Brigham Young University
BYU ScholarsArchive

Theses and Dissertations

1960

The Pratt-Newman Debate

Robert Duane Hatch
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the Cultural History Commons, and the Mormon Studies Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation
Hatch, Robert Duane, "The Pratt-Newman Debate" (1960). *Theses and Dissertations*. 4776.
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4776

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

700.2
H2826
1960

THE PRATT-HEMAN DEBATE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Speech

Brigham Young University

Provo, Utah

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science

by

Robert Duane Hatch

August, 1960

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to make the following acknowledgments:

To my wife, Beverly. Had it not been for her critical judgment of the composition and her help in typing, this thesis could never have been completed.

To Dr. J. LaVar Bateman and Dr. Richard D. Poll, who have encouraged, guided, and supervised in the preparation of this thesis.

To Chad J. Flake for allowing the author special access to materials in the Special Collections Room, Brigham Young University Library.

To the Church Historian's Office and the Utah State Historical Society for furnishing the author many valuable document, letter, etc.

To Laura Voorhees for helping in the final typing of this thesis.

To Jed J. Richardson for giving the author the opportunity of doing graduate work in the first place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study Analysis Procedure Procedure of Investigation	
II.	EVENTS PRECEDING THE DEBATE	6
III.	BACKGROUND OF THE SPEAKERS	16
	Biographical Sketch Orson Pratt J. P. Newman	
	Debate in the World of Pratt and Newman	30
	Orson Pratt J. P. Newman Utah	
IV.	THE DEBATE	39
	Analysis of Content Brief Integrity of Ideas	
	Analysis of Speaking Method	67
	Use of Emotional Proofs in the Speeches Character and Prestige of the Speakers The Structure of the Oral Discourse Style Delivery	
V.	EVENTS SUBSEQUENT	84
VI.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	86
	APPENDIX	92
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	121

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The colorful history of Mormon[1] polygamy has many interesting stories to tell, and one of the most interesting is that of Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman's debate with the Mormon Apostle Orson Pratt on "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" This debate was held at the New Tabernacle in Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 12, 13, and 14, 1870. Newman was the Chaplain of the United States Senate and one of the foremost preachers of Washington D.C. His appearance in Salt Lake City to debate the question of polygamy was a national topic. Probably never before, nor since, has so much been said in such a short time by non-Mormon presses on a question respecting Mormonism. And never before, as far as the author has been able to discover, has a chaplain of the Senate engaged in a public debate of such wide-spread interest.

For these reasons this study seems of historical significance. This is a study in persuasion. Winston L. Brembeck and William S. Howell have said:

> Persuasion has been and will continue to be one of the chief levers of life. Today the density of competing persuasions is greater than ever before, making the study of persuasion not only necessary for the specializing few but also requisite for all who would live effectively in modern society.[2]

---

[1] Mormon is a nickname for members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

[2] Winston Lamont Brembeck and William Smiley Howell, Persuasion: A Means of Social Control (Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1952), p. 1.

This study's real importance lies in its contributions to understanding the means of persuasion. Persuasion is defined by Brembeck and Howell as:

> . . . the conscious attempt to modify thought and action by manipulating the motives of men toward predetermined ends.
> Depending on the motives operative within the persuadee (s) and the urgency of the situation, persuasion may employ (1) a system of emotional appeals, (2) a maximum of fact and logical reasoning, or (3) varying combinations of (1) and (2).[1]

The questions which this paper seeks to answer are: first, what means of persuasion did the speakers use to modify the thoughts and actions of their audience; second, how effective were the speakers in this process; and finally, which of the two, Pratt or Newman, did the best job of persuading?

ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

Background information includes information on the lives of the debaters, their previous training or experience in debate, and the events leading up to the debate. These elements are not requisite to a study of persuasion in the debate *per se*, but help to understand the circumstances and conditions under which the speaking occurred.

The analysis of the debate is handled in seven parts: (1) a brief (an outline) of the speeches is included to help the reader follow the sequence of the arguments; (2) the integrity of the ideas of each speaker is examined to consider his intellectual resources, the persuasiveness of the argumentative development, and the relative truth of the ideas presented; (3) use of emotion in the speech is analyzed to consider the

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 24.

types, frequency and effectiveness of the emotional appeal in the speeches; (4) ethos, or the character of each speaker is investigated to consider the persuasive effect of his reputation during the debate; (5) structure of the discourse is observed to consider the clarity and persuasiveness of the speaker's organization; (6) speaking style is analyzed to consider the effectiveness of the language used; (7) finally, the method of delivery is analyzed to consider the over-all vocal appeal of the presentation.[1]

PROCEDURE OF INVESTIGATION

The investigation of this subject led to an extensive study of available newspapers, magazines, journals, and diaries at the Brigham Young University Library, the Church Historian's Office of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Utah State Historical Society, and the University of Utah Library. Newspapers were the most informative of these sources. The events leading immediately up to the debate, the debate itself, and the events after the debate were reported in very great detail.

Diaries were the least productive sources. Out of the many searched only a few had anything at all to say about the debate. These said nothing more than that the debate was in progress or was held; they failed to give any details.

Letters were written to the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and the Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, for information which they had on the debate, and/or Newman. Without exception

---

[1]The last six divisions are suggested by Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: Ronald Press, 1948), p. 331.

these letters were answered and much useful information was received.

Several interviews were conducted, and for the most part these contributed valuable information and suggestions. Two interviews of particular value were those conducted with A. William Lund, Assistant Church Historian of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and Ellis T. Rasmussen of the Brigham Young University College of Religion.

Histories of the Methodist Church, biographies, and newspapers were searched to find information on Newman and his activities. These gave the author an insight into the affairs of Newman prior to and after his debate with Pratt.

Histories of Utah written by Whitney, Roberts, Bancroft, and others were searched. These books were particularly helpful in checking for completeness of detail in the author's information.

Frank T. Benson, Jr.'s, "An Analysis of Orson Pratt's Invention in the Pratt-Newman Debate,"[1] was searched for information which would be helpful in answering the question asked by this paper, and although Benson's paper did not cover the activities of both speakers, and was only concerned with Pratt's invention (ie., logical, pathetic and ethical modes of persuasion), it was of considerable help in the preparation of this paper.

Last and most important, a complete text of the debate published by the Deseret News Press was obtained. This text was prepared during the debate by two reporters, Sloan and Evans, and was published in the

---

[1]Frank T. Benson, Jr., "An Analysis of Orson Pratt's Invention in the Pratt-Newman Debate," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Speech, University of Utah, 1950.

Deseret News and later in a book titled "The Bible and Polygamy."[1] Of this report the Deseret News had the following to say:

> Our readers, who were present at the Discussion yesterday, will agree with us that Messrs. Sloan and Evans have succeeded admirably in obtaining very excellent phonographic reports of the arguments of Prof. Pratt and Dr. Newman. . . We do not believe that a single word has escaped the reporters.[2]

Newman's group seemed to have felt similar to this, for a pro-Newman paper, the Washington D.C. Daily Morning Chronicle, who had their own reporter in Salt Lake City, published a record of the first day's proceedings which agrees in every detail with the record of Sloan and Evans. It may even have been the same report.[3] Not only this, but when the report was printed in full in the Deseret News no charge of incorrectness was uttered by local pro-Newman newspapers. Another thing which seems to indicate full agreement on the part of Newman with the report is that Newman's biographer, James R. Joy, listed the book containing the debate, published by the Deseret News Press, as a book written by Newman.

---

[1]Orson Pratt and J. F. Newman, The Bible and Polygamy (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Steam Printing Company, 1877).

[2]Deseret News (Salt Lake), Aug. 14, 1870, p. 347.

[3]Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington D.C.), Aug. 23, 1870.

CHAPTER II

EVENTS PRECEDING THE DEBATE

Along the Mississippi the war drums had ceased their constant beat; the negro had been freed, and men everywhere thanked God that the war had ended. But along the Potomac, at Washington, a new war had begun—this time against polygamy. It began with the Wade Bill in 1866, then the Cragin Bill in 1869, and eventually the Cullom Bill in 1870.[1] These bills were designed to destroy the practice of polygamy and the political solidarity of the Mormon community in Utah Territory.

On March 23, 1870, the Cullom Bill passed the House of Representatives. But before it passed, William H. Hooper, Utah's delegate to Congress, delivered a penetrating speech in defense of polygamy. Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the Senate and Pastor of the Metropolitan Church of Washington D.C., of which President Ulysses S. Grant was a trustee and member, felt that a reply was needed to Delegate Hooper's speech. As Hooper's arguments had been of a religious nature, Newman concluded he should be the one to deliver the reply.

On Sunday, the twenty-fourth of April, Dr. Newman gave a talk at the Metropolitan Church on the subject of polygamy. The speech was advertised two weeks before the occasion. Most of the notables of Washington were there, including President Grant, Vice-President Colfax,

---

[1]Joseph Fielding Smith, Essentials in Church History (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1953), pp. 542-543.

and Chief Justice Chase.[1]

This talk was published in the New York Herald and later reprinted by the Deseret News as a pamphlet.[2] On learning of it, Orson Pratt, one of the Council of the Twelve of the Mormon Church, prepared a reply and sent it also to the Herald. This reply was duly printed. Both articles received widespread comment.

It was not long after this, on May 3rd, 1870, that acting-editor Edward L. Sloan of the Salt Lake Telegraph (or one of his employees), challenged Newman in the following manner:

> The sermon (Newman's) should have been delivered in the New Tabernacle in this city, with ten thousand Mormons to listen to it, and then Elder Orson Pratt, or some prominent Mormon should have had a hearing on the other side and the people been allowed to decide...Come on and convert them by the peaceful influences of the Bible instead of using the means now proposed. Convince them by reason and scriptural argument and no Cullom Bill will be required.[3]

Without giving due regard to the source of this challenge, Dr. Newman made ready to invade the Mormon stronghold. News of his plans reached the valley as early as July 26, 1870. The Deseret News reported: "Rev. Dr. Newman leaves tomorrow for California, stopping at Salt Lake City to debate with the champions of polygamy."[4] A week later they again published notice of his intended arrival. They stated that Newman was coming under the assumption that he had received a challenge. They

---

[1]Orson Pratt and J. P. Newman, A sermon by the Rev. Dr. Newman, Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Church on Plural Marriage to Which is Added an Answer by Elder Orson Pratt, One of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1870), p. 11.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Telegraph (Salt Lake), May 3, 1870, p. 2.

[4]Deseret News (Salt Lake), July 26, 1870, p. 3.

did not know of such a challenge, but stated: "it appears that all eastern papers believe it is true."[1]

On the ninth of August Dr. Newman, accompanied by his wife and a Reverend Dr. Sunderland, arrived in Salt Lake City. Immediately he wrote to Brigham Young informing him that he was there, and was ready to accept the challenge "given in your (Young's) journal, the Salt Lake Daily Telegraph."[2] To this Brigham Young replied: "no challenge was ever given by me to any person through the columns of the Salt Lake Daily Telegraph." He added: "You have been misinformed with regard to the Salt Lake Daily Telegraph; it was not my journal...and I was not acquainted with its columns."[3] This statement drew angry protest from Newman. He had traveled across the country to debate with the Mormon "Chief", and now the "Chief" would not debate. His reply to Young was definitely not cordial. He accused Young of employing untruthfulness:

> Had I chosen to put a different construction on that article, and to take no further notice of it, you could then have adopted the Telegraph as your organ and the said article as a challenge, which I either could not or dared not accept.

The Doctor continued by saying that Elder Sloan, a member of the Church, and at the time acting-editor of the Telegraph, had been in "constant intercourse" with Young; that all the east considered this a challenge, and that even the people in Utah had thought it was.[4]

Edward Sloan, in the meantime, felt the pressure of the two opposing views. In a rush editorial, in which he states he was not able

---

[1]Ibid., August 1, 1870, p. 3.

[2]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 1.

[3]Ibid., p. 2.

[4]Ibid.

to find all the facts, he explains:

> I will tell him (Newman) that whether I wrote the article in question or not, I knew of its existence before it went into the compositor's hands. Further, with a very slight alteration, I will adopt the article and accept its full responsibility...[1]

Neither Young nor Newman seemed to pay any attention to this editorial.

The two gentlemen continued to exchange letters. Young invited the Doctor to address a congregation in the Small Tabernacle or the New Tabernacle, to which Newman replied that "after disclaiming and declining" to hold the debate Young had challenged to hold, that he had made other arrangements.[2]

That evening, Brigham Young prepared a letter full of bitterness for Newman. He called the Doctor's accusations of "disclaiming and declining the discussion" on his part, and his assertion that Young could have later adopted the article as his challenge, an "insinuation..very discreditable to yourself (Newman) and ungentlemanly in the extreme..." About Sloan, Young said, if he made the statement, then, "he is perfectly capable of defending it, and I have no doubt you (Newman) will find him equally willing to do so; or Professor Orson Pratt, whose name...(is) suggested in the article." He further remarked that many people will no doubt hold this attempt on the part of Newman an invention with "some sinister motive." In his final rebuke, Young states:

> If you think you are capable of proving the doctrine of "Plurality of Wives" unscriptural, tarry here as a missionary; we will furnish you the suitable place, the congregation, and plenty of Elders, any of whom will discuss with you on that or any other scriptural doctrine.[3]

---

[1]"Journal History," MSS, LDS Church Historian's Office, Salt Lake, August 9, 1870, p. 1.

[2]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 3.

[3]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

It was Sunday morning before this note was handed to Newman. He made quite a point to mention that it was Sunday in saying, "of course I would not on that day reply." During the interval between Young's letter and the return letter of Newman, the Doctor had spoken at Faust's Hall (a local Methodist meeting hall).[1] The Deseret News reported this a "fierce onslaught" against polygamy. He was reported to have called the men "bulls", the women "serfs and slaves", and the children "brats". It further says:

> Even the ancient patriarchs came in for their share of his splenetic vituperation. "Lamech, the murderer," "Abraham, the coward and equivocator," "Jacob, the swindler, liar and thief," "Gideon, the bastard and idolator," "David, the adulterer and murderer," and "Solomon, the man who built altars to worship the God Moloch."[2]

A more charitable report was written by a special correspondent of the Daily Morning Chronicle of Washington D.C. He pointed out that the three hour and a half sermon of Newman's received an impressive reception. Faust's Hall, which seated six hundred people, was filled to capacity, with many people actually crammed standing room only. Others were turned away, the report said. As for Newman's arguments, it mentions: "he gave Lamech, Jacob, David, Solomon, and other patriarchal sinners a good drubbing, and then attacked some of the prime arguments advanced by the Mormon leaders."[3]

---

[1] Since it wasn't until 1869 that the Methodists established a church in the valley, their chapel was not yet completed. In lieu of a proper chapel the church was meeting at Faust's Hall, "an unfinished hay loft over a livery stable on the south side of Second South Street between Main and State Street." Representatives of Utah Religious Denominations, World's Fair Ecclesiastical History of Utah (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon & Sons, 1893), p. 261.

[2] Orson F. Whitney, History of Utah (Salt Lake: Deseret News Press, 1893), p. 448.

[3] Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington D.C.), August 21, 1870.

The Deseret News report, whether completely true or not, did a lot to persuade the Mormons against the arguments of the Doctor. He never denied using these words, and the subsequent report of the Chronicle indicates he did use them. If we are to conclude that the trip was made to persuade the Mormons from polygamy, then at this juncture, the Doctor had impeded his progress most assuredly. If the Doctor wished only to gain approval of his constituents, then he was still in trouble, and for the same reason. Newman was faced with the problem of stereotypes. The American people as a whole held these Bible characters in high esteem. To attack them amounted to an open attack against the American people. In order to win with this sort of argument, the Doctor had to modify their frame of reference. He failed to do this. It would have been better for him to have chosen some other line of argument than to have come face to face with these stereotypes from Bible literature. Indeed, this is the mark of talent in a good speaker. He chooses from his abundance only those points which are strong and will receive the best reception.[1]

Monday morning, Newman replied to the letter of Young. He again excused himself from the invitation of Young, and accusingly stated that this gesture was a "mere device to cover, if possible your (Young's) unwillingness to have a fair discussion..." He held that the attempt of Young to have Sloan, Pratt, or other Mormon Elders debate this question was a "cheap and safe attempt" to avoid the discussion. The remainder of the letter was a direct indictment against Young.[2]

---

[1]Brembeck and Howell, pp. 117-118.

[2]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 4.

At this point, it appeared that there would be no debate, but a set of circumstances developed which precluded this possibility. It may have been an invention of Newman or an earnest appeal, but in either case, five non-Mormon gentlemen dispatched the following letter to Newman:

> Dear Sir:—Pardon the liberty which we the undersigned citizens of this place hereby take in addressing you in reference to the object of your present visit. Having seen in the News of last evening and the Herald of this morning, an attempt to make the impression upon the public that you are, after all, unwilling to debate the question "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" with Brigham Young, as the chief of the Church of Latter-day Saints, and to debate it now and here, we desire to know from you directly whether such is the fact and we would respectfully request a reply, that we may be able to set the matter in its true light by publishing the whole correspondence, as we will seek to do, in an extra of the Tribune to be issued at the earliest possible moment.[1]
>
> Very respectfully,
> John P. Taggart
> J. H. Wickizer
> George R. Maxwell
> G. B. Overton
> J. F. Woodman

Newman sent a return letter to these gentlemen and informed them that the purpose of his visit was to debate Young, and in order to put the matter "beyond dispute" he was sending Young a challenge. This letter, together with a copy of the letter from the gentlemen, Newman sent to Young. He made a formal challenge.[2] Brigham Young accepted the challenge, but appointed Orson Pratt or John Taylor as his representative.[3]

Newman replied with another letter on the same day in which he states: "I challenged you to a discussion and not Orson Pratt or John Taylor. . . Let the public distinctly understand this fact . . ." He went on to say that he would none-the-less go ahead with the debate and

---

[1]Ibid. [2]Ibid., p. 5. [3]Ibid.

