THE THREE DAYS' DISCUSSION.

THE discussion of the question "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" between Professor Orson Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U. S. Sanate, closed vesterday afternoon, according to arrangement. The arguments on the affirmative and the negative appear in our columns, having been reported in full. The audience on Saturday was a much larger one than Friday's; and yesterday there were fully eleven thousand persons present—the were not born of native Athenians. people from the surrounding settle- What, then, according to this definition, ments having come from their homes to listen to the discussion. We Ethiopian and the Midianitish women should have been pleased to have seen Vice-President Colfax present at this discussion. He would have had an opportunity of properly estimating the act, for which his admirers praised to have hearers to understand that Hagar was the derivative of the congregation for the act, for which his admirers praised to have should have been pleased to have and those of Boaz and Ruth? Were and those of Boaz and Ruth? Were they kept out of the congregation for the congregatio him so much last summer—the making the only woman whom Abraham had proceed to bring forth the proof. of a lew remarks to a few score persons children by, excepting Sarah and show that there were of males, over twenty in front of the Townsend House one Keturah. He would have us believe years of age, (Numbers 1st chapter 49th given against adultery its enormity was evening. He had caused, or at least that it was Sarah's anxiety to help the suffered, the impression to prevail that bearded the lion in his den;" when the truth was, if he had made his wishes known, instead of selecting a time when nobody excepting a few stragglers, and had made to Dr. Newman, that there were two and a half millions of Israelites. Now I shall take the position that the females among the light was stranged to Dr. Newman, instead of selecting a time when nobody excepting a few stragglers, and Newman's lide. a few other persons were present to hear him, he might have had the Tabernacle to speak in, and the whole people as listeners. The fact demonstrated by this discus-

sion, and which we view as being of far higher importance than the discussion itself, is one that has always existed, but which has been repeatedly denied, namely, that free speech on certain topics; especially polygamy, did not exist in Utah. The spectacle witnessed at this discussion was thoroughly unique. We do not state it too strongly when we say that we do not believe it can be paralle ed in any part of Christwhat other people would a church, to any opponent, and the people susend business and labor, at a very busy season of the year, and assemble from the surrounding settlements to listen patiently to an assailant of a doctrine which they hold sacred? In what other place could eleven thousand people be gathered together, who would listen as quietly as the audience did yesterday to the condemnation by an opponent of a religious doctrine as firmiy believed in and as widely understood as the doctrine of patriarchal marriage is by the Latter-day Saints? We mentally drew the contrast yesterday between the treatment the elders of this church had received in so-called Christian and free cities and commonwealths, not for decouncing existing institutions and doctrines, but for advocating the pure principles of the gospel-the first principles-and we thanked God that a day had, at last, come when the Latter-day Saints could set the world an example in this as in other respects.

There are a few points in Dr. Newman's argument yesterday to which we wish to make reference, because we think that it would be doing Professor Pratt and the cause he advocated great injustice to suffer them to pass in silence. Dr. Newman said, yesterday. "I plead for more time; my friends plead for more time; but time was denied us, I am therefore restricted to an hour." A hearer, or a reader of this remark would imagine that Dr. Newman did not have all the time he wanted to discuss this question; which would be simply untrue. Professor Pratt's propositions, as we have already published, were for each disputant to occupy half an hour alternately, or an hour a ternately. Dr. Newman chose the latter. But Professor Pratt placed no limit upon the length of time that should be occupied in the discussion. This Dr. Newman did himself. He proposed that the discussion should hold three days-commence on Fritened to his remarks yesterday, which we have quoted, and we viewed them as designed to create a false impression.

seu-ation throughout the audience was the light, burlesque style in which he alluded to the words of Jesus. The Doctor said: "Why, they somewhere quote a passage that if a man forsake his wife, he shall have a hundred. Well he ought to go on forsaking." "Buch a man would keep the Almighty busy they were polygamists? If the founders 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. creating women for him."

in Mathew 19th chapter, 27-80, also would not the nation follow their ex-

Luxe 28th chapter, 28-30, and reads:

and Ethiopia were the same country. and therefore, that Moses' Ethiopian and Midianitish wives were one and the Discussion between Professor Orses same person, and that Moses was a monogamist. The Doctor thinks Josephus good authority; yet that historian informs us that Moses married a daughter of the king of Ethiopia, and that, too, before he fled to Midian and took Jethro's daughter. He plainly shows We have assembled ourselves in this that, in the days of Moses, Midian and

he endeavored to make respecting bas- affimative, and also on the side of the negatardy. He said: "The only child recog-

This he bases on the law of Athens. that those children were bastards who were the children of Moses and the

Lord to keep his promise that led Sarah

"But unto the sons of the concubines, which Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts, and sent them away from Isaac his son, (while he yet lived) eastward unto the east country."

