



GEORGE Q. CANNON.....EDITOR

Wednesday,....August 24, 1870

THAT DISCUSSION AGAIN.

WONDERFUL self-control was exhibited on Sunday afternoon by the audience who listened to the remarks of Dr. Newman. He used such contemptuous language concerning the men of ancient days—the prophets and patriarchs—for whom the people entertain the highest reverence and regard that they were shocked; yet they remained quiet, and no expression of feeling escaped, except from a few persons when he stated that patriarchal marriage, or as he called it, polygamy, was adultery. The thought involuntarily suggested itself to the mind: how different Dr. Newman's expressions concerning David to the Savior's. According to Dr. Newman, he was everything that was infamous. Jesus in speaking to the Revelator John, (Revelations, xxi chap., 16th verse.) calls himself "the root and the offspring of David." He did not feel ashamed of his descent from the polygamist whom Dr. Newman thus derides; on the contrary, if we should judge by the expression of the Scriptures on this point, he was proud to avow it. The crimes of David in committing adultery and murder were very dreadful ones; we do not wish to palliate them; but Dr. Newman conveys the idea that they followed because he was a polygamist! His marriage with more than one wife was, according to his statement, a great sin—the great crime of his life, of which, however, he thoroughly repented. But what are the facts concerning David? Is there a single passage of scripture to prove that he committed sin by marrying his wives, or that he ever regretted doing so? No; on the contrary, Nathan, speaking in the Lord's name says:

"I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have moreover given thee such and such things."

The Lord gave them to him. This is emphatic. No evasion can change this. If there were room for doubt on this point, however, which there is not, the words recorded in I Kings 15 chap., 5 verse, would entirely remove it:

"Because David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that he commanded him all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite."

Now, we have the choice between Dr. Newman and the Bible. He says David did commit great sin in marrying wives. The Bible says that he did not; or in its own words: "he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and turned not aside from anything that he [the Lord] commanded him all the days of his life, save in the matter of Uriah the Hittite." Here is Dr. Newman on the one hand, and the Bible on the other; which shall we believe?

Dr. Newman has what he calls a roll of honor. It was necessary, in his style of dealing with this subject, to have it, to bolster up his sophistries. He calls the bearers of the honored names which he mentions in that connection, monogamists. Several of them were polygamists, as is easily proved, and it is barefaced assumption to say of some others of them, that they were monogamists. It is true that their marriages are not mentioned; but as their nation was a polygamous one, we have as much right (and we think more) to say they were polygamists, as he has to say they were monogamists. But would their acts have escaped his denunciation had the Bible left it beyond dispute—as it does of Jacob, Gideon, David and Solomon—that they were polygamists? Would he not in that case have called Noah a drunkard, Moses a murderer, Aaron an idolator, or the maker of a golden calf for the people to worship? Even Abraham only escapes his condemnation as an adulterer (in fact he calls him this) because he tries to make out that he was not a polygamist!

He says "that the Hebrew word

Naaph, translated in the seventh commandment, does include all criminal sexual intercourse," and then jumping at the conclusion that polygamy, or the taking of more wives than one, is criminal, he proclaims that polygamy is adultery. There was a law in Israel against adultery. The adulterer was punished with death. How did Caleb, then, escape the penalty and remain the honored man he was in Israel, when, according to the Doctor's own statement, he was a polygamist? Let his statement stand—that the Hebrew word *naaph*, translated in the seventh commandment, does include all criminal sexual intercourse, and what must we conclude? Conclude, of course, that Caleb, Gideon, and the father of the prophet Samuel, David and the many other polygamists of whom the Bible speaks, were not guilty of criminal sexual intercourse when they entered into plural marriage; but that in the sight of the Lord and the law which he had given to Moses, they were blameless. His attempt, therefore, to show that polygamy is adultery fails.

The Doctor quotes Paul: "Let every man have his own wife, and every woman have her own husband," as though this passage favors monogamy; but it applies to polygamy equally with monogamy. In fact, it is more literally and perfectly fulfilled under the former than under the latter institution.