[1]Ibid., p. 6.

debate Orson Pratt.[1]

The four men appointed to conduct the arrangements for the debate appeared to have had as much trouble in arriving at equitable arrangements as Newman and Young had in arranging for the debate. Pratt's representatives, Albert Carrington and Joseph W. Young, insisted that since Newman had made the challenge and since he had also given his sermon on the subject: "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons," then he ought to take the affirmative on that same subject. Newman's representatives, Rev. Dr. Sunderland and Dr. J. I. Taggart, refused the proposition, stating that Newman had given his sermon on the negative side of the question, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy" and not "God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two persons." In the end Newman's representatives won out, and the proposition for debate became; "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?"

Of no less confusion was the time of the debate. The representatives decided on six sessions of one hour and a half in length. Pratt, on learning of this arrangement, decided against it, and after considerable difficulty the time was changed to two hours and three nights. Whereas in the former arrangements each speaker was to occupy one full session; under the final arrangement each speaker was to receive only one hour each night and Newman was to follow Pratt immediately after Pratt finished. Newman called this "twenty-four to nothing;" Pratt replied that he realized this, but if Newman did not like the arrangement all he had to do was take "the affirmative of the question as proposed... namely, 'That God's law condemns the union in marriage of more than two

---

[1]Ibid., p. 6.

persons,' and Pratt said he would cheerfully follow him with all those imaginary disadvantages." Apparently Newman prefered the "twenty-four to nothing" for no more was said about it. It was not until the next day, August 12th, that final arrangements were made.[1] Handbills were immediately passed out and the first meeting was arranged for 2:00 P.M. that afternoon.

An agreement of the conditions of the debate was finally settled. Orson Pratt was to take the affirmative and Dr. Newman the negative on the question, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" The debate was arranged for Friday, Saturday, and Sunday; August 12th, 13th, and 14th, at two o'clock P.M. Each speaker was to speak one hour each day. There was to be no decision, though there were to be three umpires. The audience was not to indicate dissent or approval.

Although not all papers felt this way, there were some who felt that Newman had been too officious in coming to Utah for a debate in the first place. The New York Tribune explained that upon learning of the challenge, Doctor Newman "packed his trunk, bought his railway ticket, and started very much as Don Quixote would have done." But, it was one thing to go to Utah and quite another to debate. "Young, coolly, for August, replied that he had given no challenge; nor did the great Orson show any desire to enter the lists."[2] Since the speaker should always strive to evince the right character, this was, in the sense of the word, a defeat for Newman. Comments like the proceeding one tended to place

---

[1]Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington D.C.), August 21, 1870.

[2]"That Discussion," Millennial Star, XXXII (September 20, 1870), p. 602.

him in a foolish light.

There are two conclusions which we can draw at this point: (1) Newman's arguments in reference to the ancient patriarchs had injured his position; (2) Young's denial of the challenge, and the outward evidence justifying this denial, had also injured Newman's position.

CHAPTER III

PART I. BACKGROUND OF THE SPEAKERS

"The biggest thing about a principle or a battle or an army is a man," said F. W. Bok.[1] In order to understand the principles involved in this debate it might be helpful to first understand the men. A brief sketch of each of the two men, Orson Pratt and Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman, together with a discussion of the influence of debate in their lives, is included to aid this understanding.

Orson Pratt[2]

Orson Pratt, the "Saint Paul of Mormondom"[3] as he was called, was born on September 19, 1811, at Hartford, Washington County, New York. He was the son of Jared Pratt and Charity Dickinson. His father had been a weaver by trade, but the dawn of the industrial revolution had forced him to abandon the weaving trade and commence the life of a farmer; a life which he was little qualified to undertake.

Because of the inexperience and poverty of his parents, Orson Pratt left home at the age of ten to work on a neighboring farm. He

---

[1]F. W. Bok, quoted by David Kim, Dictionary of American Maxims (New York: Philsophical Library, 1955), p. 163.

[2]Edgar T. Lyon, "Orson Pratt—Early Mormon Leader," Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, 1932.

[3]Orson F. Whitney, History of Utah, Vol IV (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Son Company, 1904), p. 28.

never lived with his parents again after that, but he did visit them occasionally whenever he happened to be in their area. He was devoted to his parents even though he did leave them; and he testified later on in his life how blessed he had been to have lived with them as long as he did.

Orson Pratt's schooling was very meager. He attended school during the winters of 1822-1823, 1824-1825, 1825-1826, and part of 1827. Most of these sessions were for only three or four months. Other than these few months of schooling his education was mainly self-taught.

Pratt moved considerably during his early years. For a while he lived at Hurlgate, Long Island, New York with his brother Anson. Later he moved to New York City to learn the trade of cabinet maker, but his plans were disrupted soon afterwards as sickness overtook him and he was forced to return to Hurlgate and his brother's home.

1827 saw a new experience for Orson. He traveled to Ohio with two of his brothers, Parley and Nelson. Here he took up farming, but finding it not to his liking he again returned to Hurlgate.

In the spring of 1829 Orson went to Canaan, New York to work on a farm. It was while Orson was at Canaan that his brother Parley met him in September of 1830. Parley had read a copy of the Book of Mormon while at Newark, New York, where he was on a mission for the "Campbellite Church." After having read the Book of Mormon and visited Joseph Smith, the prophet and founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Parley was convinced that Smith's revelations were of God and that the Mormon Church was the true church of God. Accordingly he joined, and proceeded on his mission, but this time in behalf of that church. It was while Parley was on this mission that he visited

Orson and told him of the message of Mormonism.

Orson, in speaking of his conversion to Mormonism, said: "I heard their doctine and believed it to be the ancient gospel, and as soon as the sound penetrated my ears, I knew that if the Bible was true, their doctrine was true."[1] Orson was baptized a member of the Mormon Church on his nineteenth birthday, September 19, 1830.

To trace Orson Pratt's life from this point on is to trace the history of the Mormon Church. Wherever the Church was in need of a leader of tact and intelligence, Pratt was sent. During his life Pratt spent a total of nineteen years engaged in missionary work. He crossed the Atlantic Ocean sixteen times and proselyted in England, Scotland, Austria, Canada, California, Panama, and in most of the eastern states.

In October of 1830 he went to the birthplace of the Church--Fayette, Seneca County, New York. Here he visited Joseph Smith, by whom he was confirmed an Elder of the Church. Soon afterward he went on his first mission, to Coleville, Broome County, New York. Early in 1831 he went with Smith to Kirtland, Ohio, and after staying in that region for a few months he set out for Jackson County, Missouri, accompanied by his brother Parley.

January 25, 1832, Orson was appointed to preside over the elders of the Church. At the conference where this appointment took place, he was called to fulfill another mission, this time in the eastern states. While on this mission Orson was able to visit his parents and baptize his brother Anson.

In February of 1834 Pratt was instructed to rejoin the main body

---

[1]Ibid., p. 13.

of the Church and prepare for the "redemption of Zion." His task was to help organize "Zion's Camp" for its trip to Missouri. Zion's Camp was a group of men called to go to Missouri and reinforce the members of the Church there.

While on his way back to Kirtland, Ohio, in the early part of 1835, he read in the Messenger and Advocate, a Church periodical, that he had been chosen as one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church and was requested to be at Kirtland on the 26th of April. A two-day journey by stage enabled him to arrive on the day appointed and he was ordained on April 26, 1835.

July 4, 1836, Orson Pratt married Sarah M. Bates of New York, while serving on another mission in that state.

When the members of the Church were driven from Ohio, Orson Pratt and his family left New York and started for Far West, Missouri, but were detained by snow and ice. He later rejoined the Missouri saints at Quincy, Illinois. Here he learned that his brother Parley had been taken prisoner in Missouri. Risking his own life, he went to Missouri to help effect the escape of his brother and also others in jail there. The escape was carried off without loss of life or injury to anyone.

In the autumn of 1839 he went again to the eastern states, but this time to embark with other missionaries for Britain. He arrived in Edinburgh, Scotland in April, 1840, where he preached for nine months and baptized over two hundred people members of the Church. While upon this mission he published his noted pamphlet, Remarkable Visions, which was republished in New York.

His time from 1841 to 1844 was spent at Nauvoo, Illinois. Here

he served as an instructor of Mathematics at the "University of Nauvoo," and as a member of the city council. During this time, he informed us, "I occupied much of my time in study," he further said that he made himself "thoroughly acquainted with algebra, geometry, trigonometry, conic sections, differential and integral calculus, astronomy and most of the physical sciences." He also pointed out that he pursued these studies without the assistance of a teacher.[1]

In 1842 he broke away from the Church through the influence of John C. Bennett. Bennett is reported to have told Pratt that Joseph Smith wanted Pratt's wife for a "spiritual wife." Bennett told Pratt that Smith had secretly taught the doctrine that wives should be had in common. This did not set well with Pratt and he felt that Joseph Smith had become a fallen prophet. Although he claimed that he had not broken with the Church but only with Smith, he was excommunicated and stripped of his Apostleship.

After considering the facts more carefully, Pratt learned that it was Bennett who had designs on his wife and not Smith. It was not, however, until January of 1843 that he was accepted back into the Church. Immediately before this time he was notified of a plot on the life of Joseph Smith by Bennett and others, and he notified Smith of the plot. This convinced Smith that Pratt could be trusted, and the hand of fellowship was extended towards him. He was rebaptized on January 20, 1843, and was restored to his position in the Council of Twelve Apostles.

Referring to this experience later in life Pratt said, "it was

---

[1]Ibid., p. 27.

because he got his information from a wicked source, from those disaffected" that he fell in the first place. However, he pointed out, "as soon as he learned the truth he was satisfied."[1]

Apparently Pratt was satisfied, for soon after his re-entry in the Church he entered into the practice of polygamy. Not only this, but when the Church decided to make a public announcement of the doctrine of polygamy in 1852, Orson Pratt was requested to make it.

When the Church left Nauvoo in 1846 Pratt took his families—four wives and three small children--west to Garden Grove. Here he was selected to go with an advanced body of pioneers into the Salt Lake Valley. He left with this group in the spring of 1847. On the 21st of July, he and Erastus Snow entered the Salt Lake Valley, the first Mormon pioneers to do so. This was three days before Brigham Young and the last of the group were to enter.

A few weeks later Pratt returned to Winter Quarters. Here, at a conference held on April 6, 1848, he was appointed to succeed Elder Orson Spencer as President of the European Mission and editor of the Millennial Star.

In 1851 he was released from this mission and returned to Salt Lake Valley. The following winter he sat as a member of the Council in the first legislative assembly of the Territory of Utah. He served in the Territorial Legislature for thirteen times in all, or at every session held while he was in the Territory, and was speaker of the House during eight of those sessions.

---

[1]Brigham H. Roberts, A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Vol II (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1930), p. 101.

As has been mentioned, when the public announcement of polygamy was made on August 29, 1852, Orson Pratt was appointed to make it. Almost immediately after the announcement he was appointed to preside over the Latter-day Saints in all states of the Union and in the British Provinces of North America. His headquarters was at Washington D.C. Here he began to publish The Seer, in the columns of which he endeavored to defend the Mormon position on polygamy.

In 1856, 1864, and 1877, he made other trips to England and Europe as a missionary for the Church. During one of his trips he returned by way of Panama, California, and then Utah.

He published many books on mathematics and gospel subjects,[1] and was considered by many of his fellow members as an exceptionallywell trained man. Even today most Mormons consider him as one of the foremost men in Mormon history.

Wilford Woodruff, President of the Mormon Church at the time of Pratt's death, said: ". . . he (Pratt) had traveled more miles, preached more sermons, studied and written more upon the Gospel and upon science than any other man in the Church."[2]

Orson Pratt died at his home in Salt Lake City, Utah on October 3, 1881. He was survived by sixteen sons, sixteen daughters, and forty-three grandchildren. He had had ten wives and forty-five children.

---

[1] Some of his writings include: Absurdities of Immaterialism, 1851; The Great First Cause, 1851; The Seer, 1853; Pratt's Cubic and Biquadratic Equations, 1866; Key to the Universe, 1879; Treatise on the Egyptian — Pyramid Gizeh, 1879; etc.

[2] Whitney, p. 29.

John Philip Newman[1]

John Philip Newman was born on September 1, 1826. He was the son of Philip Newman, a thoughtful and studious man of German descent, who died when John was eight years old. In the hands of Mary D'Orley Allan, his wife, was to rest the education and guidance of John and six other children. Apparently Mary was equal to the work for she is remembered by posterity as a vivacious and richly intelligent woman.

At sixteen the lad underwent a spiritual experience which gave him a desire to study in the Methodist ministry. Of this experience the following story is told:

> Passing through the street one day he was suddenly accosted by a stranger, of impressive mien, who, without a single word of salutation simply said: "God wants your heart," and then vanished as abruptly as he had appeared. Two weeks thereafter, on a bright Sabbath morning, the same stranger met him, and, before he could ask an explanation of his undesired officiousness, slipped into the young man's hand a slip of paper, on which was written, "God wants your heart." "His message," says the Doctor, "was obeyed, and within a month thereafter I was received into the Methodist Episcopal Church.[2]

Newman then gave himself to a study of the ministry. He entered Cazenovia Seminary in New York, and after a few terms began to preach in country churches. Through diligence and practice he became an accomplished speaker. It is said that during this period he underwent a change from a crude bombastic speaker with appalling pronunciation and grammar to an intellectual and imaginative preacher.

In 1855 he married Angeline Ensign who was a constant and inspiring

---

[1]James R. Joy, "Newman, John Philip," Dictionary of American Biography, Vol XIII (1934), pp. 464-465.

[2]Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington, D.C.), August 19, 1870.

companion to him. Although they never had any children, the dearness and closeness of each for the other was acknowledged by even his worst enemies.

A few years after his marriage he was stationed in Albany, New York, and had such distinguished persons as the governor of the state in his congregation. Not long after this he moved to New York City and it is said that his preaching crowded the largest churches to capacity. Of particular mention is the Bedford Street Church in 1859, and the Washington Square Church in 1862. In 1863 he received a doctor's degree from Rochester University in New York.[1] Rochester University was a privately owned educational institution founded in 1850. In 1900 the university had only 28 instructors and 352 students, so in all probability it was quite small in 1863.[2]

Immediately upon getting this degree he sailed to the Middle East and visited the Holy Land where he gained information which enabled him to write a respectable volume on Palestine called <u>From Dan to Beersheba</u>. After he returned in 1864 he was sent by Bishop E. R. Ames to New Orleans. In November, 1862 the secretary of war issued an order to Union commanders in the departments of Missouri, Tennessee, and the Gulf, instructing them to turn over to Bishop Ames "all the houses belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South," in which loyal ministers did not officiate.[3] In order to fill the vacancies left by

---

[1]<u>Daily Morning Chronicle</u> (Washington, D.C.), August 21, 1870.

[2]"University of Rochester," <u>Encyclopaedia Britannica</u>, 11th ed., Vol. XXIII, p. 430.

[3]William Warren Sweet, <u>Methodism in American History</u> (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), p. 295.

this requisition Newman and other appointed ministers and missionaries were sent to the South. Newman's work in New Orleans was evidently successful. In Newman's subsequent nomination for chaplain of the United States Senate, Senator Kellogg said "he was eminently successful" in his efforts in the South.[1] Another writer affirms his success and said:

> He labored at this post for five years with the greatest success. About this time he established the New Orleans Advocate, a weekly religious paper in the interest of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He also founded an orphan asylum in New Orleans, which now has under its protection and care more than a hundred orphans, and which controls property valued at $75,000. He established a normal school with a property value of $15,000, and founded an academical institution in which young men are trained for the ministry. He was the originator and builder of nine churches for the colored people, and reared a $50,000 church for all classes of people.[2]

In 1869 he went to Washington, D.C. to establish the Metropolitan Church. This appointment was of special significance for President Grant, Vice-President Colfax, Chief Justice Chase, Major General Logan, and other notables became members of his congregation.

It was while Newman was here that Senator Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania nominated him as chaplain of the United States Senate.[3] Those speaking in his behalf laud him for his exceptional work in the South. Senator Kellogg made particular mention of his ill health and small salary incurred in his work in the South, and Senator Hannibal Hamlin of Main said that he administered with Christian fidelity to those who "passed away under the affliction that visited New Orleans

---

[1] U.S., Congressional Globe, 41st Cong., 1st Sess., 1869, p. 30.

[2] Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington D.C.), August 19, 1870.