Was Sarah still anxious to help the Lord to keep His promise, and not satisfied with giving him Hagar, gave him these other concubines? or was this an anxiety of Keturah on the same point? Strange that the ladies in those days should be so anxious to give their husbands wives and concubines. The endom. In what other place, or among wives among the Latter-day Saints resemble them marvelously in this reschapel or hall be gratuitously furnished pect. But Dr. Newman denies that Abraham was a polygamist, and Dr. Newman ought to be authority; we suppose he is in some places. And this out of every five hundred persons. brings us to another point. We have heard of the wickedness and

bagnios of Washington, how that many men occupying high places debase themselves and corruption reigns too widely, but after hearing the arguments of this popular preacher from there, we cease to wonder at this debauchery. He asserts that Abraham, despite his commerce with more than one living wife at a time, was not a polygamist—that he did not have wives by God's command and permission; but had wives and concubines in violation of God's law. Jacob, also, had his wives contrary to the same law. Caleb, also, the mighty prince, pre-eminent in (srael for his fidelity; the only one, besides Joshua, who left Egypt a lies in all. Now comes another species of man and lived to enter Canan was calculation founded on this data: Divide man and lived to enter Canaan, was equally a transgressor; besides numbers | 22,273 first-born males, and we find one firstof others whose names we need not mention. Yet, in praying, the Doctor offers his petitions to the God of Abraham and Jacob, -to the God who called Abraham his friend and whose highest promise to mankind is that they shall go, if faithful to Him, to Abraham's bosom! Now if Abraham and Jacob could thus have commerce with women. outside of divine and lawful wedlock. as Dr. Newman says they had, and still be called the friend of God and have their names associated with His who rules eternity, is it any wonder that where ministers labor who teach such seven, in each household, though there may have been men who had no wife at all, monstrous doctrine men have mistresses, frequent houses of ill-fame, and commit every other species of vileness? "Oh! Yes, follow Abraham and Jacob's examples as I teach themtake mistresses, keep them as long as you please, only take care that when you get old and the fires of life burn low -as Jacob did, eight years before you dle-do not have connexion with them, and repent and say you wish you had not done it, and all will be right. Abraday, end on Sunday. Now, we list ham and Jacob have got to heaven, and why not you?

Are we too severe in drawing these conclusions? We think not. We think Another point that created a painful the premises warrant them. At any rate we are thankful that such doctrine is so rarely taught in the hearing of the youth

of the nation were polygamists, the The passage thus ridiculed is found not heads of the tribes sons of polygamists, how can any one assume used to have been monogamic, and be consistent? I presume that my honored friend, notwithstanding his great desire neither are any kind of marriages, shall it be concluded, therefore, that there were no marriages?

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say into you, That ye which have followed me, notice of points that are open to critinotice of points that are open to criti-The passage thus ridiculed is found heads of the tribes sons of polygamists,

He isbored hard to show that Midian BOES THE BIBLE BANCTION POLY

Pratt and Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the U. S. Senate. Third and Closing Day.

PROF. ORSON PRATT. LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

congregation in the third session of our dis-Ethiopia were distinct lands, as separate as the United States and Mexico now are.

This brings us to another point that tive. This afternoon one hour is allotted to nized as a bastard by Jewish law is a child born of a Jew and a Pagan woman."

man."

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 dis-

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.

