

of this passage. But John Milton had them in succession. But more than this, for argument's sake grant the position assumed by my friend, then the numerical element of the argument must come out, and a man can only have two wives but no more. Do you keep that law here? And yet that is the argument and that is the logical conclusion.

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

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

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

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

The 14th verse of the same chapter says:

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

He therefore sees thee with indignation join thyself in marriage to one of those who had committed fornication or spiritual idolatry, lest they should raise up children who, by the power of example, might lay themselves under the terriblest of idolatry. The prophet is directed to get a wife of whoredoms; and, after this, he is directed to go and love an adulterous woman. My friend cites these as examples where God makes an exception to a general law. He also cites the case of Abraham offering up his son Isaac, and the case of consanguinity, in Deuteronomy xxv, from 5th to 10th verse. Now the first three cases were merely typical; the first two were designed to set forth more impressively the relations between God and His people. The case of consanguinity has nothing to do with polygamy. It is only a modification or exception in special cases for the preservation of the families of Israel from extinction. Where, therefore, I ask, is the general law?

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

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

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

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

Now, I come to the assumptions by the gentleman. First, that there is no law condemning or forbidding polygamy. Has he proved that? Second, that the Hebrew nation, as it was in the wilderness, when the Mosaic code was given, was polygamous. Has he proved that? Can he find in the whole history of the Jewish nation from the time they left Egypt to the time they entered the land of Canaan, can he find more than one instance of polygamy? Perhaps he may find two. I will be glad to receive that information, for I am a man seeking light, and to-day I throw down a challenge to your eminent defender of the faith, to produce more than two instances of polygamy, from the time the Jews left the land of Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. I will assist him in his research and tell him one, and that was Caleb. Now supposing that a murder should be com-

mitted in your city, would it be fair for Eastern papers to say that the Mormons are a murderous people? No, I would rise up in defence of you! I would say that that is a crime and an injury to the people here! Yet, during a period of forty years we find one man out of two millions and a half of people practicing polygamy, and my friend comes forward and assumes that the Israelites were polygamists?

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

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

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

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

We to-day then challenge for the proof that as a nation the Jews were polygamous. One or two instances, as I have already remarked, can be adduced. We may say again that if, as he assumes, these laws were given to regulate the existing system, this does not sanction it any more than the same thing sanctions sheep-stealing or homicide. He said these laws were general, applying to all men, married or unmarried. Has he proved it? This is wholly gratuitous. There is no word in either of these passages which permits or directs a married man to take more than one wife at a time. I challenge the gentleman for the proof. It is no evidence of the sanction of polygamy to bring passage after passage, which, he knows, if construed in favor of polygamy, polygamy must be in direct conflict with the great organic law recorded in Leviticus 18, 18.

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

DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION POLYGAMY?

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

Third and Closing Day.

PROF. ORSON PRATT.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

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

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

Yesterday I was challenged by the Reverend Doctor Newman to bring forth any evidence whatever to prove that there were more than two polygamist families in all Israel during the time of their sojourn in

the wilderness. At least this is what I understood the gentleman to say. I shall now proceed to bring forth the proof.

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

"Even all they that were numbered, were six hundred thousand, and three thousand, and five hundred and fifty."

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

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

Now let us examine these dates in connection with polygamy. If we suppose the average numbers of wives to have been seven, in each household, though there may have been men who had no wife at all, and there may have been some who had but one wife; and there may have been others having from one up to say thirty wives, yet if we average them at seven wives each, we would then have one husband, seven wives and seventy-five children to make up the average number of eighty-three in the family, in a polygamic household. This would give an average of over ten children apiece to each of the 210,000 polygamic wives, when we deduct the 30,000 husbands from the 603,550 men over 20 years old we have 573,550 unmarried men in Israel. If we deduct the 210,000 married women from the total of 1,003,550 over twenty years of age, we have 793,550 left. This would be enough to supply all the unmarried men with one wife each, leaving still a balance of 20,000 unmarried females to live old maids or enter into polygamic households.

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

Having brought forth these statistics, let us for a few moments examine more closely these results. How can any one assume Israel to have been monogamic, and be consistent? I presume that my honored

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

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

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

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