[3] U.S., Congressional Globe, 41st Cong., 1st Sess., 1869, p. 30.

but two short years since."[1] A different note, however, was suggested in the speech of Senator Richard Yates of Illinois who favored another nominee. He said: "I know Rev. Dr. Newman very well. He is a splendid man, and especially as a political preacher he is unsurpassed." But, he suggests there are enough politicians in the Senate already.[2] The New York Times echoed this attitude in an editorial the next day, explaining that this seemed to have been the only qualification for Newman's appointment.[3] Undoubtedly Newman's political activities in the South had created foes as well as friends.

On the second ballot Newman won an overwhelming victory of thirty-five votes as compared to seven for the second highest man.

When his three year term as pastor of the Metropolitan Church expired, President Grant appointed him "inspector of the United States Consulates," and with his wife as secretary he made a leisurely trip around the world. Perhaps no other endeavor of Newman's drew as much controversy as this one. The Chicago Tribune is particularly critical in the following editorial:

> Some little time ago, it was announced that the Rev. Dr. Newman, the pastor of the President's church in Washington and the chaplain of the United States Senate, proposed to take a pleasure trip around the world. Now it is announced that this gentleman has been tendered the appointment of inspector of consulates. This appointment places the Rev. Dr. Newman in the following comfortable conditions: He draws a salary from the Methodist Church in Washington; he draws another salary as chaplain of the United States Senate; he draws still another salary as inspector of consulates; and he has his expenses paid for a pleasure-trip around the world.
>
> The appointment of Dr. Newman to this office, therefore, is not

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 31.

[3] New York Times, March 13, 1869, p. 3.

> si[illegible] wrong in the light of using the public moneys to pay the expenses of a pleasure-trip, but a further wrong in thus neglecting the pressing necessity for rooting out notorious abuses. It is to be hoped that the news of the appointment is premature, or, if actually made, that the senate will see the propriety of keeping its chaplain at home, where, if he does his professional work well, there is plenty of it to do.[1]

It does not appear that Newman actually abused this appointment for as one biographer said, "Newman took his commission seriously and his report yielded favorable suggestions."[2]

During this period of Newman's life he was elected three different times as chaplain of the Senate; March 12, 1869, March [illegible], 1871, and March 7, 1872.[3]

Again in 1876 he was appointed pastor of the Metropolitan Church in Washington, D.C., but on returning he found the presidential pew vacant. Newly elected President Hayes, although a Methodist, chose to attend a small neighborhood church rather than the elaborate, austere chapel of Newman's. Newman seems to have taken this with stoical good grace. Regardless of the lack of presidential attendance, his meetings remained well attended.

His next pastorate in 1879 to 1882 was at Central Church, New York City, of which his faithful friend Grant became a trustee.

When the operation of the three year limit on p[illegible] [illegible] him he became the minister of a Congregational society known as the Church of the Disciples. This appointment resulted in his again being publicly criticized. Both Methodist and non-Methodists, as well as some

---

[1] As found in the Salt Lake Herald, March 21, 1873.

[2] Roy, Dictionary of American Biography, p. 465.

[3] U.S., Congressional Globe, 41st to 43rd Cong., 1st Sess., 1869-1872.

Congregationalists, thought his appointment scandalous. Before he finally resigned as pastor of the Church of the Disciples, there were at least two concerted efforts made by members of his congregation to unseat him. He yielded to their request in the end.[1]

After seeking re-admission to the Methodists Conference he was again appointed to the Metropolitan Church at Washington.

Meanwhile an active program was being conducted by his influential lay friends to have his name proposed for an office in the General Conference. As early as 1872 he had been nominated for the office of bishop, and had received a high vote of one-hundred ballots. In 1880 he had 120 votes for mission secretary. Finally in 1888, with the active help of the Grant family and his friends of the Grand Army of the Republic, he was elected a bishop in the Methodist Church on the fourteenth ballot over determined opposition.

During the next few years he did a considerable amount of traveling. He served in Omaha, Nebraska from 1888 to 1896, and then in San Francisco from 1896 to 1899. Coupled with these two appointments he did extensive missionary-type work in Japan, South America, and Mexico.

An excellent summary of his personal qualities and charm has been recorded by James R. Joy. He said:

> As an administrator he was not distinguished. He was accused of pomposity and self-esteem, but his fine spirit, which mellowed with the years, and his broad sympathy, redeemed some of these faults; His rather grandiose style, with rehearsed gestures and pose, and a wealth of allusion and illustration from literature and foreign travel, delighted the prevailing taste. . . Doubtless his commanding and ingratiating countenance, his stalwart figure, his distinguished bearing, and his musical and sonorous voice, made his audience uncritical of his thought, which was not

---

[1] Deseret Evening News (Salt Lake City), November 11, 1884, as quoted in Journal History, November 11, 1884.

analytical or profound. In the public mind he was "Grant's pastor." That famous friendship never waned. Newman watched by his hero's bedside at Mount McGregor, administered the rite of baptism, and pronounced the official eulogy.

John Philip Newman died on July 5, 1899, at Saratoga, New York, where he had long maintained a summer residence.

PART II. DEBATE IN THE WORLD OF PRATT AND NEWMAN

In order to understand the setting of the debate it may be helpful to consider the various types of preparation each of the two speakers had for their debate in 1870. Two methods might be used to determine this preparation; first, actual debate experience, and second, any speech training which might have been a preparation for this debate.

Pratt

Pratt's experience was much different from Newman's. Where Newman had been educated in an eastern university, Pratt's formal schooling amounted to only a few years here and there. But one way education favored the frontier man was in the school of experience. For some forty years Pratt had been both proselyter and teacher for the Mormon Church. One can not meet the daily challenge of verbal argument proselyting a new religion without an immense amount of practical experience in argumentation. Pratt, as a proselyter, was exceptional. Even today, members of the Mormon Church consider him as one of the best expounders Mormonism has ever produced.

The only exact evidence of formal debating done by Pratt prior to his debate with Newman was an experience reported by himself in the Millennial Star of May, 1841. He was writing from Scotland and said: "I had one discussion with a Wesleyan Methodist preacher which lasted

two evenings."[1] The saying, "One is better than none," is certainly true in this case, for one such debate experience is worth a great deal in the way of preparation for another debate.

As to Pratt's formal training in debate, even less information is found. However, the following facts suggest some, and possibly extensive, training in debate. Joseph Smith in his History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, reported seeing some young elders engaging in a debate on the subject of miracles. The proposition being "Was it or was it not the design of Christ to establish his gospel by miracles."[2] Again on February 4, 1842, he recorded that he attended another debate. At this time, he explained, "Debates were held weekly and (were) entered into by men of the first talents in the city, young and old, for the purpose of elicting truth, acquiring knowledge, and improving in public speaking."[3]

Certainly these citations can not be accepted as positive proof that Pratt had extensive formal training in debating, yet they do indicate a probability of some formal training. Orson Pratt was too much of a leader in Nauvoo and too active to let such events pass him by unnoticed.

His position a few years later as a faculty member of the University of Deseret (University of Utah) offers additional

---

[1]"Letter from Orson Pratt," Millennial Star, Vol. II (May, 1841), p. 11.

[2]Joseph Smith, History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Period I, Vol. II (Salt Lake City: Deseret News, 1948), p. 317.

[3]Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 513.

evidence of formal training. In the years 1868, 1869, 1870, 1871, and 1872, the following explanation appeared in the catalog of the University of Deseret:

> Literary Societies (debate societies) will be found among the attractive and beneficial features of the University. They will be organized among the students, and have for their objects a theoretical and practical training in oratory, debate, declamation, composition, and parliamentary rule and order.[1]

A news item appearing August 4, 1870, just four days before Newman came to Salt Lake City reported the following about the work of the University and its literary societies:

> The recitations were given not only perfect in word, but they were spoken with the spirit and the understanding, and gave evidence of considerable knowledge of the principles of elocution.[2]

In 1867, the University opened for the first time since 1852, and was reported to have had only two hundred and twenty-three students and a faculty of ten persons. In 1870, there were twelve teachers and only two hundred and twenty-five students. Although Orson Pratt was listed as "Professor of Mathematics, Astronomy, and Moral Science,"[3] the smallness of the school and the few number of teachers indicates a possibility that Pratt assisted in these programs.

Although this information stands only as circumstantial

---

[1] Third Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students in the University of Deseret for the Academical Year 1870-1871 (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Office, 1871), p. 5.

[2] Deseret News (Salt Lake), August 4, 1870, p. 311.

[3] Third Annual Catalogue, p. 11.

proof that Pratt had any training at all in debate, the probabilities are very great that he had some preparation for the engagement with Newman.

Newman

Although there appeared no evidence that Newman had any prior debates before his debate with Pratt, there are several circumstances which afford a basis for a reasonable inference that he did have some training. The mere fact that Newman studied for the ministry at Rochester University in New York tells us a lot about his background. The study of homiletics during this period employed the use of many great writers, among which were William Ellery Channing, Henry Ware, Ebenezer Porter, Henry J. Ripley, John Broadus, Austin Phelps, and G. T. Shedd.[1] All of these men wrote excellent books on preaching. This was a great period of development in homiletical theory.

Development in the rest of the field of speech was just as impressive. John Ward, George Campbell, Hugh Blair, Richard Whately, and many, many others wrote exceptional books on speech which were studied during Newman's school days.[2] Under these circumstances, it would have been most improbable for him not to have read some of these books.

---

[1] Karl R. Wallace (ed), History of Speech Education in America (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 149.

[2] Thonssen and Baird, pp. 131-143.

It is not unusual for us to discover that Rochester University itself, the school Newman graduated from with a doctor's degree just seven years before the debate, had at that time on its faculty one of the nation's finest rhetoricians. Martin Brewer Anderson was president of the University at the time Newman was there, having served some ten years of a thirty-five year presidency.[1]

Another individual, Joseph H. Gilmore, joined the faculty of Rochester just a year following Newman's graduation. He was appointed professor of rhetoric and was the writer of several books, including The Outlines of Logic (1876) and The Outlines of Rhetoric (1877). Gilmore explained that he outlined his courses in these books just as he had been teaching them since he came to the university. This indicates quite a tradition of rhetorical development at the university. It is therefore a strong suggestion that Newman studied formally in the field.

University training during these important times implies more than just the reading of books; this was a period of activity too. Almost in the very beginning of American educational development debates of some sort were held. Starting in early colonial times with the Latin Syllogistics, which David Potter explains had remained "practically unchanged since (their) inception in the medieval universities" of Europe.[2] Harvard University

---

[1] Dictionary of American Biography, Vol. I (1928), p. 269-270.

[2] Wallace, pp. 240-242.

was the first to adopt the syllogistics in 1636, and within a few years most of the other American universities adopted similar programs.[1]

The procedure for the latin syllogistics differed somewhat from the commonly accepted type of debate today. A tutor or a professor, often the president of the school, selected the question. A respondent was selected to defend the side of the question, which, "in the opinion of the tutor represented truth." The remaining students were opponents whose expressed duty it was to raise logical objections to the respondent's position.

The disputation was opened by the respondent who read a "carefully worded Latin discourse" in which he stated the proposition, defined it, and then presented his strongest logic in support of the proposition. "Each of the opponents, then, made his objection to the case, drawn up in the form of a syllogism . ." hence the debates were called Latin syllogistics.[2]

A reaction of the students against the syllogistics brought a more utilitarian type of debate. Literary (debate) societies were formed using the English language rather than Latin. "As early as 1830, the Demosthenians and the Phi Kappas met at the University of Georgia."[3] Before long, intersociety debates were a "regular campus fixture."[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

It was not until 1881, a decade after the Pratt-Newman debate, that the first intercollege debates were recorded, but the interest in debating before this time did not lag. Even a small university like the University of Deseret, as has been mentioned, had literary societies. At Yale, and undoubtedly other universities too, literary societies had assumed such importance that for a time students entering college were automatically allocated to one of the major organizations.[1]

Under the circumstances it seems most improbable that Newman escaped training in one of these societies.

Debate among the clergy was not uncommon in Newman's time, in fact debates of a religious nature had been practiced from the earliest beginnings of the reformation, perhaps even before, if Duke George is right: "Disputations have been allowed from ancient times, even concerning the Holy Trinity," he said, why not between John Eck of the University of Ingolstadt and Martin Luther of Wittenberg? "What good is a soldier if he is not allowed to fight, a sheep dog if he may not bark, and a theologian if he may not debate?" Duke George had his way.[2]

As late as November 4, 1850, here in the United States, Elder S. S. Church and Reverend C. D. Simpson debated the question,

---

[1] William Norwood Brigance (ed), A History and Criticism of American Public Address (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943), p. 193.

[2] Roland Bainton, Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), p. 108

Is Division in the Church of Christ Sinful?"[1] In 1851, Elders M. T. Wills and W. W. Keep conducted a debate lasting several days on baptism and the Holy Ghost.[2] A decade after that the Thomas Huxley and Bishop Samuel Wilberforce debate on organic evolution made great news here in America.[3] Debates among the clergy then, were quite common in 1870.

The accumulation of these facts produces strong evidence that Newman had some type of formal debate training, as does the confidence with which he proposed this type of encounter to Brigham Young.

Utah

The final question is, "What part did debate play in the life of people of Utah?" Utah was different from most places in the nation. Although debating had been practiced during the early years of the Mormon Church, public debates with other churches were discouraged by the Church in Utah. As early as 1836, Joseph Smith recorded telling some young missionaries:

> . . . go in all meekness, in sobriety, and preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified; not to contend with others on account of their faith, or systems of religion, but pursue a steady course. This I delivered by way of commandment; and all who observe

---

[1] Vigilance, p. 96

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ernest J. Wrage and Barnet Baskerville, American Forum (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), p. 285.

> it not, will pull down persecution upon their heads, while those who do, shall always be filled with the Holy Ghost; this I pronounced as a prophecy, and sealed with hosanna and amen.[1]

This admonition was repeated on the fly-leaf of most missionary handbooks of the Church for many years. Within the pages of these same handbooks additional instructions were often given:

> A safe rule to follow is to never argue or debate in open air meetings. Little good is gained by such; great evil often results. Argument only serves to entrench others in their own beliefs, and often leads to bad feelings. The spirit of argument is not the spirit of the Gospel.[2]

Although the missionaries were instructed never to engage in debates A. William Lund, Assistant Church Historian, explained that on occasions the missionaries were allowed to enter debates, but only under circumstances which did not allow an honorable retreat. He considered the challenge of Newman to Young such a circumstance.[3]

So we find public debates on religious subjects an established tradition among the Christian people generally, but used only sparingly among the Mormons. This might explain the reluctance of Brigham Young to accept the challenge of Newman to debate.

---

[1]Smith, Vol. I. p. 431.

[2]Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, The Missionary's Hand Book (Independence, Mo.: Zion's Printing and Publishing Co., 1937), p. 92.

[3]Interview with Assistant Church Historian, January 22, 1960.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEBATE

When the sage said: "success has many faces," he was not thinking about debate, but he might well have been. Debate has many faces, and it is through respecting all of these faces, so to speak, that the best debating is usually done. A debater may have deep and provocative thoughts, but those thoughts will fall back dead without the life of a pleasing presentation. Conversely, the presentation may be expertly delivered and beautifully clothed, but if the ideas are not sound the speech prevails only for a moment, and then like a quieting breeze subsides into oblivion.

In order to consider these various fields of success the following analysis has been broken down into two parts. Part one will be concerned with the content of the speeches and will include: (1) a brief (an outline) of the speeches to aid the reader in following the sequence of the arguments; (2)[1] the integrity of the ideas of each speaker to consider the intellectual resources of the speakers, the persuasiveness of the argumentative development, and the relative truth of the ideas presented.

Part two will consider the speaking method employed by the speakers and is broken down into five parts: (1) emotion in the speeches to consider the types, frequency and effectiveness of the emotional appeal in the speeches; (2) ethos, or the character of the speakers to

---

[1]These six devisions are suggested by Thonssen and Baird, p. 331.

consider the persuasiveness of the speaker's reputation and any effort of the speakers to increase the prestige of their reputation during the debate; (3) structure of the discourse to consider the clarity and persuasiveness of the speakers organization; (4) style of the speakers to consider the effectiveness of the language used by the speakers; (5) finally, the method of delivery to consider the over-all vocal appeal of the presentation.

PART I. ANALYSIS OF CONTENT

A. BRIEF

First Day

Orson Pratt was the first speaker on the beginning day and each day of the debate after that. His speech will be considered first. The following is an outline or a brief of the full debate.[1]

Pratt

I. The Bible sanctions polygamy, for

A. There are laws regulating polygamy in the Old Testament, for

1. Deuteronomy 21: 15-17

> If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born be hers that was hated: Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born: But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.

2. Exodus 21: 7-11

> And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed: to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife; her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage,

---

[1] Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy.

shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

3. Deuteronomy 25: 5-10

If a brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have not child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger; her husband's brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her.
And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.
And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.
Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;
Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother's house.
And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed.

B. Presence of polygamy or monogamy in the lives of wicked or righteous men does not indicate approval or disapproval of either form of marriage in God's eyes, for

1. Cain was wicked and was a monogamist, but monogamy is not necessarily bad.

2. Lamech was a murderer and was polygamist, but polygamy is not wrong because of his sins.

3. Adam was righteous and was a monogamist, but that does not prove polygamy is wrong.

C. Captive women entered into polygamy with children of Israel, for

1. Numbers 31: 15-18

And Moses said unto them have ye saved all the

women alive?

Behold these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of the Peor, and there was a plague among the congreagation of the Lord.

Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him.