The statistics of Israel in the days of Mose

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

Newman's idea of piety and had no were over twenty years of age. I assume ing to the logic of the gentleman, that cirmore wives; in other words, experienced this for this reason, that from the birth of Moses down until the time that the Israelchange of heart. But, unfortunately ites were brought out of Egypt, some eighty for the symmetry of this theory, the years had elapsed. The destruction of the male children had commenced before the male children had commenced before I 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 i 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 we heard yesterday afternoon, reads thus: would this make from the birth of Moses, or "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her siseighty years? It would amount to 800,000 males above that of the males. But I do not wish to take advantage in this argu- was the law according to King James' ment by assuming too high a number. I will diminish it one half, which will still will diminish it one half, which will still tors Dw.ight and Edwards, and several other, is the language of these passages. leave 400,000 more females than males. This other celebrated commentators, disagree Will any person pretend to say that a mar-The females, then, over twenty years of age would be 663,550, added to 400,000 surplus women, making in all 1,003,550 women over

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 versa numbered 22,273. Families having no male children over one month old we may sup pose to have been in the ratio of one-third o 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, makingthirty thousand famitwenty-five hundred thousand persons by bern male to every 112 persons. What i 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-ene 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 connecand 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 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 226,000 unmarried females to live old maids or enter into polygamic

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 Having brought forth these statistics, let us for a few moments examine more closely

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, whis 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

But we are informed by the reverend

of marriage throughout all Israel.

Doctor that the laws given for the regula-tion of matters in the polygamic form of marriage bear upon the face of it the conmarriage 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
social evil; and to the excise laws passed
social evil; and to regulate intempertures were joined together one to another. in our own country to regulate intemper-ance; 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 de-nounce it as a crime. And when God tures make penal laws, they denounce as relation to quarrels between blood relaof God against murder, It was denounced as a crime by the very penalty attached, which was death; and when the law was marked by the punishment-the criminal was so denounced when the law was given. God gave laws to regulate these things in cumcision 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 conducted was probably given to prevent such vexademn the Passover as being immoral because tions between blood relations—between birth of Moses; how many years before, I how it should be conducted. Does that conknown not. The order of King Pharaoh was demn 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 naver do! logic will never do! Now, then, we come to that passage in Levitious, 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 "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, translation. My friend, together with Docwith that intrepretation; 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, 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 theu 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 found in the Hebrew but eight times. Now, we have not been favored with these authorities we have had no access to them. Here in these mountain wilds it is very

ing the likeness of one thing to another, which is correct. But does the language 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 apeice to each of the 210,000 polygamic wives. When we deduct to her sister," while tikkah is translated by King James' translated "to her sister;" lo is translated "neither;" while tikkah is translated by King James' translators "shalt thou take a wife to her sister," veishab being translators being translators "while tikkah is translated by King James' translators "shalt thou take a wife to her sister," veishab being translated by King James' translators "shalt thou take a wife to her sister," veishab being translated by King James' translators "el-ahotah being translated by King James' translators "el-ahotah being translated" to her sister, "old the her sister, being translated to her sister, being translated to her sister, "el-ahotah being translated translated to her sister, being translated to her sister, being translated to her sister, being translated translated to her sister, being translated t take." They have certainly given a literal translation. Appeal to the Hebrew and you will find the word ishah occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "wife." The word abotah translated by King James' translators "a sister," occurs hundreds of times in the Bible, and is translated "sister." But are these the only translations,—the only renderings? ishah, when it is followed by abot has another rendering. That is when "wife" is followed by "sister" there is another rendering.

Translators have no right to give a double translation to the same Hebrew word, in the same phrase; if they translate veishah one they are not at liberty to translate the same will find the word ishah occurs hundreds they are not at liberty to translate the same word in the same phrase over again and call it wife. This Dr. Edwards, or some other monogamist has done, and inserted this false translation in the margin. What object such translator had in deceiving the public must be best known to himself; he probably was actuated by a zeal to find some law against polygamy, and concluded to manufacture the word "wife" and place it in the margin, without any original Hebrew word to represent it. Ahot, when standing alone, is rendered sister; when preceded by ishah, is rendered another. The suffix ah, attached to ahot, is translated "her;" both together (ahot-ah) are rendered "her sister," that is, sister's sister; when ahot is rendered "another," its suffix ah represents "her" or more properly the noun they are not at liberty to translate the sam