In no single point does Dr. Newman's antagonism to the Bible appear more glaring than in the language he uses respecting the men who practiced plural marriage. He tries to prove that Abraham was an adulterer: yet God calls him His friend. He stigmatizes Jacob in the vilest manner; yet God says He is the God of Jacob. He denounces Gideon, in strong terms; yet Paul has him, Jacob and other polygamists, inscribed in his "roll of honor" as men who, through faith, "subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises," &c. He cannot find language too severe to speak of David; yet Jesus calls himself the Son of David. And so we might go on adding proof to proof that his view of the ancient worthies as far from being the true one as darkness is from light. All that we have cited of these ancient servants of God is strictly historic, and according to a statement of the Dr. in his opening speech, there is this difference in reading the historic portions of the Bible, and history as related by Xenophon and others anciently, and Howe, Bancroft, etc., in modern times—the history of the Bible is absolutely true.

Can any one imagine for a moment that if the marriages of these men were a sin in the sight of Heaven that they would have escaped condemnation? Prophets and apostles proclaimed against every sin; they spoke in language that could not possibly be misunderstood concerning the crimes of the people; but what prophet or apostle condemned the marriages of the patriarchs? Did they denounce their taking more wives than one? Never; on the contrary they held them up as examples for their children to imitate. John saw, and has written in Revelations xxi chap., 12th verse, that the names of the twelve patriarchs, those sons of Jacob born in polygamy, were written on the gates of that holy city, the holy Jerusalem, which is to descend out of heaven from God! What an honor for a man's children, who, if we may believe Dr. Newman, repented for forty years his share in begetting them! Surely, if Jacob had seen what John saw, instead of being sorry for having had four wives and twelve sons, he would have felt delighted and praised the Lord. Jesus, too, the descendant of polygamous ancestry, He who rebuked sin with unsparring severity, never reflected upon His progenitors for their marriages. But said He to the Jews, when they boasted of their descent from grand old Abraham, the man who had wives and concubines, the father of the faithful and the friend of God:

"If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."

What works? Dr. Newman says that Abraham was an adulterer. Was it such works that Jesus said the Jews should imitate? If the Dr.'s theory were correct about Abraham's actions, the Jews could claim justification for having commerce with women outside of wedlock, and who could condemn them? Certainly not Doctor Newman. And this brings us again to one of the points we reached yesterday: With Dr. Newman's belief and views respecting Abraham as he sets them forth, is it any wonder that when he tells men to do the works of Abraham that they think

themselves justified in keeping mistresses and patronizing women other than their wives?

It was very amusing to hear Dr. Newman's assertions about the effect of plural marriage on procreation. He said:

"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 this, that good, reliable authorities say that in polygamic,—mark you, polygamic 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 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."

Reliable authorities truly, one side asserting that which the other denies! But who are these "reliable authorities" who contradict each other so flatly, and who, because of their contradictions, are quoted by Dr. Newman? Assertion is cheap, it can be made without trouble. But the facts, judging by the results of plural marriage in this country, both sexes preponderate where that system prevails, and it would puzzle "reliable authorities" to tell which is the most numerous. The representatives of Dr. Newman recognized this fact when they made it one of the "conditions" of the discussion that children under eight years of age were not to be admitted. Would they have thought of such a condition in any other place than Utah?

Shall we believe his statement that the destruction of the race, the depopulation of the earth and its change to a howling wilderness, are to follow the practice of plural marriage? We hope he believes it himself, and that he will persuade everybody in Washington and throughout the nation that he is a reliable authority upon this point. Because if the destruction of "Mormonism" and the conversion of Utah to modern civilization be desirable, there need be no attempt made to prohibit polygamy by legislative enactment or otherwise; let that system prevail, and the destruction of the race, according to this statement, inevitably follows! Messrs. Cullom, Cragin & Co., please take notice!

In Friday's remarks the Doctor was very emphatic in his declaration that the Lord hates the putting away of wives—a sentiment that we heartily endorse. He also dwelt upon companionship and the law of affinities. It is said that a gentleman who sat behind him, and who was very officious on that day, winced at these remarks, and his countenance assumed an injured expression, as though he thought the Doctor was getting personal. We wonder if the putting away, with which he is charged, had any influence in bringing about his appointment to Utah, where he could set the "Mormons" an example of civilization and teach them law? Such men are the kind who generally think themselves under special obligations to raise a howl about plural marriage and to denounce men who take wives and maintain them honorably, instead of putting them away.

WHAT A SPECTACLE!