But all the women-children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.

(a) Since these had already caused Israel to commit adultery, it is probable that these were held as wives and not servants.

(b) There were 32,000 divided up with the families on this occasion.

2. Deuteronomy 21: 10-14

When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive;

And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife:

Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;

And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.

And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will, but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.

(a) This was given to both a monogamist and polygamist nation.

(b) Already a surplus of women since Egypt had been destroying male children for 80 years.

D. Laws regulating adultery in the Bible commanded persons, in some circumstances, to enter polygamy, for

1. Exodus 22: 16-17

And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.
If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

2. Deuteronomy 22: 28-29

If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;
Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

(a) This is a general law for single and married men.

(b) If we followed these commandments today, there would not be any houses of ill-fame.

E. Righteous men were sometimes polygamists, for

1. II Chronicles 24: 2-3 and 15-16

And Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest.
And Jehoiada took for him two wives, and he begat sons and daughters.
(15-16) But Jehoiada waxed old, and was full of days when he died.
And they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both toward God, and toward his house.

2. Hosea 1: 2-3 and 3: 1

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.
So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblain; which conceived, and bare him a son.
(3: 1) Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel, who look to other gods, and love flagons of wine.

F. Mormons practice polygamy because God commanded it.

Newman

I. It is important that the terms be defined, for

A. What is the Bible?

B. How is sanction to be used in this debate?

C. The correct word for this debate is "polygyny", not polygamy.

II. There are grand features in monogamy not found in polygamy, for

A. Companionship is the loving of two hearts.

B. Procreation pleases God when it is done by monogamist.

C. Prevention, namely to prevent the indiscriminate intercourse of the sexes, can only be done in monogamy.

III. The very nature of marriage suggests monogamy, for

A. There is in it an element of choice, preference of one man for one woman. There is not an excess of marriageable, women, either in this or any other country.

B. There is its (monogamy's) innocency: the union of a man with his wife is an act as pure as the devotion of angels in Heaven.

C. There is a nobleness in monogamist marriages.

IV. Pratt's arguments can be refuted, for

A. Cain's murder of Abel did not result because of a marriage relationship, but Lamech, the first polygamist, killed because of polygamy.

B. Malachi rebuked the Jews for polygamy by saying: "Why have ye dealt treacherously with the wife of your youth?" (Malachi 2: 14 is probably the passage referred to.)

C. Christ says: "Have ye not read that the beginning God created the male and female?" This was Christ's effort to lift marriage from the degradation to which polygamy had pulled it. (Matthew 19: 4)

Second Day

Pratt

I. Newman's definition of terms are acceptable, for

A. If the correct word is polygyny or polygamy it will make no difference in the subject of the debate.

B. The Bible referred to is the King James translation and the original documents whenever they can be found.

C. The word sanction stands as defined by Newman.

II. Newman did not offer rebutting evidence, for

A. He spent forty-nine minutes in a flourish of oratory.

B. Remainder of the time was spent in referring to Cain's going to the Land of Nod and marrying a wife, and so on, but he did not examine my testimonies.

III. Newman's arguments can be refuted, for

A. The grand features of monogamy are also found in polygamy, for

1. Polygamy offers companionship.

2. Polygamy offers an opportunity unexcelled in procreation, for

(a) One polygamist can father ten or twenty-fold more children than a monogamist or a polyandist (more than one husband).

(b) It is better that a righteous man have fifty

wives than for one unrighteous man to take one wife and teach his children unrighteousness.

(c) God never had anything to do with the marriages of the unrighteous, he just permits them.

3. Prevention is provided far better in polygamy than in monogamy, for

(a) There are thousands of prostitutes in the city of New york, which are not found in polygamist nations.

(b) There was a strictness against such practices in ancient Israel.

Newman

I. I did not answer all Pratt's scriptural argument yesterday because he did not define the terms as he was suppose to do.

II. Pratt's argument asserting that polygamy is the best method of procreating is wrong, for science affirms that where polygamy or polygyny prevails there is a tendency to a preponderance or predominance of one sex over the other, either male or female, which amounts to an extermination of the race.

III. Leviticus 18: 18 is a "general law" prohibiting polygamy.

"Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." (The preceding is the scripture as it reads in the margin,[1] but in the text it reads "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the

---

[1]The margin in a standard Bible contains words which might be used inter-changeably with the corresponding word in the text.

other in her life time.")

A. This marginal interpretation of Leviticus 18: 18 is correct, for

1. It is sustained by biblical and classical scholars such as Bishop Jewell, Cookson, Dwight, and others.
2. The preface to the law sustains this interpretation.
3. Dr. Edwards says the words which are translated "wife" or "sister" are found in the Hebrew writing of the Bible eight times; and in each case they refer to inanimate objects, "such as the wings of the cherubims . . ." etc., signifying the coupling to one to <u>another</u>, "the same as thou shalt not take one wife to <u>another</u>."
4. Such a marriage is forbidden by sequence and analogy.
5. If the marginal reading of this scripture is not correct then the Mormons are violating the law of God, for
   (a) Mr. E. Bolton, a Mormon, married a woman and her two daughters.
   (b) Captain Brown, a Mormon, married a woman and her two daughters.
   (c) Mr. Davis, a Mormon, married three sisters.
   (d) Mr. Sharkey married three sisters.

IV. Pratt's arguments can be refuted, for

A. Deuteronomy 21: 15-17, is a law of primogeniture, and is designed to preserve the descent of property. Since there is a general law prohibiting polygamy this scripture

is no longer in contest.

B. Exodus 21: 7-11, refers to the law of breach of promise. Pratt can not prove that either the father or the son married the girl.

C. Deuteronomy 25: 5-10, refers to the preservation of families, and Pratt must show one solitary instance in the Bible where a married man was compelled to obey this law.

D. Numbers 31: 15-16 and 17-18, has nothing to do with polygamy, it has only to do with a military expedition, and the reduction of people into slavery as domestics.

E. Deuteronomy 21: 10-13 and 14, is designed to regulate the treatment of a captive woman by a conqueror who desires her for a wife, and has nothing to do with polygamy.

F. Exodus 22: 16-17, is the law of seduction, and Deuteronomy 22: 28-29, is the law of rape and they have nothing to do with the law of polygamy.

G. II Chronicles 24: 2-3 and 15-16, does not say that King Joash had two wives simultaneously, it just says he had two wives.

H. Hosea 1: 2-3 and 3: 1, is an account of a spiritual or literal fornication.

V. Mr. Pratt can not show more than two polygamists in the whole House of Israel.

Third and Last Day

<u>Pratt</u>

I. There is proof that there were more than two polygamists in the House of Israel, for mathematically and logically it

would not have been possible for all Israel to have been monogamists during their sojourn in the wilderness, for 2,500,000 population (according to Newman) divided by the number of families (Numbers 3: 43) 30,000 would make 83 persons per family. (30,000 was arrived at by adding 22,273 mentioned in Numbers 3: 43, with 7,424 or 1/3 not included in this sum, plus 303 just to make it an even number.)

II. Lev. 18: 18, is not a general law against polygamy, for the marginal reading of Newman is not correct, for

A. Authorities cited by Newman on this subject were not cited as to source of statement and we have no access to them here in the mountains.

B. The original Hebrew indicates the text reading is right, for <u>el-ahotah</u> is translated "her sister" not "wife".

C. The law was given to prevent quarrels, which are apt to arise among blood relations.

III. Newman's refutation of scriptural references will not stand up under investigation, for

A. The general or unlimited language of the laws cited say: "If a man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other," indicating both married and unmarried men. "Will any person pretend to say that a married man is not a man?"

B. Newman's general law has been disproved, therefore all of my scriptural references still stand.

C. Newman might choose to quote Deuteronomy 17: 17, "Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn

not away..." and say that this means more than one, but this same passage mentions that the king was not to multiply horses too, but he certainly could have more than two.

D. Concerning the phrase "duty of marriage" found in Exodus 21: 12, and said by Newman to be only a promise of marriage, it means "cohabitation", and therefore means much more than betrothal.

Newman

I. There are errors in Pratt's mathematics, for the 22,273 first-born do not represent the number of families in Israel at the time, for many of the first-born were dead.

II. The marginal reading of Lev. 18: 18 is correct, for

A. The original Hebrew states el-ahotah this way in other passages. (Challenges Pratt to meet him on paper on the Hebrew of the Text.)

B. Mormons aren't living according to God's law even if it is wrong.

III. Cases used by polygamists to support their claims of polygamy can be disproven, for

A. Abraham was a monogamist and not a polygamist until Sarah insisted that he marry Hagar, but then later she realized her sin, and Hagar was sent away. Keturah, Abraham's other wife was married to him after the death of Sarah.

B. Jacob was a wicked man up until the time he was converted at the brook Jabbok, and he married into polygamy before this time. He later abandoned polygamy.

C. Pratt has claimed in a sermon on celestial marriage that Moses was a polygamist, but this is not true, for Zipporah and the Ethiopian woman were the same person.

D. Gideon was a polygamist, but he was an idolator too, and if the one sanctions polygamy the other sanctions idolatry.

E. In the case of Hannah, the wife of Elkanah, God honored her motherhood by giving her a son in answer to prayer, but he was honoring monogamy because Hannah was Elkanah's first wife.

F. David, was a sinful man when he took his wives, but he repented later in his old age.

G. Solomon's greatness was foretold, but that does not mean God approved of his polygamy.

IV. Mr. Pratt made three challenges yesterday (actually on the first day): (1) Show that the New Testament condemned polygamy, (2) show that polygamy is adultery, (3) show that polygamy is no prevention of prostitution; these can be proven, for

A. The New Testament does condemn polygamy, for

1. I Corinthians 7: 2-4 proves the exclusive right of a wife to one husband:

> Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.
> The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

2. I Corinthians 6: 15-17 can only be fulfilled under monogamy:

> Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and

make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.
What! know ye not that he which is joined to an harlot is one body? For two (said he) shall be one flesh.
But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.

3. A passage (I Timothy 3: 2) declares that a "bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife." If this is good enough for the priest it is good enough for the layman.

4. Christ said: "have ye not read that in the beginning God made them male and female?" (Mark 10: 6) Thus he brings out the great law of monogamy.

B. Polygamy is adultery, for Moech is the Hebrew word for adultery and it includes all criminal sexual intercourse.

C. Polygamy is not a prevention of prostitution, for

1. Prostitution is as old as authentic history.

2. Prostitution has been and is today more prevalent in polygamic countries than in monogamic countries.

3. The figures on prostitution in the cities of this nation have all been overdrawn.

V. It has been claimed in some printed works that monogamic nations are short lived and polygamic nations long lived; this is not true, for Greece and Rome outlived all the other polygamic nations.

B. THE INTEGRITY OF THE IDEAS

Four revelent arguments were advanced by Pratt in his first speech. Briefly stated, these were (1) there are laws regulating polygamy in the Old Testament; (2) captive women entered into polygamy with the children of Israel; (3) laws regulating adultery in the Bible commanded persons, in some circumstances, to enter into polygamy; (4)and finally, righteous men were sometimes polygamist. Another point, the presence of polygamy or monogamy in the lives of wicked or righteous men does not indicate approval or disapproval of either form of marriage in God's eyes, seems to have been more of a premature rebuttal argument than a constructive argument; and hence, it would have been better placed later in the debate.

Pratt had spoken for a full hour, economically using his time, and advancing no less than nine significant scriptures. It seemed incumbent upon Newman to bounce back with an equally large amount of proof. However, this was not the intention of Newman. Instead, he spent forty-nine of his sixty minutes defining the terms, and extolling the virtues of monogamy, stating that opportunities for companionship, procreation, and prevention existed in monogamy and not in polygamy. In the remaining eleven minutes he failed, almost completely, to refute Pratt's arguments.

Technically then, at this juncture of the debate, Newman was behind in the arguments; but in making this blanket statement, it would be wise for us to remember that Newman's sermon at Washington D.C. had been answered by Pratt, and Pratt's answer had been read and studied by

Newman.[1] Not only this, but Delegate Hooper's speech had also been read by both men.[2] In it, Hooper cites many of the scriptures later used in the first speech of Pratt. This becomes further revealing when it is observed that Hooper was merely quoting from an eighteenth century theologican named Martin Mada.[3] The arguments of the polygamist were not unknown to Newman. It seems reasonable, therefore, that this side-tracking of the question may have been in his mind right from the beginning. In this way Newman hoped Pratt's next speech would amount to nothing more than "sounding brass, or a tinking cymbal." Either Pratt would present more premature rebuttal evidence or use the remainder of his constructive material.

Pratt chose to present refutation. Although the issues presented by Newman, the day before, had very little to do with disproving the proposition, "The Bible sanctions polygamy," Pratt chose to handle them, and thus escaped the inevitable result of shooting all his guns at once. He challenged Newman's virtues of monogamy, saying that companionship was just as obtainable in polygamy as it was in monogamy; not only this, but polygamy offered a much better method of procreation, for the greater number of children would come to the more righteous man. As far as prevention is concerned, there is more prevention under polygamy than under

---

[1]Pratt and Newman, A Sermon . . .

[2]Congressional Globe, 41st Cong., 2d Sess., 1869-1870, Part 7, Appendix, 173-179.

[3]Mada was chaplain of the Lock Hospital in London. By his exertion, a fine chapel for the use of the unfortunate and fallen women of the community was constructed. His sympathies were deeply touched by their circumstances, and he published a book in their behalf titled: Thelyphthora; or, A Treatise on Female Ruin, in its Causes, Effects, Consequences, Prevention, and Remedy. The remedy he prescribed was polygamy, which he discussed in a very thorough manner.

monogamy, for there is less cause for prostitution.

Newman came back in his second speech with a completely organized and well worded attack on the proposition. This speech was, in the most part, a direct quotation of his sermon in Washington D.C. three months earlier. Many of the sentences appeared verbatim from his sermon. He insisted that Leviticus 18: 18 was a "general law" prohibiting polygamy. To prove this he used the marginal reading of the scripture rather than the reading as it appeared in the text.[1] He argued that this interpretation was correct, for it was sustained by biblical and classical scholars. He cited the names of three; Bishop Jewell, Cookson, and Dwight. He failed, however, to cite them as to comments or source of comments. This, then, amounted to little more than a mere assertion. He then went to the preface of the law which he said was found in the first few verses, pointing out that from verse six to seventeen "the law of consanquinty is laid down, and the blood relationship defined." The next verse, he said, was consequently a prohibition against polygamy. It is not clear in his explanation why this is the case, for both consanquinity and blood relationship have to do with the same topic, and neither one seems to disagree with the text reading of the scripture.

Newman next cited a Dr. Edwards who said that the words which are translated "wife" or "sister" are found in the Hebrew writing of the Bible eight times; and in each passage they refer to inanimate objects, "such as the wings of the cherubims . . ." etc., signifying the coupling together on <u>to another</u>, "the same as thou shalt not take one wife <u>to another</u>."

---

[1]The margin in a standard Bible contains words which might be used interchangeably with the corresponding word in the text.

He continued his support of the point by stating that polygamy is forbidden by sequence and analogy. For example, verse seven says a son shall not marry his mother, it follows that a daughter shall not marry her father. In this case it says in verse sixteen, "thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," so if two men are not to have the same wife, then two women are not to have the same husband.

Newman further pointed out, if Pratt did not accept his translation of this passage, then the Mormons were on the two horns of a dilemma, for John Hyde, Jr., in his work called: "Mormonism" states that several men had married into this sort of an arrangement.

From this position, Newman went on to refute Pratt's arguments of the day before, stating that in each case the discovery of a general law against polygamy changed the meaning of Pratt's scriptures. Deuteronomy 21: 15-17 was the law of primogeniture, Exodus 21: 7-11 was the law of breach of promise, and so on.

At this point of the debate, it appeared that Newman had wiped out the arguments of Pratt. Even though there might be some question as to the exactness of the evidence, it was none-the-less compelling. When many lines of argument are used to prove a point, there is a tendency for belief to be induced by the sheer weight of numbers.

As a parting shot Newman challenged Pratt to show more than two polygamists in the whole House of Israel. This challenge was soon to return and haunt Newman.

Pratt began his third and last speech with a mathematical equation, which proved that it would have been impossible for the House of Israel to have been anything except polygamist. He used two basic facts: (1) Newman stated near the end of his second speech that there were 2,500,000

people in the House of Israel;[1] and (2) Numbers 3: 43 said there were 22,273 families with first-born males. Pratt added another one/third for those without first born males, plus 303 more just to make it even, and came out with 30,000 families. This would mean that there were eighty-three persons per family; an impossibility in monogamy.

He also introduced other figures, such as; the number of males over twenty years old (Numbers 1: 49), destruction of the male children by Pharaoh during an eighty year period (400,000), and the number of children under twenty years of age (892,900). All of these figures appear designed to prove that there were more women than there were men, but they did not prove that Israel was polygamist. It probably was not intended to prove this proposition, but only support it by inference. The result, however, was not the best. It made Pratt's reasoning very difficult to understand, and needed review over and over again in order to trace the progress of the conclusion.

Pratt next attacked Newman's "general law" (Leviticus 18: 18), stating that it was not a general law against polygamy. Newman had cited certain authorities (Bishop Jewell, Cookson, and Dwight), explained Pratt, but these were four monogamists interested in sustaining monogamy. He exclaimed, "Now we have not been favored with these authorities, we have had no access to them. Here in these mountain wilds it is very difficult to get books." On the latter point Pratt was certainly correct, but his attack on the veracity of the authorities personally was nothing more than <u>argumentum ad hominem</u>.