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

to another?" Because they saw a necessity for it. There is this difference; in all the other seven passages where the words Veishah el-ahotah occur, there is a noun in the nominative case preceeding them, denoting something to be coupled together. Exodus 26th chapter, 3rd verse contains ishah elahotah twice, signifying to couple togother the curtains one to another, the same words being used that are used in this text. Ge to the fifth verse of the same chapter, and there we has e the loops of the curtains joined together one to another, the nown in the neminative case being expressed. Next go to Ezekiel, 1st chapter, 9th, 11th and 23d verses; and these three passages give the But in the text under consideration no such noun in the nominative case occurs; and hence the English translators concluded to give each word its literal translation.

The law was given to prevent quarrels which are apt to arise among blood relations. We might look for quarrels on the other side between women who were not related by blood; but what are the facts in tions? Go back to Cain and Abel. was it spilled the blood of Abel? It was a blood relation, his brother. Who was it that cast Joseph into the pit to perish with hunger, and afterwards dragged him forth from his den and sold him as a slave to persons trading through the country? It was blood relations. Who slew the was to be stoned to death. It was a crime, and seventy sons of Gideon upon one stone? It was one of their own brothers that hired men to do it. Who was it that rebelled against King David and caused him with all his wives and household, excepting ten concubines, to flee out of Jerusalem? It was his blood-relation, his own son Absalom. Who quarreled in the family of Jacob? Did Bilhah quarrel with Zilpah? No. Did Leah quarrel with Bilhah or Zilpah? No such thing is recorded. Did Rachel quarrel with either of the hand-maidens? There is not a word concerning the matter. The little, petty difficulties occurred between the two sisters, blood relations, Rachel and Leah. And this law

> sister and sister. Having effectually proved the marginal reading to be false, I will now defy not only the learned gentleman, but all the world of Hebrew scholars, to find any word in the original to be translated "wife" if ishah be first translated "onc." (The speaker was here informed he had only fifteen

> I am informed I have only fifteen minutes. I was not aware I had spoken a quarter of the time. I shall have to leave this sub-

minutes left.)

ject and proceed to another The next subject to which I shall call your attention is in regard to the general or unlimited language of the laws given in the besides the other in her life-time." That various passages which I have quoted. If a was the law according to King James' man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other, is the language of these passages.

Will any person pretend to say that a mar-he denies the assertion made yesterday that person is a man, it proves that the law is applicable to married men, and if so it rests with my learned friend to prove that it is limited. Moreover, the passage from the margin in Levitious was quoted by Dr. Newman as a great fundamental law by which all the other passages were to be overturned. But it has failed; and, therefore, the other passages quoted by me, stand good unless something else can be found by the learned gentleman to support his forlorn hepe.

Perhaps we may hear quoted in the answere to my remarks the passage that the future king of Israel was not to multiply wives to himself. That was the law. The word multiply is construed by those opposed to polygamy to mean that twice one make two, and hence that he was not to multiply wives, or in other words, that he was not to take two. But the command was also given that the future king of Israel was not to multiply horses any more than wives. Twice one make two again. Was the future king of Israel not to have more than one horse? The idea is ridiculous! The future monogamists, interested in sustaining mono-king of Israel was not to multiply them; not gamy. According to Dr. Edwards, the words to have them in multitude that is, only to

which we translate 'a wife to her sister' are take such a number as God saw proper to give them. We might next refer you to the uncle of Ruth's dead husband, old Boaz, who repre-sented himself as not being the nearest kin. difficult to get books. In each passage they There was another nearer who had the Divine right to take her, and this other haprefer to inanimate objects; that is, in each of the eight places where the words are found. We have searched for them in the pened to be the brother of Boaz, perhaps a little older. Josephus tells us, according to the learned gentleman, that this oldest broth-Hebrew and can refer you to each passage where they occur. And each time they was a married man. Suppose we admit it. Did Boaz not know his brother was married refer to objects joined together, such as wings, loops, curtains, &c., and signify when he represented him as the nearest of coupling together. The gentleman reads the passage "Thou shalt not take one wife to another," and understands it as involving the likeness of one thing to another, "He had the right to marry har. This, then, we arrive at by the assistance of Josephus; and it proves that married men were required which is correct. But does the language forbid, as the margin expresses it, the taking of one wife to another? Not We have the privilege according to the rules or articles of debate, which have been read this afternoon, to apply to the original Hebrew. What are the Hebrew words—the original—that are used, Veishahel-shotah lo tikkah; this when literally translated and transposed is "neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister." veishab being translated by why a sife should not be reason. Matthew, in regard to divorces, and also in Malachi, on the same subject, Malachi, or the Lerd by the mouth of Malachi, informs the people that the Lord hated putting away. He gave the reason why a wife should not be put away. Not a word against polygamy in either passage But there is certain reasoning introduced to show that a wife should not be put away. In the beginning the Lord made one, that is a wife for Adam that he might not be alone. oman was given to man for a companion that he might protect her, and for other holy purposes, but not to be put away for trivial causes; and it was cause of condemnation in

