, the disorder here in every department is great. The English papers often speak of mismanagement in the French army but if these writers saw the state of things here, they would think English management perfect. Now that every one is called to arms, it appears there are no arms to give them. It is actually contemplated issuing to part of the Garde Mobile old flint muskets. There are only fifteen Chassepots here. Canrobert's corps have been sent to Metz. He expects to join it from Paris."

**FOREIGN NEWS.**

**GREAT BRITAIN.**

Declines Austria's proposed league.—Desperate action fight.—Met in London.—Enthusiasm at Brussels.—The Times on Napoleon.—The Heavens in England.—The Bank of France suspended payment.

LONDON.—The Telegraph formerly contradicted the report that the Prince Imperial is in London, who is the son of the late Emperor Napoleon III. There was an enthusiastic demonstration on Thursday night before the palace of the British legation at Brussels.

The Times this morning says the pride of France is wounded and her prestige dimmed. He who brought this on her must suffer for it. Victorious or discredited is Napoleon's alternative on the next battle field.

Prussian accounts say nothing at Keonigsauer could equal the destruction of life at Worth. Some believe Napoleon was on the field with McMahon. At the French headquarters they are in entire ignorance of the details of the battle of Worth, but they believe that it was important and decisive. Experiments at Shoeburyness with metralliers are said to have been splendidly successful. The press gives glowing accounts of the range and accuracy of the weapon.

The Bank of France has suspended specie payment.

LONDON, 12.—A desperate fight occurred to-day at Derry between Orangemen and Catholics. Three killed and several wounded. The military were compelled to interfere.

The Berlin correspondent of the Times, writes that England has declined to join Austria in the league proposed by Baron Von Bismarck for guaranteeing the belligerents against loss of Territory. England's reason for declining is that the league could not save the North German confederation in the case of Prussia being defeated.

A cable special to the London correspondent of the New York Herald, who was present at the Battle of Worth, telegraphs the following from Carlsruhe, the French Official account of the Battle at Worth are wholly untrue. McMahon was completely routed. The French abandoned everything and fled, leaving behind their killed, wounded and prisoners, numbering twenty thousand, out of fifty thousand engaged. The French held a strong position but the Prussians fired with terrible precision, the French very badly. Both sides fought desperately and finally the French gave way in panic. The accounts representing Strasbourg still in communication with Nancy are untrue. Strasbourg has been completely besieged since Monday and the gates are shut. Heavy Artillery is now on the way for the Prussians. A stout resistance is expected. The Crown Prince is vigorously pursuing McMahon and another engagement is expected. It is believed the object of the Prussians is to get between Metz and Paris.

**SPAIN.**

Discussion in the Council of State. MADRID.—Violent discussions have broken out, in the council of State. At the last sitting a scene occurred be-

tween Gen. Prim and the President of the Council.

The republicans hail with joy the news of the Prussian victories. In them they see hopes of a French republic, and consequently one for Spain also. The monarchists are losing confidence.

MADRID, 12.—A manifesto had been issued by the leaders of the Republican party, which demands a convocation of the Cortes and revision of the monarchical clause of the Constitution.

**CUBA.**

The War to be Prosecuted.

The Spanish authorities intend to make a great effort to suppress the Cuban insurrection during the coming winter. Twelve thousand troops will be sent out in September.

**DENMARK.**

(Alexandria Genl.)

The Princess of Wales has left Copenhagen. Her precipitate departure indicates that Denmark will soon be actively engaged in the war.

**PRUSSIA.**

Retaliation.—French Prisoners.—The doings of the Wurtemberg troops.—The French March out as the Prussians March in.—King William's Proclamation to the French.

BERLIN, 11.—It is reported that a proclamation will soon be issued, declaring the intention of the Prussian forces to burn a French village for each German post bombarded by the French fleet.

BERLIN, 12.—Midnight.—Two thousand, two hundred and sixty-five French officers and soldiers taken in the battle of last Saturday have just arrived.

A Stuttgart dispatch, says that in the battle of Worth, the 1st corps of the Wurtemberg contingent lost six officers and twenty three men killed, 237 wounded, and 118 missing. At Gersweiler the Wurtemberg troops captured, one mitrailleuse, three cannon, one staff carriage, 2,200 prisoners and five hundred horses.

McMahon marched out of Sourin on Sunday night on one side of the town just as the Prussians were marching in at the other.

The King of Prussia has issued the following proclamation: "We, William King of Prussia, make known to all the inhabitants of French Territory occupied by the German forces, that the Emperor Napoleon, having by sea and land attacked the German nation who are eager to live in peace with the French people, have taken command of the German armies, to repel the aggression and by military events have been led to pass the French frontier. We war against soldiers, not citizens, therefore, the latter may continue secure in the possession of their property so long as they abstain from hostilities, and we grant them protection, as a matter of right. The Generals commanding Corps will decide what measures are necessary toward individual communities violating the usages of war, they will also regulate the equity necessary to sustain their troops, and fix the difference of exchange between German and French currency in order to facilitate the dealing of soldiers and citizens. Signed, William, given at Saarbrück on the eleventh day of August, 1870."

The Bavarian army has passed through Vöges and bivouaced last night at Dornburg near Saarbrück. General Sheridan has left Berlin for the King's headquarters.

**ARRIVALS AT THE TOWNSEND HOUSE.**

AUGUST 12th, 1870.  
James Walsh, Chicago  
Edward McQuaid  
Henry G. Warren Pa  
Joseph T. Matheua, England  
R. B. Matheua  
Don McQuaid  
Don Geo. B. Lake and family  
W. F. Thompson.

**ARRIVALS AT SALT LAKE HOUSE.**

AUGUST 12th.  
J. N. Seibert, Ogden  
Saml. Houston, Tex.  
Chas. Graham, New York  
M. O. Nichols, Searka City, H. R.  
Wm. Samelson and wife San Francisco  
M. Keaton, Provo city  
M. Saffor  
J. R. Jenkins, England  
N. N. Hawkins, Detroit  
A. S. Tryne  
A. S. Gault, Ogden  
P. S. Payne.

AUGUST 13th.  
E. Lawrence A.  
W. H. H. H.  
S. W. Howland, San Francisco.  
C. Walcott, England  
S. H. Walter, Royal Engineers  
Henry Simons, Phila.  
Miss Fannie Simons, Phila.  
S. Deppen, Bremen Germany

**NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.**

**AT SOCIAL HALL,**

**Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday,**

**AUGUST 15, 16 & 17.**

**MUSEUM**

**OF LIVING WONDERS!**

The Tallest Lady in the World!  
The Largest Man on Exhibition!  
The Beautiful Ol. Canadian Girl!  
And the Illustrious Hero!

Making Four of the most INTERESTING CURIOSITIES Ever placed before the Public.

**TWO EXHIBITIONS EACH DAY!**

AFTERNOON from 2 till 5 o'clock.

EVENING from 7 till 10 o'clock.

6223 3

**WANTED!**

A FIRST CLASS WOMAN COOK, to go to a Western Hotel, wages will be paid. Apply to W. JONES, Rovers House.

6221