He followed this argument with an appeal to the original Hebrew. This was fully within the rules of the debate. Both men had agreed that the original could be used if either party desired to use it. Pratt

insisted that *Veishah el-ahotah lo tikkah* literally translated and transposed is "neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister; "*veishah* being translated by the King James' translators "a wife;" *el-ahotah* being translated "her sister;" *lo* is translated "neither;" while *tikkah* is translated "shalt thou take."[1]

Pratt's appeal to the original Hebrew was involved, but very convincing. There could be no doubt after he finished that he knew what he was talking about. Both in this argument and the argument preceding involving mathematics, Pratt produced more facts than were necessary to draw a conclusion. There seemed to be the desire to impress, the hope to overwhelm, the effort to convince his hearers of his wisdom and learning, that many others have tried to achieve and very few have obtained.

Pratt explained that the law was given to prevent quarrels which are apt to arise among blood relations. He pointed out the cases of Cain and Abel; Joseph's being sold into Egypt by his brothers; the slaying of the seventy sons of Gideon upon one stone by their own brothers; the rebellion of Absalom, the son of David, against his father; the quarrels of Leah with her sister Rachel. All of these, he said, were feuds between blood relations. Undoubtedly this supported Pratt's idea in an excellent manner, but it did not answer Newman's charge that the Mormons were not living God's command if his interpretation was wrong, for he had said many Mormons had married two sisters.

---

[1]According to Dr. Ellis T. Rasmussen of the Brigham Young University College of Religion, this is a literal translation of the verse, but the verse might also be translated in the way Newman translated it if the context of the scripture indicated so. However, Dr. Rasmussen feels that the true interpretation of this scripture has nothing to do with marriage. He explained, it has only to do with promiscuous relations between a man and his wife's sister for the purpose of vexing his wife.

In rebuttal to Newman's refutation of his scriptural arguments of the first day, Pratt pointed out that the general or unlimited language of the law cited said: "If a man shall commit rape, if a man shall entice a maid, if a man shall do this, or that, or the other," indicating both married and unmarried men. He said, "Will any person pretend to say that a married man is not a man?" He then challenged Newman to prove that the language of these laws was limited. Since Newman had answered most of Pratt's arguments by referring to the "general law" Pratt contended that Newman would now have to find other means of over-ruling this scripture because his general law failed.

At this point Pratt disgressed from rebuttal, and began some more premature refutation. Only this time, it was given with good justification. Pratt would not be able to occupy the floor after Newman's next speech, and since Newman had used this argument with telling effect in his sermon at Nauvoo, Pratt wished to preclude that possibility here. It was well that he did, for this was the third point on Newman's agenda. The point refered to concerns Deuteronomy 17: 17 which says: "Neither shall he multiply wives to himself, that his heart turn not away . . ." Pratt exclaimed the word multiplied is construed by opponents to polygamy to mean more than one. He argued, since God had just finished commanding the kings not to multiply horses, and no one would say that the Lord would not allow the kings more than one horse, it is just as foolish to insist that God was making a limit of one wife.

Concerning the phrase "Duty of marriage," occuring in Exodus 21: 7-11, the terms "duty of marriage" are translated "cohabitation" by Professor Josiah W. Gibb, A.M. Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological School, Yale College. Hence, God would not command un-

diminished "cohabitation" with a women merely betrothed and not married, as Newman argued. Because of the lack of time this argument was not clear.

Parting from the group for the last time, Pratt challenges the audience to go home and find where Hosea ever divorced his first wife because of whoredoms as contended by Newman.

The third speech of Pratt had been a most devastating one, and there was much material left for Newman to handle. In the speech of Hooper, as well as the article written by Pratt, there had not been mentioned anything about mathematics or Hebrew. These two arguments appear to have been used for the first time. In the wake of their surprise, it was a difficult task, to say the least, for Newman to present refutation.

Although his objections were realistic they still were not conclusive. There are four general parts to a good rebuttal argument; one, state it, explain it, support it, and conclude it. Newman's tendency was to state the point, explain it, but not support it. As for example, his argument in answer to Pratt's mathematics. Here he points out that Pratt assumes the slaying of all male children for eighty years, but he does not come back with proof that it did not continue for eighty years. It is true that "He who asserts must prove," and in this case Pratt asserted the eighty years, but at the same time, the better debating is usually done if the assertion is pointed out and then one goes on to show that the assertion is wrong.

With the responsibility of speaking immediately after Pratt finished, it could hardly be expected that Newman would be able to adequately consider the true nature of Pratt's mathematics. However, in

all fairness to Pratt, it must be pointed out that Newman failed to strike at the heart of Pratt's arguments. Pratt's arguments were based upon two facts; first, Newman's estimate of the population of Israel, and second, the 22,273 families having first-born males over one month old as listed in Numbers 3: 43. All Newman said against this argument was that the 22,273 first-born did not represent the number of families in Israel at that time, for many of the first-born were dead. This might be quite true and yet fall within the interpretation Pratt placed upon the figures. Pratt added one/third more for those having no male children over one month old at that time. He even went further and included 303 families more just to make it an even 30,000. Newman needed to show that this was too small of an addition. This he failed to do. It is interesting to note that Newman could have increased the total number of families to 60,000 or 120,000 and still have had too few families for 2,500,000 monogamist people.

In meeting Pratt's arguments against Newman's general law (Leviticus 18: 18) Newman showed a great lack of flexibility. Instead of producing arguments from the original Hebrew to counteract those of Pratt from the original Hebrew, he merely argued the logic of it; "If it is correct in these passages (seven cited by Dr. Dwight) why is it not correct in the other?" If the word means sister it should make no difference, because "every woman is sister to every other woman." These arguments admit a certain amount of logical reasoning, but are compromised by failure to enlarge upon and support them by example. He further compromises himself, and admits, as it was, the superiority of Pratt's knowledge, by challenging Pratt to meet him in the newspapers of "your city or elsewhere upon the Hebrew of this text," instead of producing

his Hebrew then and there.

Newman next drives home the idea that the Mormons are not living the law according to Pratt's translation if he, Newman, is wrong. Mormons have married two sisters to one man. Newman said, "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 dilemma are before him." It is interesting to note that Pratt never mentioned this argument. It is possible that he did not know how to answer it, and therefore avoided it. He may also have considered it unimportant and therefore not handled it.

At this point, Newman entered a field which had heretofore not been engaged in by Pratt. He proposed to show evidence which would refute those cases of polygamy in the Bible generally cited by polygamists to prove that polygamy was practiced in the Old Testament. This, technically, was not necessary for Newman to do, since Pratt had not tried to use these arguments. On the other hand, it might have been a task undertaken with a long-range plan in mind. If however, this argument was undertaken because of Newman's expecting Pratt to have used these ideas in his last speech, and when he failed to do this, Newman found the better part of an hour before him with nothing to say, then Newman showed exceeding inflexibility. His slight treatment of Pratt's major arguments in the last speech suggests that he followed this course of action because of an inflexible nature. Regardless of how this action is considered, it was not a wise thing to do. He produced the arguments, and he then proceeded to refute them. This amounted to giving evidence for the affirmative and then giving refutation. In one or two cases, the refutation was not really clear-cut, and did him more harm than good. An

example is his citation of Hannah, the first wife of the polygamist Elkanah who prayed for a child and was given Samuel. He asserted that because Hannah was the first wife of Elkanah, God honored her motherhood by answering her prayer. This in no way condemned the act; it only brought the evidence to the attention of his listeners. Newman mentioned in his last speech that he had received three challenges from Pratt the day before (actually two days before). First, he was to show that the New Testament condemns polygamy; second, he was to show that polygamy is adultery; lastly, he was to show that polygamy is no prevention of prostitution.

In order to prove that the New Testament condemns polygamy, Newman cited I Corinthians 7: 2, 4 which says:

> Nevertheless to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.
> The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband; and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife.

Newman argued this means that every woman should have her own "peculiar, proper and appropriate husband." He further pointed out that one great evil prevailed in the church at Corinth—"a community of wives" and Paul here struck at the "very root of the evil."

It is difficult to anticipate what Pratt would have said had he been permitted to answer this argument in the debate; but standing as it does, alone and without refutation, it constitutes a powerful support of Newman's position.

Newman next referred to I Corinthians 6: 15-17:

> Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? Shall I then take the members of Christ and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.
> What! Know ye not that he which is joined to a harlot is one body? For two shall be one flesh. But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.

The argument found here is that Paul likens Christ to marriage. It is the joining together of one person unto one Christ, and hence one wife to one husband by inference.

Newman further pointed out Christ's statement, "have ye not read that in the beginning God made them male and female?" Thus, Newman said, "he brings out the great law of monogamy." Newman grants that the "allusion is incidental, nevertheless," he said, "it is all-important as falling from the lips of the Great Master."

On the second challenge, "show that polygamy is adultery" Newman points out Naaph is the Hebrew word for adultery and it is used to include all criminal sexual intercourse, therefore it includes polygamy. This assumes that polygamy is a form of criminal sexual intercourse, and in this debate, this assumption is certainly not warranted.

On the last challenge, "polygamy is no prevention of prostitution," Newman pointed out; he was prepared to prove, "and I will prove it in your daily papers, that prostitution is as old as authentic history, and that prostitution has been and is today more prevalent in polygamic countries than in monogamic countries. I can prove that the figures representing prostitution in monogamic countries are all overdrawn." Newman cited St. Louis where they "have just taken the census of the prostitutes," and said that there were only six hundred and fifty courtesans. He cited this one instance, but most of these arguments were assertions. Because of his later failure to produce these facts promised in the daily papers, it seems unjustified to acknowledge them as binding.

As a final argument Newman considered an argument often advanced by the press of the Mormon community, that monogamic nations are short-lived, and that polygamic nations are long-lived. He cited Greece and

Rome as examples of monogamic nations, and he pointed out that they outlived all the other polygamic nations of their time. He continued:

> Babylon is a ruin today, and Babylon was polygamic, Egypt, today is a ruin! Her massive piles of ruin bespeak her former glory and her pristine beauty. The last addition of the polygamic nations—Turkey—is passing away. From the Golden Horn and the Bosphorus, from the Danube, and the Jordan and the Nile, the power of Moharmedanism is passing away before the advance of the monogamic nations of the old world.

Conclusions

Each speaker revealed some strong and some weak points. Pratt was generally more detailed and accurate in his use of authorities and ideas. He usually stayed with the subject or idea until it was exausted. Sometimes, however, his flare for detail played havoc with him as he became too elaborate and detailed in his arguments. His mathematics, for example, were difficult to follow. His use of the Hebrew, also, was so detailed that few could follow every step.

Newman was imaginative and reasonable in his refutation, but he was too shallow in his proof. He poked holes in Pratt's arguments, but he failed to drive a wedge. He needed to carry the development of his ideas one step further and support them with good facts and examples.

In his use of authorities Newman appeared haphazard. He failed to cite specific statements and the source of these statements. He often used his own reputation as proof of the existence of a fact. This amounted to little more than assertion.

PART II. ANALYSIS OF SPEAKING METHOD

A. [illegible] PROOF IN THE SPEECHES

Many speeches are given which are intellectually sound, even convincing, but which fail to move to action. They are received by the ear, but they fail to register with the heart. "The normal human mind," says A. K. Rogers, "is not content merely to be logical and realistic, it craves food for its emotions also."[1] If a speech is to really be effective it must appeal to both the emotions and the intellect.

Pratt

There is a marked contrast between the emotional content of Pratt's speeches and those of Newman. Newman understood the need of emotional proofs and used them extensively. Pratt used emotional proofs, but infrequently and subtly when he did so. In Pratt's first speech there was hardly any use of emotional proofs at all, but during the second speech, after he had produced his major constructive arguments, he began to use more emotional proofs. This speech contained more emotional proofs than the other two combined.

Certain words were used over and over again for emotive emphasis. For example, Pratt frequently referred to polygamy as the "great" and "divine" institution. One time he said; "What, then, had it to do with the <u>divinity</u> of the <u>great institution</u> established called polygamy?";

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 359.

another time: "a faithful, righteous, holy man, who takes according to the great, divine institution of polygamy . . ."; and in another place:

> Polygamy 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.

A few examples of Pratt's use of emotional proofs are included for examination and example.

> Mr. Newman has said he would like nine hours to bring forth his arguments and reasonings for the benefit of the poor people of Utah. I wish he would not only take nine hours, but nine weeks and nine months, and be indeed a philanthropist and a missionary in our midst; and try and reclaim this poor people from being the "awful beastly" people they are represented abroad.[1]

As a final and parting remark on the third day of the debate, Pratt said:

> Having discussed the subject so far, I leave 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 immovable as the Rock of Ages, and will stand when all things on the earth and the earth itself shall pass away.[2]

Newman

As has been mentioned, Newman understood the need for emotional proof and used it frequently. Where ever possible he colored his words with vivid and picturesque language. In referring to the Bible it was "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?"[3] While speaking of the relationship of men and

---

[1] Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 6.

[2] Ibid., p. 95. [3] Ibid., p. 71.

wife he said:

> 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 toward the sky. See that ivy how it entwines itself gently, sweetly and beautifully around the 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.[1]

Chauncey Goodrich once said of John I. Curran, "The faults of Mr. Curran arose from the same source as his excellence. They lay chiefly on the side of excess."[2] Newman's fault was his excess too. An illustration of this is found in his argument on the grand features of monogamy. He said:

> Ah! what a pleasure it is for a man when far 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 lisp 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 him!' 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.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 39.

[2] Thonssen and Baird, p. 330.

[3] Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, pp. 39-40.

B. CHARACTER AND PRESTIGE OF THE SPEAKERS

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said:

> The reason why anyone refuses his assent to your opinion, or his aid to your benevolent design, is in you. He refuses to accept you as a bringer of truth, because, though you think you have it, he feels that you have it not. You have not given him the authentic sign.[1]

Many things combine to give this "authentic sign," but for the most part they can be classified as (1) the reputation or prestige enjoyed by the speaker with respect to his particular audience and subject at the moment he begins to speak," and (2) "the increasing or diminishing of that prestige as a result of what he says and does during the speech."[2] Prestige and reputation are called ethical proofs. They are inspired by our belief in the speakers sagacity, high character, and good will.

Pratt

In considering the relationship of character or ethos to the speaking powers of both speakers we must remember that there were two different audience situations. Pratt was speaking for a Mormon cause among the Mormons, whereas Newman was speaking before a Mormon audience and also to an unseen non-Mormon audience. His unseen audience consisted of the voters of the United States. He was concerned with both, but it is possible that he was more concerned with the latter. This dualism

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 383.

[2]*Ibid.*, p. 384.

must therefore be recognized as we discuss the influence of Newman's character on his speaking.

Pratt, as has been mentioned, was speaking to Mormons as a Mormon. His sagacity had been evident among them for years. He was chosen to announce the practice of polygamy to the world in 1852. He had written and edited many books and papers, and was also a teacher, and though self-educated, was considered exceptional by them. His high character is demonstrated in his selection as an apostle, and his good will is evident by the fact that he was speaking to them for their cause.

It has been stated by Thonssen and Baird in their book, Speech Criticism, that the introduction is "not (an) uncommon part of the speech is which to find such appeals."[1] So let us turn to Pratt's introduction on the first day. He said:

> I appear before this audience to discuss a subject that is certainly important to us, and no doubt is interesting to the country at large, namely: the subject of plurality of wives, or, as the question is stated, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" I would state, by way of apology to the audience, that I have been unaccustomed, nearly all my life, to debate. It is something new to me. I do not recollect of ever having held more than one or two debates, in the course of my life, on any subject. I think the last one was some thirty years ago, in the city of Edinburgh. But I feel great pleasure this afternoon in appearing before this audience for the purpose of examining the question under discussion. I shall simply read what is stated in the Bible, and make such remarks as I may consider proper on the occasion.[2]

This passage is of interest in that it attempts to (1) confirm our belief in the justice and innocence of the speaker's cause, and (2) to establish the speaker's modesty and honesty. He contends that the subject is important to the audience, and of interest to the entire

---

[1]Ibid., p. 387.

[2]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 12.

country, thus serving to notify the audience that he is a man conscious of his challenging responsibility. He then pointed out that he was "unaccustomed" to debate, thus tending to express modesty.[1] "But," he explained, "I feel great pleasure" in appearing, and will simply read "what is stated," thus showing the conviction that the facts would bear him out.

Admittedly, these are not the most complete methods of using all "available means of persuasion within the speaker," but they represent an effort to achieve some semblance of them.

In as much as the impression of sagaciousness is often given by using common sense in arguments, displaying a sense of good taste, or using materials which process intellectual integrity and wisdom,[2] it is apparent that Pratt increased his prestige as a result of what he said. His arguments from the beginning to end were bountiful and intelligent. They were possessed of an intellectual fiber creditable to any man.

Newman

Newman's dual audience situation makes it more difficult to determine his reputation and prestige at the time he began to debate. To

---

[1]It is true that the general belief expressed in many modern speech classes is that the individual should never apologize to the audience, but those who advocate this as a universal policy forget that America is famous for supporting the cause of the under-dog.