hose days for a man to put away his wife. But there is not a word in Malachi condemn-But there is not a word in Malachi condemnatory of a man marrying more than one wife. Jesus also gives the law respecting divorces, that they should not put away their wives for any other cause than that of fornication; and he that took a wife that was put away would commit adultery. Jesus says, in the 5th chapter, that he that putteth away his wife for any other cause than fornication causes her to commit adultery. Then the husband is a guilty accomplice, and if he puts away his wife unjustly he is guilty of adultery himself, the same as a confederate in murder is himself a murderer. As an adulterer he has no right to

word? It does not mean dwelling nor refuge as asserted in the New York Herald by Dr. Newman. Four passages are quoted by him in which the Hebrew word for dwelling occurs, but the word translated "duty" of marriage, is entirely a distinct word from that used in the four passages referred to. Does not the learned Dr. know the difference between two Hebrew words? Or what was his object in referring to a word elsewhere in the Scripture that does not even occur in the text under considera. tion? In a Hebrew and English Lexicon (published by Josiah W. Gibbs, A. M., Prof of Sacred Liter, in the Theology School in Yate College,) page 160, it refers to this very Hebrew word and to the very passage, Ex. xxxi: 10, and translates it thus: -"cohabi. tation,"-"duty of marriage." "Duty of marriage," then is "cohabitation:" thus God commands a man who takes another wife, not to diminish the duty of cohabitation with the first. Would God command undiminished "cohabitation" with a woman merely betrothed and not marrieo?

While I have a few moments left let me refer you to Hosea. I wish all of you when you go home, to read the second chapter of Hosea, and you will find with regard to Hosea's having divorced his first wife because of her whoredoms, that no such thing is recorded as stated by Mr. Newman yester. day. The Lord tells Hosea to go and speak to his brethmen, (not to his son); to his sisters, (not his daughter,) of the house of Israel, and tell them what the Lord will do; that he may not acknowledge them any longer as a wife. Hosea bore the word of the Lord to Israel whom his own two wives represented, saying that their whoredoms. their wickedness and idolatries had kindled the anger of the Lord against them. Having discussed the subject so far

eave it now with all candid persons to judge. Here is the law of God; here is the command of the Most High, general in its nature, not limited, nor can it be proved to be so. There is no law against it, but it stands as immoveable as the Rock of Ages, and will stand when all things on the earth and the earth itself shall pass away.

DR. J. P. NEWMAN Said:

RESPECTED UMPIRES, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I had heard, prior to my coming to your city that my distinguished opponent was eminent in mathematics, and certainly his display to-day confirms that reputation. Unfortunately, however, he is incorrect in his statements. First, he assumes that the slay. ing of all the male children of the Hebrew, was continued through eighty years; but he has failed to produce the proof. To do this was his starting point. He assumes it; where is the proof either in the Bible or in Josephus? And until he can prove that the destruction of the male children went on for eighty years. say this argument has no more foundation than a vision. Then he makes another blunder: the 303,550, the number of men above twenty years of age, mentioned in this case, were men to go to war; they were not the total population of the Jewish nation, and yet my mathematical friend stands up here to-day and declares that the whole male population above twenty years of age consisted of 303,550, whereas it is a fact that this number did not include all the males.