THERE is a depth of pathos about the following extract, which we take from a correspondence written to a Chicago paper from this city, that is very touching. The poor wretch who writes it deserves sympathy. Probably he will receive it. He writes about the recent election:

"I said we had no organ. From an unfortunate misunderstanding and difference, arising from the absence of any recognized political authority, the only Gentile paper in the Territory has been running a man of its own, or was doing so up to within two or three days of the election. Here was the spectacle of an organ without a party and a party without an organ, and nobody, apparently, capable of bridging over the gulf."

We could not, if we had tried, have written a better description of the outfit alluded to than is here given. "An organ without a party and a party without an organ!" Woeful spectacle! After all the efforts that had been made to collect delegates, to make speeches, to bring about unity, not to speak of the red-eye whisky that was drunk on every possible occasion, it is truly pitiable to be compelled to make such a report!

POLEMICS AND POLYGAMY.

THE Missouri Democrat, (St. Louis,) in alluding to the correspondence com-

menced by Dr. Newman with President Young, which it calls "sensational," after quoting from the letters, and noticing specially President Young's statement repudiating the *Telegraph* as his organ, says:

"On this statement of facts it is affected to be assumed that Brigham Young 'backed out' of the challenge. This certainly is, as the lawyers say, a *non sequitur*, for no man should be held to be bound by the utterings of an unauthorized agent. If any doubt existed as to Young's willingness to allow Dr. Newman to argue against polygamy before a Mormon congregation, those doubts must have been dispelled by a note which Brigham addressed to Dr. Newman, at a subsequent period of the same day or which he refused to be bound by the *Telegraph*."

The *Democrat* then publishes the note which President Young wrote, inviting Dr. Newman to speak to the congregation in either or both of the Tabernacles on Sunday.

THE REVISION OF THE BIBLE.

THE revision of the authorized version of the holy scriptures has now fairly commenced in England. After having been acknowledged and accepted in all English-speaking countries for between two and three centuries, King James' translation is to be superseded by one translated more in accordance with the style spoken by the educated English and English-speaking people at the present day.

The propriety of conducting the work under the auspices and authority of Parliament was canvassed in the House of Commons, but the decision arrived at was adverse to such a proposition, and it was left entirely to the clergy; it being hinted, however, that the government might interpose if, when the revised version was submitted to the whole people for sanction, its power was necessary to give it authority.

The proposition for revision emanated from the Episcopal clergy, or rather the dignitaries—archbishops and bishops—of the English State Church, who claim the existence of many inaccuracies in the present version, and assert the great necessity for their correction. Although the Episcopalians were the ones to propose revision the work of re-translation will by no means be confined to them. The originators of the scheme have invited the co-operation of learned men belonging to other denominations to assist them. The Committee of Convocation, sixteen in number, with the Bishop of Winchester as Chairman, was appointed on the sixth of last May; the commencement of the task was set for the latter part of June.

The committee consists of men eminent as Greek and Hebrew scholars, and to the former will be entrusted the New Testament; to the latter the Old Testament. They have separated into two companies, for the performance of their task. They will work separately, but will communicate to each other the results of their labors. Of the Hebraists engaged on the Old Testament nine are members of the original committee, the remainder, eighteen in number, not Episcopalians, having accepted the invitation to assist. In the New Testament revision there will be eighteen Dissenters and seven Episcopalians. Besides the gentlemen actually engaged in the work of revision, the advice and suggestions of other eminent scholastic divines and authorities, in Europe and America, have been solicited.

All proposed alterations and changes are to be decided by majorities, and none are to be accepted unless there is a two-thirds' vote in its favor. In case of a discussion on any passage the decisive vote is not to be taken until the next subsequent meeting, so that all prejudice may have had time to subside. It has been estimated that the amount of revision and change will average one correction to each verse in the entire Bible; the change thus wrought would be enormous; but the proposal is to rigidly test every change before it is adopted.

The importance of the work to which these learned gentlemen have devoted themselves can not very well be overestimated. The Bible, containing, as it does, the plan of human redemption, is justly entitled to be considered the book of books, and any attempt to change the text thereof should be conducted with extreme caution. As it is, it contains enough, and so plain that all may understand, to remodel the world, and to establish a universal reign of justice and truth, if its principles were carried out. And while it is desirable to have a strictly correct translation, and the task of