It is interesting to contrast this introduction with that of Daniel Webster's in the White murder case. He said: "I am little accustomed, gentlemen, to the part which I am now attempting to perform. Hardly more than once or twice, has it happened to me to be concerned, on the side of the government, in any criminal prosecution whatever; and never, until the present occasion in any case affecting life. Thonssen and Baird, p. 386.

[2]Ibid., p. 387.

the typical American he was revered as "Grant's Minister." But to some factions of the United States he was nothing more than a politician. He had been elected by a pro-North legislature as Chaplain, and had been billed as the political minister, so consequently some considered his reputation untrustworthy. However, on the whole, the mere fact that he was chaplain of the Senate and the President's adviser and minister, is strong grounds to conclude that he was generally held in great esteem by his fellow Americans. To the Mormons, however, he was an interloper. He represented all the things that they had hated for years. Ministers had been credited with the killing and persecution of Joseph Smith; ministers had been accused of being responsible for the loss of their homes three different times. Now here was another minister, and he had come to overthrow their "divine institution" of polygamy. His reported accusations that the men were "bulls," the women "serfs and slaves," and the children "brats" did much to alienate an already hostile audience. Reputation wise, Newman's stock-in-trade was little if anything to the Mormons. It probably did him more harm than it did good.

Newman did not do much in this debate to influence the hostile audience in his behalf. His introduction was bland and without color. He commenced almost immediately into a detailed definition of terms. Once he mentioned something that might be construed as an effort at ethical proof, but it went to the extreme and became somewhat assertive: "I am here to speak to the people, and I will be an organ to you in the name of the Lord."[1] It is certain that the Mormons did not consider him an organ of the Lord, in fact their belief concerning ministers

---

[1]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 29.

generally would have probably placed him more as an organ of the Devil. This statement may have impressed certain people of the non-Mormon audience; but the fact that it was unannounced and completely disconnected from anything said before or after, gives very little value to it as far as ethical proof, or ethos as it is technically called, is concerned.

Newman's total disregard of Pratt's constructive material on the first day of the debate did little to impress people with his sagaciousness. It was a calculated risk, but it backfired. He knew most of the arguments of Pratt, and he sought the advantage of waiting until the second day to present his strongest issue, but his failure to immediately construct a good case for the negative was a defect which he never entirely surmounted during the full course of the debate. It should, however, be remembered that Newman came back with many fine and intelligent arguments on the second and third days, and this in some measure tended to establish him as a sagacious man.

C. THE STRUCTURE OF THE ORAL DISCOURSE

Two objectives must be kept in mind by the critic when evaluating the structure of a debate. First, he must examine the organizational structure as "an assembly of many parts bound together in an orderly and balanced whole." Secondly, he must consider the debate in the light of its adaptation to the audience. A speech might follow all the rules of logical organization, and yet fail to meet the needs of that particular audience.[1] With these two points in mind, let us consider Pratt's and Newman's speeches.

Pratt commenced his speeches with a brief introduction, probably only forty to fifty seconds long. The body of his speech usually occupied all but one or two minutes of his time. He seldom gave more than a brief remark for the introduction or closing.

Newman very seldom gave any introduction or conclusion. His introduction the first day was nothing more than a restatement of the proposition and an explanation of the importance of a discussion of the question. His introductions subsequent to this were even shorter.

Pratt's first speech commenced with three arguments. These were: (1) there are laws regulating polygamy in the Old Testament; (2) captive women entered into poly amy with the children of Israel; (3) laws regulating adultery in the Bible commanded persons, in some circumstances, to enter into polygamy. Another argument "righteous men were sometimes

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 393.

polygamist" was advanced, but did not follow correct organizational procedure. It was designed as a refutation point, and this was not the time for refutation. All three of these arguments, however, inductively supported the proposition.

Newman commenced his arguments with an elaborate definition of terms. Under the circumstances and considering the audience and the question, this extensive defining of terms was not necessary.[1] Brembeck and Howell point out "if you assume that little or no knowledge exists, when your hearers know much about your topic, they will accuse you of insulting their intelligence . . ."[2] Certainly this audience understood the meaning of the words, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" Hence, Newman showed some weakness in audience adaptation on this point.

Newman next considered the grand features of monogamy. This was in no way connected with the proposition, but was a subject in and of itself. His continuation of this line of reasoning carried him into contrasting polygamy with monogamy. This also failed to support the proposition.

Pratt, in his second speech, proceeded to refute Newman's arguments on the grand features of monogamy. Undoubtedly Pratt was also off the subject of the debate, but Newman's arguments justified this

---

[1]Martin Brewer Anderson had a definite sympathy with the scientific method and taught the historical method of research and criticism. This became somewhat of a hobby with him, and he required in each department at Rochester University (Newman went to Rochester during this period) the historical development of each subject. Joseph H. Gilmore's books, The Outlines of Rhetoric and The Outlines of Logic are direct parallels to Newman's elaborate definitions. Both go extensively into the definition by history of each word and sentence. This suggests a common origin to Newman's and Gilmore's methods.

[2]Brembeck and Howell, p. 317.

course of action.

Newman's next speech was a powerful attack upon the proposition. It was organized with considerable detail and comprehensiveness. All in all, it was one of Newman's best organized speeches, both in organization *per se* and in audience adaptation. He first refuted a few of Pratt's last arguments and then moved into a constructive case of his own. He argued that Leviticus 18: 18 was a general law against polygamy. His arguments were organized to the last detail. He next moved to a refutation of Pratt's major arguments of the day before, handling each of them in the order in which they appeared. When he finished he had a speech well adapted to the needs of the situation, and organized into a balanced whole.

Pratt handled Newman's last point first. He attempted to prove by mathematics that monogamy was impossible in ancient Israel. His equation was detailed and confusing. It employed too many unnecessary figures.[1] However, the cohesiveness of his argument was supplemented by his overwhelming conclusion.

From this point, Pratt proceeded to destroy Newman's general law. The organization of this argument was also detailed and confusing, but the fact there was such a difference in the number of pages required for this speech compared to his first two speeches, indicates that Pratt supplemented his elaboration with a decrease of speed.

His last argument was directed at rebuilding his own case. He followed the same policy he generally used of referring to each argument in

---

[1]Tempering this criticism a bit, it is conceded that Pratt possibly left out a concluding statement to draw in his argument of the preponderance of men over women. Had he not switched into the next argument this feature of his organization might have resolved itself.

the order in which they first appeared.

Newman's refutation of Pratt's last speech occupied less than ten minutes of the sixty he had available. He asked a few penetrating questions, challenged to meet Pratt on paper on the Hebrew argument, and then proceeded to give some constructive material. The organizational quality of the constructive material is in doubt, for there does not appear justification for its inclusion here. It was given in refutation to arguments never really stressed by Pratt.

Newman concluded his part of the debate by answering three questions asked by Pratt during the first day of the debate. These questions were: (1) Does the New Testament condemn polygamy? (2) Is polygamy adultery? (3) Is polygamy a prevention of prostitution? The last two of these questions had nothing to do with the proposition "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy." For this reason their inclusion indicates faulty organization.

Taken as a whole, Pratt's speeches showed better organization than Newman's, both as regards to organizational craftsmanship and audience adaptation. Pratt included several arguments which had little relationship to the resolution, but by and large the errors on this score were unimportant. Newman's first speech revealed little adaptation to the audience. Very few points produced at that time actually attacked the proposition. His next two speeches, however, were somewhat better than the first. His second speech was highly organized and effective. But his third speech was lacking in adaptation and flexibility, however, it was still more effective than the first.

D. STYLE

Style, said Hugh Blair, is "the peculiar manner in which a man expresses his conceptions, by means of language."[1] In this particular case it is a matter of written as well as oral style. Written in the sense that more people probably read the debate than actually listened to it. Long ago Aristotle observed that written prose is not the same as spoken word. Written prose may be read over and over again until the idea becomes clear, but the spoken word does not allow time to reconsider its meaning. If the audience misses the idea it is gone.[2] This differentiation is helpful when we consider the debate, for Pratt's style was more convincing in its written form, whereas Newman's style was perhaps most convincing when heard instead of read.

Orson Pratt's style was plain, precise, and lucid. He used ornaments, but only on occasions; his strength lay in his simplicity. Through it he was able to go right to the heart of the argument. There is a sense of satisfaction as one reads his speeches that he had established his point and destroyed the opposition's arguments. His use of proof is worded in a convincing and enlighting manner.

Newman's style was generally florid. "Generally" is used because at times he appeared as plain and precise as Pratt, and at other times he embellished his sentences to the extreme. During most of the debate,

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 405.

[2]Brembeck and Howell, p. 375.

however, he hit an even medium.

His speech on the first day was perhaps the most florid. On the second and third days, as the necessity for extemporizing became more important, he decreased his embellishment. Whenever he struck an idea he had used before in a speech he had prepared, he used prepared sentences, and these were usually ornate. For example, in his speech at Washington he gave Leviticus 18: 18 as proof of a general law against polygamy, and he concluded: "From verse six to verse seventeen, inclusive, the law of consanquinity is laid down and the blood relationship defined."[1] On the second day of the debate, he cited this same passage and said: "From verse 6 to verse 17, inclusive, the law of consanquinity is laid down, and the blood relationship defined."[2]

---

[1]Pratt and Newman, A Sermon . . .

[2]Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, p. 66.

E. DELIVERY OF THE SPEECH

Perhaps no task in speech criticism is more difficult than to evaluate the delivery of those who are dead. Yet as difficult as the job appears, it is none-the-less clear that "Remote as we are from perfect knowledge, we deem ti less blameworthy to say too little rather than nothing at all."[1]

Another maxim of equal truthfulness says: "What our enemies say ought not to be taken as evidence."[2] Yet, in evaluating Pratt's delivery during the debate, there is good justification in taking the evidence of an anti-Mormon paper. The justification lies in the fact that the evaluation is highly commendatory, and the written copy of the debate seems to justify most of the observations of the commentator. He said:

> Mr. Pratt thinks and speaks slowly, with good enunciation, without any attempt at eloquence, but with such amplification as suits an extemporaneous address. He is not in any sense brilliant, and if he had had sufficient time for preparation cannot be said to be dull. He lacks steadiness and off-hand faculty, but is a patient, studious worker. There are men among the Mormons who can make a better off-hand speech, abounding in wit, humor, and vulgarity. Mr. Pratt never indulges in vulgarity, and if he is capable, under an exigency, of being witty, the exigency seldom occurs, and he is slow to meet it. But in patient research and plodding thoroughness he is the superior of most of his associates.[3]

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, p. 455.

[2]Olive Logan, quoted by David Kim, Dictionary of American Maxims (New York: Philsophical Library, 1955), p. 158.

[3]Daily Morning Chronicle, (Washington, D.C.) August 14, 1870.

Pratt's speaking has been considered by many pro-Mormon writers as "eloquent and powerful,"[1] and surely in a sense it must have been. Yet considered by the side of Newman even the highly pro-Mormon writer Orson F. Whitney admitted: "Newman was the more eloquent."[2]

Newman's delivery was considered by some good and by others bad. Those that disliked his manner of speaking said that he was too "vapid and bombastic."[3] Undoubtedly the maxim: "What our enemies say ought not to be taken as evidence," is worthy of being remembered at this time. Those more charitable, and probably more truthful, agreed with Whitney that "Newman was the more eloquent."

The special correspondence of the Chronicle said that "In the pulpit Dr. Newman is earnest, forcible, and impressive. He uses no manuscript, but gets full of his subject and then speaks from his fulness."[4] James R. Joy in his biography of Newman said:

> His rather grandiose style, with rehearsed gesture and pose, and a wealth of allusion and illustration from literature and foreign travel, delighted the prevailing taste. His sermons and lectures were laboriously prepared to the last detail. Doubtless his commanding and ingratiating countenance, his stalwart figure, his distinguished bearing, and his musical and sonorous voice, made his audience uncritical of his thought, which was not analytical or profound.[5]

These two descriptions of Newman's delivery are of his

---

[1]Whitney, Vol IV, p. 29.

[2]Orson F. Whitney, A Popular History of Utah (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1916), p. 251.

[3]Salt Lake Herald, August 17, 1870, p. 1.

[4]Daily Morning Chronicle, (Washington, D.C.) August 14, 1870.

[5]Joy, p. 465.

speaking generally, and in the absence of a full description of his delivery at the debate, gives us reason to believe that if he was generally like this, he probably was much like this during the debate.

CHAPTER V

EVENTS SUBSEQUENT

Although the debate was officially finished, there were several events subsequent which rightfully belong to a discussion of the debate. Two days after the final session the Salt Lake Tribune published a lengthy letter from Newman.[1] This letter was a defense of his position on several arguments, viz. (1) Leviticus 18: 18, which was the general law cited by Newman against polygamy; (2) Exodus 21: 7-11, which was the disputed passage concerning "betrothal" and "cohabitation"; (3) and the numberical problem which Pratt had advanced. For the most part, these arguments were persuasive, but the fact that they were subsequent to the debate lessens their real value as part of the discussion.

Pratt, not to be outdone, wrote a reply to Newman. This was published in the Salt Lake Deseret News of August 26, 1870.[2] In this reply, Pratt argues against Newman's Hebrew rendering of Leviticus 18: 18 and Exodus 21: 7-11. Interestingly enough, Pratt never replied to Newman's argument on his numerical problem. Perhaps Pratt felt that the statesman was right wen he said "Silence is one of the hardest arguments to refute."

---

[1] Salt Lake Tribune, August 16, 1870, p. 1.

[2] Deseret News, August 26, 1870, p. 1. Also Pratt and Newman, The Bible and Polygamy, pp. 117-122.

The debate was carried by most of the newspapers of the nation. Some papers, such as the Washington, D.C. Daily Morning Chronicle and the Philadelphia Press, had their own reporters in Salt Lake City for the debate. Others provided commentaries of the debate for their subscribers. Still others provided full texts of the speeches. Probably none of the newspapers of the nation failed to say something about the debate.

"In war the heroes always outnumber the soldiers ten to one."[1] In debate the difference is even more pronounced. Reports from Mormon journals always indicated that Pratt was the winner, but some of the reports from pro-Newman journals indicated that Newman was the winner. To actually determine the winner in the opinion of the majority of American newspapers is a task too difficult for this paper to answer without a personal visit of the author at Washington, D.C., and in a sense it is a task outside the scope of this thesis. However, a few reports appearing in some of the newspapers are included as Appendix III.

---

[1]H. L. Mencken, quoted by Kin, Dictionary . . ., p. 233.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This is a study in persuasion. It seeks to answer the following questions: first, what means of persuasion did the speakers use to modify the thoughts and actions of their audience; second, how affective were the speakers in this process; and finally, which of the two, Pratt or Newman, did the best job of persuading?

To answer the above questions this paper considered the events preceding the debate, the background of the speakers, the debate itself, and the events subsequent to the debate.

The events preceding the debate can be summerized as follows: Utah's delegate to congress, William H. Hooper, gave a speech in defense of polygamy before the passage of the Cullom Bill in March, 1870. Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman, Chaplain of the United States Senate and Pastor of the Metropolitan Church of Washington, D.C., gave a reply to Delegate Hooper at the Metropolitan Church on Sunday, April 24, 1870. His reply was printed in the New York Herald, and was later read in Utah. In reviewing the article the Salt Lake Telegraph challenged Dr. Newman to come to Utah and debate one of the prominent Mormon elders on the subject. Newman considered this a challenge from Brigham Young and left for Salt Lake City. Upon arriving there he discovered that Young was not willing to debate him.

However, a few days later a debate was arranged between Orson Pratt and Dr. Newman. It was held on August 12, 13, and 14, 1870, at

the New Tabernacle in Salt Lake City.

In chapter three, the background of the speakers is divided under two parts. Part one gives a brief biographical sketch of both Pratt and Newman. Part two examines the previous experience and training each of the speakers had which might have prepared them for the debate.

The chapter dealing with the debate itself considers the debate under two general headings: first, analysis of content; and second, analysis of speaking method. The section analysing the content of the speeches contains a brief (an outline) of the speeches to aid the reader in following the sequence of the arguments, and a discussion of the relative integrity of the ideas of each speaker to aid the reader in evaluating the persuasiveness of the argumentative development, and the relative truth of the ideas presented.

Part two, considering the speaking method of each speaker, is broken down into five parts: (1) use of emotion in the speaking to consider the types, frequency and effectiveness of the emotional appeal in the speeches; (2) ethos, or the character of the speakers to consider the persuasiveness of the speaker's reputation and any effort of the speaker to increase the prestige of his reputation during the debate; (3) structure of the discourse to consider the clarity and persuasiveness of the speaker's organization; (4) style of the speaking to consider the effectiveness of the language used by the speakers; (5) finally, the method of delivery to consider the over-all appeal of the presentation.

The final chapter considers the events subsequent to the debate. Both Pratt and Newman wrote articles for the local newspapers defending their positions. In this chapter these articles are reviewed. Reference

is also made to newspaper reports throughout the nation in this chapter.

Because of the intrinsic interest which the newspaper reports themselves hold, the author has included a few of them in the appendix. Also in the appendix is a copy of Pratt's opening speech and Newman's second speech. These two were selected because they represent the best speeches of the two speakers in the opinion of the author.