Then again the 22,273 first born de not represent the number of families in Israel at hat time, for many of the first born were dead. These are the blunders the gentleman has made to-day, and I challenge him to nere could not be brought than one or two instances of polygamy in the history of Israel from the time the Hebrew left Egypt to the time they entered Canaan. Has he disproved that? He has attempted to prove it by a mathematical problem, which problem is based on error: his premises are wrong, therefore his conclusions are false. Why didn't he turn to King James' translation? I will help him to one polygamist, that is Caleb. Why didn't he start with old Caleb and go down and give us name after name and date after date of the polygamists recorded in the history of the Jews while they were in the wilderness? Ladies and gentlemen, he had none to give, and thereore the assertion made yesterday is true, that during the sojourn of the children of Israel in the wilderness there is but one instance of polygamy recorded.

Now we come to the law that I laid down

yesterday—"Neither shall thou take one wife to another." I reaffirm that the translation n the margin is perfect to a word. He labors to show that God does not mean what He says. That phrase, "one wife to another," may be equally rendered one woman to another, or one wife to her sister. The very same phrase is used in the other seven passages named by Dr. Dwight. For example Exodus 26, 3, Ezekiel 1, 9, etc. He admits the translation in these passages to be correct. If it is correct in these passages, why is it not correct in the other? His very admission knocks to pieces his argument. Why then does he labor to create the impression that the Hebrew ishau means woman, or wife What is the object of the travail of his soul? The word ahoot, he contends, means sister; but sister itself, is a word which means a specific relation, and a generic relation. Every woman is sister to every other woman, and I challenge the gentleman to meet me on paper at any time, in the newspapers of your city or elsewhere upon the Hebrew of this text. I reaffirm it, reaffirm it in the hearing of this learned gentleman, reaffirm it in the hearing of these Hebraists, that as it is said in the margin is the true rendering. namely "neither shalt thou take one wife to another." But supposing that is incorrect, permit me, before I pass on, to remind you of this fact, he refers, I think, in his first speech to the "margin;" the "margin" was correct then and there, but it is not here. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways: correct when he wasts to quote from the "margin;" but not when I want to do so. He quoted from the margin, and I followed his illustrious example.

And now, my friends, supposing that the text means just what he says, namely "nei-ther shalt thou take a wife unto her sister to vex her;" supposing that is the rendering, and he asserts it is and he is a Hebraist, I argued and brought the proof yesterday that this law of Moses is not kept by the Mormons, in other words there are men in your very midst who have married sisters. Where was the gentleman's solemn denunciation of the violation of God's law? Why did he not lift his voice and vindicate the divine law? But not a solitary word of disapproval is uttered! Yesterday he pronounced a curse—"cursed is he that confirms not to curse—"cursed is he that confirms not to the words of this law, to do them." Does not the curse rest upon him and upon his people. I gave him the liberty to choose whether this text condemned polygamy, or whether it condemned a man for marrying two sisters; he must take his choice, the horns of the dilemms are before him. For the sake of saving polygamy he stands up here, in the presence of Almighty God and His holy angels, and before this intelligent congregation he admits that in this church, and with this people, God's holy law is set at defiance. What respect, therefore, can we have for the gentleman's argument, drawn from the teachings of Moses, in support of polygamy?

He refers us to the multiplication of horses. him, Bebold, we have foreaken all, and followed these what shall we have therefore.

The suppose a king may have one horse of this people that one wife could bring for the shall you need the was shall we have therefore. The law referred to by my one that the concluded, therefore, that there were no marriages?

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son or man shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"And every one that hat are open to critical in the thrones of his given, and we must forbear.

"And every one that are open to critical in the thrones of his given, and we must forbear.

"And every one that are open to critical in the thrones of his given, and we must forbear.

"And every one that are open to critical in the thrones of his given, and we must forbear.

"And every one that hat are open to critical in the thrones of his given, and we must forbear.

"And every one that many down these preduced, therefore, that there were no marriages?

"And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son or man shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"And every one that me required the bid in the same produced in the regeneration when the Son or man shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

"And every one that hat are open to critical in the thrones of his given, the form of transal is the produced in the same produced in the same lebrew words or phrase in the same his title can depend the man of the produced in the same produced in th