In a basket ball game each side makes some points, but one side makes more than the other. In a sense this is the case with debate. One of the speakers might present the best material, or have a better voice, and still fall short of his opponent in the final analysis. This was true in the Pratt-Newman debate as can be seen from the following conclusions:

Pratt's Speaking:

Although Pratt had little formal education he was qualified to uphold the Mormon position on polygamy by virture of his extensive training as a missionary and spokesman for the Mormon Church.

Although there is no actual proof that Pratt had any formal training in debate there is a strong probability that he did.

Pratt was generally more detailed and accurate in the presentation of his ideas. He usually stayed with his subject until he exhausted it, however, his flare for detail played havoc with him as he sometimes became too scientific and elaborate in his arguments.

Pratt was speaking to Mormons for a Mormon cause, so his character or ethos was well established. Pratt also used several devices to increase this prestige during the debate.

Pratt's style was plain, precise and lucid. He used ornaments, but only on occasions. His strength lay in his simplicity.

Newman's Speaking:

No actual proof has been found which indicates Newman had formal training in debate, but it is improbable that Newman failed to get this training in the light of existing circumstances.

Newman's derogitory statements about Biblical characters alienated his listening audience. The American people as a whole held Bible characters, such as Abraham, Jacob, and Solomon, in reverential esteem. Newman was faced with the problem of stereotypes. His attack on those Bible characters amounted to an open attack on the American people. This attack injured Newman's position.

Brigham Young's denial that he challenged Newman to a debate, and the outward evidence justifying this denial, injured Newman's position.

Newman tended to rely upon general assertions rather than specific evidence as proof. Although he was imaginative and reasonable in most of his refutation, he was too shallow in his use of proof. He poked holes in Pratt's arguments, but he failed to drive a wedge. He needed to carry the development of his ideas one step further and support them with good facts and examples. In his use of authorities he appeared haphazard. He failed to cite specific statements and the source of these statements. Also, he often used his own reputation as proof of a fact. This of course, amounted to little more than assertion.

Newman did little during the debate to establish prestige of character. He probably had the reputation of a good character before the debate, but he failed to add to that prestige during the debate. His introductions were bland and without color. He did little to influence a hostile audience. His effort to side-tract Pratt's arguments on the first day injured his reputation.

Newman's style was generally florid, but at times it was plain and precise. His speech on the first day was the most florid, but on the second and third days, as the necessity for extemporizing became more important, he decreased his embellishment.

General Conclusions:

Public debates on religious subjects were an established tradition among the Christian people generally, but were engaged in reluctantly by the Mormon Church. The Mormons felt that debating did them more harm than good; it only increased persecution, they felt.

Newman used more emotional speaking than did Pratt. Newman understood the need for emotional appeal and used it extensively; Pratt used emotional appeal in his speeches, but infrequently and subtly when he did so.

Taken as a whole, Pratt's speeches showed better organization than Newman's, both as regards to organizational craftsmanship per se and audience adaptation. Pratt included several arguments which had little relationship to the resolution, but not nearly as many as Newman. Newman's first speech revealed little adaptation to the audience. His next two speeches, however, were somewhat better than the first. They still lacked in adaptation and flexibility though.

Though Pratt was considered a good speaker, it is probably true that Newman was the "more eloquent."

Utah Mormon papers considered Pratt's arguments much superior to Newman's. As far as they were concerned, Newman helped the cause of polygamy more than he harmed it.

As would be expected, most non-Mormon papers in Utah favored Newman, but most of them held some reservations as to who won the

argument.

No final conclusion is entertained as to who actually won the debate in the opinion of the majority of American newspapers in the United States, for this is a question unsolved at the present time. However, one conclusion seems apparent, many newspapers felt that the debate injured monogamy.

In the light of all prior conclusions it is probably safe to say that the better debating was done by Orson Pratt.

Suggestions for Future Studies

Two problems which this paper does not answer, nor could it cover them without the author's personal presence in Washington, D.C., are: first, what was Newman's position in bringing about future anti-Mormon legislation; and finally, in the opinion of most American newspapers who won the debate, how important was the debate, and was it of help to the Mormons?

Two other studies might also be conducted on the following: (1) What was the effect of the debate on the Mormon people? (2) Did the debate change in any way the feeling of the American people toward the Mormons?

APPENDIX I. Pratt's First Speech in Debate, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" August 12, 1870, in Salt Lake City, Utah

Professor Orson Pratt

I appear before this audience to discuss a subject that is certainly important to us, and no doubt is interesting to the country at large, namely: the subject of plurality of wives, or, as the question is stated, "Does the Bible sanction Polygamy?" I would state, by way of apology to the audience, that I have been unaccustomed, nearly all my life, to debate. It is something new to me. I do not recollect of ever having held more than one or two debates, in the course of my life, on any subject. I think the last one was some thirty years ago, in the city of Edinburgh. But I feel great pleasure this afternoon in appearing before this audience for the purpose of examining the question under discussion. I shall simply read what is stated in the Bible, and make such remarks as I may consider proper on the occasion.

I will call your attention to a passage which will be found in Deuteronomy, the 21st chapter, from the 15th to the 17th verse:

> If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born be hers that was hated: Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born: But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; the right of the first-born is his.

Here is a law, in the words of the Great Lawgiver himself, the Lord, who spake to Moses; and it certainly must be a sanction of a plurality of wives, for it is given to regulate inheritances in families of that description, as well as in families wherein the first wife may have been divorced, or may be dead; wives contemporary and wives that are successive. It refers to both classes; and inasmuch as plurality of wives is nowhere condemned in the law of God, we have a right to believe from this law that plurality of wives is just as legal and proper as that of the marriage of a single wife. This is the ground we are forced to take until we can find some law, some evidence, some testimony to the contrary. They are acknowledged as wives in this passage at least--"If a man have two wives." It is well known that the House of Israel at that time practised both monogamy and polygamy. They were not exclusively monogamists: neither were they exclusively polygamists. There were monogamic families existing in Israel in those days, and therefore in the Lord giving this He referred not only to successive wives, where a man had married after the death of his first wife, or if the first wife had been divorced for some legal cause, but to wives who were contemporary, as there were many families in Israel, which can be proved if

necessary, that were polygamists. I might here refer to the existence of this principle concerning the rights of the first-born in monogamic and polygamic families prior to the date of this law. This seems to have been given to regulate a question that had a prior existence. I will refer, before I proceed from this passage, to the monogamic family of Isaac, wherein we have the declaration that Esau and Jacob, being twins, had a dispute, or at least there was an ill feeling on the part of Esau, because Jacob at a certain time had purchased the right of the first-born--that is, his birthright. The first-born, though twins, and perhaps a few moments intervening between the first and second, or only a short time, had rights, and those rights were respected and honored centuries before the days of Moses. This was a monogamic family, so far as we are informed; for if Isaac had more than one wife, the Bible does not inform us. We come to Jacob, who was a polygamist, and whose first-born son pertained to the father and not to the mother. There were not four first-born sons to Jacob who were entitled to the rights of the first-born, but only one. The first-born to Jacob was Reuben, and he would have retained the birthright had he not transgressed the law of heaven. Because of transgression he lost that privilege. It was taken from him and given to Joseph, or rather to the two sons of Joseph, as you will find it recorded in the fifth chapter of 1st Chronicles. Here then the rights of the first-born were acknowledged, in both polygamic and monogamic families, before the law under consideration was given. The house of Israel was not only founded in polygamy, but the two wives of Jacob, and the two handmaidens, that were also called his wives, were the women with whom he begat the twelve sons from whom the twelve tribes of Israel sprang; and polygamy having existed with Israel or Jacob, the founders of that nation, was continued among them from generation to generation down until the coming of Christ; and these laws therefore were intended to regulate an institution already in existence. If the law is limited to monogamic families only, it will devolve upon my learned opponent to bring forth evidence to establish this point.

We will next refer to a passage which will be found in Exodus, 21st chapter, 10th verse. It may be well to read the three preceding verses, commencing with the 7th: "And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her into a strange nation he shall have no power seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he hath betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish." Also the following verse, the 11th: "And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money." I think from the nature of this passage that it certainly does have reference to two lawful wives. It may be that objection will be taken to the word "wife"--"another wife"--from the fact that it is in italics, and was so placed by the translators of King James, according to the best judgment they could form, taking into consideration the text. I do not intend at present to dwell at any length upon this passage, merely declaring that this does sanction plurality of wives, so far as my judgment and opinion are concerned, and so far as the literal reading of the Scriptures exhibits, it does sanction the taking of another wife, while the first is still living. If this word

"wife" could be translated "woman," that perhaps might alter the case, providing it can be proved that it should be so from the original, which may be referred to on this point, and it may not. We have the privilege, I believe, of taking the Bible according to King James' translation, or of refering to the original, providing we can find any original. But so far as the original is concerned, from which this was translated, it is not in existence. The last information we have of the original manuscripts from which this was translated, is that they were made into the form of kites and used for amusement, instead of being preserved. With regard to a great many other manuscripts, they may perhaps agree with the original of King James' translation, or they may not. We have testimony and evidence in the Encyclopedia Metropolitana that the original manuscripts contained a vast number of readings, differing materially one from the other. We have this statement from some of the best informed men, and in several instances it has been stated that there are 30,000 different readings of these old original manuscripts from which the Bible was translated. Men might dispute over these readings all the days of their lives and there would be a difference of opinion, there were so many of them. This, then, is another law, regulating, in my estimation, polygamy.

I will now refer to another law on the subject of polygamy, in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy--I do not recollect the verse, but I will soon find it--it commences at the 5th verse: "If brethren dwell together"--Now, it is well enough in reading this, to refer to the margin, as we have the privilege of appealing to it, so you will find in the margin the words "next kinsman," or "brethren." "If brethren--or next kinsmen--dwell together:"

> If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger: her husband's brother shall go in unto her and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her.
>
> And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not out out of Israel.
>
> And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.
>
> Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him: and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;
>
> Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man who will not build up his brother's house.
>
> And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed.

It may be asked, What has this to do with polygamy? I answer that as the law is general, it is binding upon brethren and upon all near kinsmen dwelling together. Not unmarried brethren or unmarried kinsmen only, but the married and unmarried. The law is general. If it can be proved from the original, or from any source whatever, that

the law is not general, then the point will have to be given up. But if that cannot be proven, then here is a law that not only sanctions polygamy, but commands it; and if we can find one law where a command is given, then plurality of wives will be established on a permanent footing, equal in legality to that of monogamy. This law of God absolutely does command all persons, whether married or unmarried, it makes no difference--brethren dwelling together or near kinsmen dwelling together--which shows that it is not unmarried persons living in the same house that are meant, but persons living together in the same neighborhood, in the same country in Israel, as it is well known that Israel in ancient days did so dwell together; and the law was binding upon them. This was calculated to make a vast number of polygamists in Israel from that day until the coming of Christ. And the Christian religion must have admitted these polygamists into the Church, because they would have been condemned if they had not observed this law. There was a penalty attached to it, and they could not be justified and refuse to obey it. Hence there must have been hundreds, perhaps thousands, of polygamists in Israel, when Jesus came, who were living in obedience to this law and who would have been condemned if they had disobeyed it. When the gospel was preached to them, if they could not have been admitted into the Christian Church without divorcing their wives God would have been unjust to them, for if they, through their obedience to God's law, should have been cut off from the gospel, would it not have been both inconsistent and unjust? But as there is no law either in the Old or New Testament against polygamy, and as we here find polygamy commanded, we must come to the conclusion that it is a legal form of marriage. We cannot come to any other conclusion, for it stands on a par with the monogamic form of marriage; consequently wherever we find either righteous men or wicked men, whatever may be their practices in the course of their lives, it does not affect the legality of their marriage with one wife or with two wives.

We may refer you to Cain, who had but one wife, so far as we are informed. He was a monogamist. He was also a very wicked man, having killed his own brother. We find he was driven out into the land of Nod. Of course, as the Lord had not created any females in the land of Nod, Cain must have taken his wife with him, and there was born a son to him in that land. Shall we condemn monogamy and say it was sinful because Cain was a murderer? No; that will never do. We can bring no argument of this kind to destroy monogamy, or the one-wife system, and make it illegal. We come down to the days of Lamech. He was another murderer. He happened to be a polygamist; but he did not commit his murder in connection with polygamy, so far as the Scriptures give any information. There is no connection between the law of polygamy and the murder he committed in slaying a young man. Does that, therefore, invalidate the marriage of two persons to Lamech? No; it stands on just as good ground as the case of Cain, who was a monogamist and a murderer also.

Adam was a monogamist. But was there any law given to Adam to prevent him taking another wife? If there was such a law, it is not recorded in King James' translation. If there be such a law recorded, perhaps it is in some of the originals that differed so much from each other. It may be argued in the case of Adam, that the Lord created but one woman to begin the peopling of this earth. If the Lord saw proper to create but one woman for that purpose, he had a perfect right to do

so.

The idea that that has any bearing upon the posterity of Adam because the Lord did not create two women would be a very strange idea indeed. There are a great many historical facts recorded concerning the days of Adam that were not to be examples to his posterity. For instance, he was ordered to cultivate the garden of Eden--one garden. Was that any reason why his posterity should not cultivate two gardens? Would any one draw the conclusion that, because God gave a command to Adam to cultivate the garden of Eden, to dress it and keep it, that his posterity to the latest time should all have one garden each, and no more? There is no expression of a law in these matters; they are simply historical facts. Again, God gave him clothing on a certain occasion, the Lord himself being the tailor--clothing to cover the nakedness of Adam and of Eve his wife; and this clothing was made from the skins of beasts. This is a historical fact. Will any one say that all the posterity of Adam shall confine their practice in accordance with this historical fact? Or that it was an expression of law from which they must not deviate? By no means. If the posterity of Adam see fit to manufacture clothing out of wool, or flax, or cotton or any other material whatever, would any one argue in this day that they were acting in violation of the law of the Divine Creator, of a law expressed and commanded in the early ages? Why, no. We should think a man had lost all powers of reason who would argue this way. As our delegate remarked in his speech, Adam had taken all the women in the world, or that were made for him. If there had been more, he might have taken them, there was nothing in the law to limit him.

I would like to dwell upon this longer, but I have many other passages to which I wish to draw your attention. The next passage to which I will refer, you will find in Numbers, 31st chapter; 17th and 18th verses. This chapter gives us a history of the proceedings of this mixed race of polygamists and monogamists called Israel. At a certain time they went out to battle against the nation of Midianites: and having smote the men, they took all the women captives, as you will find in the 9th verse. Commencing at the 15th verse, we read:

> And Moses said unto them have ye saved all the women alive? Behold these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of the Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord.

You will recollect the case of some Midianitish women being brought into the camp of Israel contrary to the law of God, not being wives; and Israel with them sinned and transgressed the law of heaven, and the Lord sent an awful plague into their midst for this transgression. Now, here was a large number of women saved, and Moses, finding they were brought into camp, said these had caused the children of Israel to sin; and he gave command: "Now, therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women-children, that have not known a man by lying with him keep alive for yourselves." How many were there of this great company that they were to keep alive for themselves? There was something very strange in this. If they had caused Israel to sin why spare them? Or why keep them alive for themselves? That they might

have them lawfully. Some may say to have them as servants, not as wives. Some might have been kept as servants and not as wives, but would there not have been great danger of Israel sinning again with so many thousand servants, as they were the same women who had brought the plague into the camp of Israel before? How many were there of these women? Thirty-two thousand, as you will find in another verse of the same chapter. And these were divided up as you will also find, in the latter part of the same chapter, among the children of Israel. Those who stayed at home from the war took a certain portion--sixteen thousand in number; those who went to the war, including the Levites, took the remaining sixteen thousand.

Now to show that polygamy was practiced among the children of Israel in taking captive women, let me refer you to another passage of Scripture, in Deuteronomy, 21st chapter, commencing at the 10th verse:

> When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive;
>
> And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldst have her to thy wife;
>
> Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails;
>
> And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife.
>
> And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.

Now, this law was given to a nation, as I have already shown, which practiced polygamy as well as monogamy; and consequently if a polygamist saw a woman, a beautiful woman, among the captives; or if a monogamist saw a beautiful woman among the captives; or if an unmarried man saw a beautiful woman among the captives, the law being general, they had an equal right to take them as wives. This will explain the reason why the Lord told Israel to save thirty-two thousand Midianitish women alive for themselves. It will be recollected that the Israelites already had a surplus of women. I have no need to refer to the destruction of the males that had been going on for a long period of time--about eighty years, until Moses went to deliver Israel from Egypt. During this time females were spared alive, making a surplus of them in the midst of Israel; but the Lord saw there were not enough, and he made provision for more by commanding them to spare these captive women and keep them alive for themselves. If my opponent who will follow me, can bring forth any evidence from the law of God, or from the passage under consideration, to prove that this law was limited to unmarried men, all right; we will yield the point, if there can be evidence brought forward to that effect. "When you go forth to war if you see a beautiful woman"--not you unmarried men alone, but all that go forth to war.

The next passage to which I will refer you, where God absolutely

commands polygamy, will be found in Exodus, 22nd chapter, 16th and 17th verses:

> And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her, he shall surely endow her to be his wife.
> If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

There is the law of Exodus; now let us turn to the law of Deuteronomy, 22nd chapter, 28th and 29th verses, on the same subject:

> If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;
> Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

Does this mean an unmarried man? The law was given to a nation wherein both forms of marriage were recognized, and wherein single men existed. If it does mean single men alone, we would like to hear the proof. The law is general. Whether married or unmarried, whether a monogamist or a polygamist, if he committed this crime, if he found a maid and committed the crime there specified, of seduction, there is the law; he shall marry her, and shall not only marry her, but shall pay a fine of fifty shekels of silver to the father. This was the penalty; not that they were justified in the act. It mattered not whether he was a polygamist, a monogamist, or an unmarried man, he must comply with the law as a penalty. That was another command establishing and sanctioning polygamy, sanctioning it by divine command. If this law could have been put in force in modern times, among modern Christian nations, what a vast amount of evil would have been avoided in the earth. It is proverbial that among all the nations of modern Europe, as well as in our own great nation--Christian nations--there is a vast amount of prostitution, houses of ill-fame, and prostitutes of various classes; now, if this law, which God gave to Israel, had been re-enacted by the law-makers and legislatures and parliaments of these various nations, what would have been the consequence? In a very short time there would not have been a house of ill-fame in existence. Their inmates would have all been married off to their seducers, or their patrons; for who does not know that females would far rather be married than prostitute themselves as they do at the present time? And they would lie in wait to entrap this man and that man, and the other man, to get out of these brothels, and, as the law is general, if the same law had existed in our day, it would soon have broken up houses of ill-fame. There might have been some secret evils, but it would have broken up the "social evil," as practiced openly.

The next passage to which I will refer you is in 2nd Chronicles, 24th chapter, 2nd, 3rd, 15th and 16th verses:

> And Joash did that which was right in the sight of the Lord all the days of Jehoiada the priest.

And Jehoiada took for him two wives, and he begat sons and daughters.

According to the ideas of monogamists, Jehoiada must have been a very wicked man, and Joash "a beastly polygamist" for taking two wives. We will take the man who received the wives first. Joash, who received the wives from the highest authority God had on earth, "did right in the sight of the Lord, all the days of Jehoiada the priest." What! Did he do right when Jehoiada took two wives for him and gave them to him? Yes, so says the word of God, the Bible, and you know the question is, "Does the Bible sanction polygamy?" But what a dreadful priest that man must have been, according to the arguments of monogamists! Let us see what kind of a character he appears. In the same chapter, and in the 15th and 16th verses we read:

But Jehoiada waxed old, and was full of days when he died; a hundred and thirty years old was he when he died.

And they buried him in the city of David among the kings, because he had done good in Israel, both toward God, and toward his house.

"Because he had done good in Israel, both toward God and toward his house," they buried him among the kings, honored him in that manner; and the reason why they did bestow this great honor upon him was because he had done good. In the first place he had given two wives to Joash, which was a very good act, for he was the highest authority God had upon the earth at that time; and God sanctioned polygamy by lengthening out the age of this man to 130 years, a very long age in those days.

But I shall have to hasten on, although there are many passages which I have not time to quote. The next will be found in Hosea, 1st chapter, 2nd and 3rd verses: "The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea." This was the introduction of Hosea as a prophet. No doubt he brought the evidence as a prophet; and in the beginning of the word of God through Hosea, to the world, he must have come with great proof. The first thing the Lord said to him, was "Go take unto thee a wife of whoredoms." In the 3rd verse it says: "So he went and took Gomer, the daughter of Diblain." If such a thing had occurred in our day; if a man had come forth professing to be a prophet, and the first thing he said as a prophet was that the Lord had revealed to him that he was to go and take a wife of such a character, what would be thought of him? Yet he was a true prophet. Was this the only wife God commanded Hosea to take? No. The Lord said—"Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friends, yet an adulteress." See chapter three. What, love a woman, an adulteress, when he already had a wife of very bad character! Take wives of such disgraceful reputation? Yet God commanded this, and He must be obeyed. This did not justify any other prophet in doing so. Jeremiah would not have been justified in doing the same. But this was a command of God, given to Hosea alone. It was not given as a pattern for any other man to follow after, or for the people of this generation to observe. Yet it was given in this instance. "But," enquires one, "does not the Lord require such characters to be put to death?" Yes, but in this instance, it seems the Lord deviated from this law; for He commanded a holy prophet to go and marry two women. This recalls to my mind the law given to

Israel, recorded in Deuteronomy, where the Lord commanded the law of consanguinity to be broken. You will recollect that in two different chapters the Lord pointed out who should not marry within certain degrees of consanguinity; yet in the 25th chapter of Deuteronomy He commanded brethren, who dwell together, and near kinsmen, to break that law, which was a justification in part to not regard the law of consanguinity. God has a right to alter His commands as He pleases. Go back to the days of Noah, and the command was given: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" yet the same God commanded Abraham, that good man who is up yonder in the kingdom of God, according to the New Testament, to take his son Isaac and slay him and offer him up as a burnt offering. Here is one command in opposition to another. Consequently, God does sometimes give a command in opposition to another, but they are not examples for you or me to follow. Supposing I should prove by ten thousand examples from the Bible that polygamy was practiced in ancient Israel, is that a reason why you and I should practice it? No; we must have a command for ourselves. God sometimes repeats a command. The Latter-day Saints in this Territory practice polygamy; not because God commanded it in ancient times, not because Moses gave laws to regulate it; not because it was practiced by good men of ancient times, but because it is as divinely legal as monogamy, and enjoined upon us by divine command.

APPENDIX II. Newman's Second Speech in Debate, "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" August 13, 1870, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dr. John P. Newman

Messrs. Umpires and Ladies and Gentlemen:

I understand the gentleman to complain against me that I did not answer his scriptural arguments adduced yesterday. If I did not the responsibility is upon him. He, being in the affirmative, should have analyzed and defined the question under debate; but he failed to do that. It therefore fell to me, not by right, but by his neglecting to do his duty; and I did it to the best of my ability. It was of the utmost importance that this audience, so attentive and so respectable, should have a clear and definite understanding of the terms of the question; and I desire now to inform the gentleman, that I had the answers before me to the passages which he adduced, and had I had another hour, I would have produced them then. I will do it today. Now, my learned friend will take out his pencil, for he will have something to do this afternoon.

A passing remark—a word in regard to the original manuscripts, written by Moses or Joshua, or Samuel, or the prophets. You sit down to write a letter to a friend, you take it into your head to copy that letter; you copy that letter; the original draft you care nothing about—whether it is given to the winds or the flames. What care I about the two tables of stone on which the original law was written, so that I have a true copy of this law? A passing remark in regard to Mother Eve. I will defend the venerable woman! If the Fall came by the influence of one woman over one man, what would have happened to the world if Adam had had more wives than one? More, if one woman, under monogamy, brought woe into the world, then a monogamist, the blessed Virgin Mary, brought the Redeemer into the world, so I think they are even.

My friend supposes that the Almighty might have created more women than one out of Adam's ribs; but Adam had not ribs enough to create fifty women. My friend speaks against polyandry, or the right of women to have more husbands than one. He bases his argument upon the increase of progeny. Science affirms that where polygamy or polygyny, or a plurality of wives prevails, there is a tendency to preponderance or predominance of one sex over the other, either male or female, which amounts to an extermination of the race.

I will reply, in due time, to the gentleman's remarks in regard to Gideon and other scriptural characters, and especially in regard to prostitution or what is known as the social evil. But first, what was the object of the gentleman yesterday? It was to discover a general law for the sanction of polygamy. Did he find the law? I deny it. What is the law? Law is the expression of the legislative will; law is the manner in which an act is performed. It is the law of gravitation that all things tend to a common center. It is the law in botany that the flowers open their fan-like leaves to the light, and close them beneath the kisses of night. What is the civil law? Simply defining

the conduct of God's moral subjects. Laws are mandatory, prohibitory and permissive: commanding what should be done; prohibiting what should not be done, and permitting what may be done. And, yet, where has the gentleman produced this general law which he spent an hour in searching for yesterday? And then remember, that this law must sanction polygamy! Perhaps it is not necessary to repeat our definition of the word "sanction." My learned friend, for whom I have respect, agrees with me as to the definition of that term, therefore we need not spend a solitary moment further touching these two points.

There is another vital point in reference to the nature of law. In legislating upon any subject there must be a great, organic central principle, mandatory or prohibitory, in reference to that subject; and all other parts of the particular law as well as of the general code must be interpreted in harmony therewith.

Now I propose to produce a law this afternoon, simple, direct and positive, that polygamy is forbidden in God's holy word. In Leviticus XVIII and 18th, it is written: "Neither shalt thou take one wife to another, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." There is a law in condemnation of polygamy. It may be said that what I have read is as it reads in the margin, but that in the body of the text it reads: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her life time." Very well, argumentum ad hominem, I draw my argument from the speech of the gentleman yesterday. Mr. Pratt said, in his comments upon the text, "If brethren dwell together,"—Now it is well enough in the reading of this to refer to the margin, as we have the liberty, I believe, to do so, and you will find that in the margin the word brother is translated "near kinsman." I accept this mode of reasoning; he refers to the margin, and I refer to the margin; it is a poor rule that will not work both ways; it is a poor rule that will not favor monogamy if it favor polygamy. Such then is the fact stated in this law.

Now it is necessary for us to consider the nature of this law; and to expound it to your understanding, it may be proper for me to say that this interpretation, as given in the margin is sustained by the most eminent biblical and classical scholars in the history of Christendom—by Bishop Jewell, by the learned Cookson, by the eminent Dwight, and other distinguished biblical scholars. It is an accepted canon of interpretation that the scope of the law must be considered in determining the sense of any portion of the law, and it is equally binding upon us to ascertain the mind of the legislator, from the preface of the law, when such preface is given. The first few verses of the XVIII chapter of Leviticus are prefatory. In the 3rd verse it is stated that:

> After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordinances.

Both the Egyptians and Canaanites practiced incest, idolatry, sodomy, adultery and polygamy. From verse 6 to verse 17, inclusive, the law of consanguinity is laid down, and the blood relationship defined. Then the limits within which persons were forbidden to marry, and in verse 18 the law against polygamy is given—"neither shalt thou

take a wife to her sister," but as we have given it, "neither shalt thou take one wife to another," etc.

According to Dr. Edwards, the words which are translated a "wife" or "sister," are found in the Hebrew but eight times, and in each passage they refer to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, tenons, mortises, etc., and signify the coupling together one to another, the same as thou shalt not take one wife to another.

Such then is the law. Such were the ordinances forbidden, which the Egyptians and the Canaanites practiced. Now we propose to push this argument a little further. If it is said that this passage does not prohibit a man marrying two sisters at the same time, then such a marriage is nowhere in the Bible pronounced incestuous. That is the objection of my friend. To which I reply that such a marriage is forbidden by sequence and analogy. As for example, where the son, in the 7th verse, is prohibited from marrying his mother, it follows that the daughter shall not marry her father; yet it is not so given and precisely stated. In verse 14 it is said—"thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother;" so I infer that it would be equally criminal to uncover the nakedness of a mother's brother, though it is not so stated. In verse 16 it is said—"thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy brother's wife," so I infer that a man shall not uncover the nakedness of his wife's sister, that is, if two brothers shall not take the same woman, then two women shall not take the same man, for between one man and two sisters, and one women and two brothers is the same degree of proximity, and therefore both are forbidden by the law of God. Furthermore, if for argument's sake, we consider this means two literal sisters, then this prohibition is not a permission for a man to take two wives who are not sisters; for all sound jurists will agree that a prohibition is one thing and a permission is another thing. Nay, more, the Mormons do or do not receive the law of Moses as binding. That they do not is clear from their own practices. For instance, in Leviticus, XX chapter and 14th verse, it is said:

> And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness; they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they.

Yet Mr. John Hyde, Jr., page 56 of his work called "Mormonism," states that Mr. E. Bolton married a woman and her daughter; that Captain Brown married a woman and her two daughters.

These are illustrations of the violation of the law. More than this, Leviticus XVIII, 18, prohibits a man from marrying two sisters; yet Mr. Hyde informs us that a Mr. Davis married three sisters, and a Mr. Sharkey married the same number. If the question is, Is the law of Moses obeyed here or not? and supposing this gentleman can prove that the text means two literal sisters, and two literal sisters are married here, then I affirm that you do not keep God's law, or that which you say is God's law, as given through his servant Moses. Nay, more than this: If it here means two literal sisters, and whereas, Jacob married two sisters: and, whereas, the great Mormon doctrine that God worked a miracle on Leah and Rachel that they might have children; and, whereas, it is here said that said miracles were an approval of polygamy, so also were such miracles an approval of incest, if it be true that God did not express this approval at Jacob having two wives; neither did he express

disapproval of his having two sisters; therefore the Divine silence in the one case is an offset to the Divine silence in the other case. Even you are driven to this conclusion, either my interpretation of this passage is correct,--neither shall a man take another wife,--two wives, or you must admit that this passage means two literal sisters, and in either case you live in the violation of God's law. It is for my distinguished friend to choose which horn of the dilemma he pleases. I thank him for the compliment he paid me--that I came here as a philanthropist. I have only kindness in my heart for these dear men and women; and had not this kindness filled my heart; had I believed in a crushing, iron, civil law, I could have remained in Washington. But I came here believing the truth as it is in Jesus, and I am glad to say that I have the privilege of speaking what I believe to be God's truth in your hearing.

The gentleman quoted Deuteronomy XXI, 15-17, which is the law of primogeniture, and is designed to preserve the descent of property:

> If a man have two wives, one beloved, and another hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated;
> Then it shall be, when he maketh his sons to inherit that which he hath, that he may not make the son of the beloved first-born before the son of the hated, which is indeed the first-born:
> But he shall acknowledge the son of the hated for the first-born, by giving him a double portion of all that he hath; for he is the beginning of his strength; for the right of the first-born is his.

How did he apply this law? Why he first assumed the prevalence of polygamy among the Jews in the wilderness, and then said the law was made for polygamous families as well as monogamous. He says--"Inasmuch as polygamy is nowhere condemned in the law of God, we are entitled to construe this law as applying to polygamists." But I have shown already that Leviticus XVIII, 18, is a positive prohibition of this law, and therefore this passage must be interpreted by that which I have quoted. I propose to elect the balance today, and try every scriptural argument which he has produced in the scales of justice.

I have recited to you God's solemn law--"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another;" and I will try every passage by this law. My friend spent an hour here yesterday in seeking a general law; in a minute I gave you a general law. How natural is the supposition, where a man has two wives in succession, that he may love the last a little better than the first! and I believe it is common out here to love the last a little better than the first. And how natural it is for the second wife to influence the father in the disposition of his property so that he will confer it upon her child! while the children of the first wife, poor woman, perhaps dead and gone, are deprived of their property rights. But supposing the meaning of this passage is two wives at the same time, this cannot be construed, by any of the accepted rules of interpretation, into a sanction of polygamy; if it can, I can prove that sheep stealing is just as divinely authorized. For it is as if Moses had said: "For in view of the prevalence of polygamy, and that you have so far forgotten and transgressed God's law of monogamy as to take two

wives at the same time, therefore this shall not work abrogation of the law of primogeniture, the first born son shall not thereby be cheated out of his rights." Now it is said: "If a man have two wives:" very well, if that is a privilege so also are these words: "If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep and kill it and sell it, he shall restore five oxen for the ox he stole, and four sheep for the sheep." If the former assertion is a sanction of polygamy, then the latter assertion is a sanction of sheep stealing, and we can all go after the flocks this afternoon.

The second passage, in Exodus XXI, 7th to 11th verses, referring to the laws of breach of promise, Mr. Pratt says proves or favors polygamy, in his opinion; but he did not dwell long upon this text. He indulged in an episode on lost manuscripts. Now let us enquire into the meaning of this passage:

> And if a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do.
>
> If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her.
>
> And if he hath betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters.
>
> If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish.
>
> And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money.

What are the significant points in this passage? They are simply these--according to the Jewish law a destitute Jew was permitted to apprentice his daughter for six years for a pecuniary consideration; and to guard the rights of this girl there were certain conditions: First, the period of her indenture should not extend beyond six years; she should be free at the death of her master, or at the coming of the year of jubilee. The next condition was that the master or the son should marry the girl. What therefore are we to conclude from this passage? Simply this: that neither the father nor the son marry the girl, but simply betrothed her: that is, engaged her, promised to marry her: but before marriage relation was consummated the young man changed his mind, and then God Almighty, to indicate his displeasure at a man who would break the vow of engagement, fixes the following penalties, namely, that he should provide for this woman, whom he has wronged, her food, her raiment and her dwelling, and these are the facts: and the gentleman has not proved, the gentleman cannot prove, that either the father or the son marry the girl. He says the honored term "wife" is there. Honored term! God bless that term! It is an honored term, sacred as the nature of angels. Yet I have to inform my distinguished friend that the word wife is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek, but simply "if he take another," that is if he betroth another, and then change his mind he shall do thus and so. Where then is the gentleman's general law in approval of polygamy?

The next passage is recorded in Deuteronomy XXV chapter, and from the 5th to the 10th verses, referring to the preservation of families:

If brethren dwell together, and one of them die and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger, her husband's brother shall go in unto her and take her unto him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband's brother unto her.

And it shall be, that the first-born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother which is dead, that his name be not put out of Israel.

And if the man like not to take his brother's wife, then let his brother's wife go up to the gate unto the elders, and say, My husband's brother refuseth to raise up unto his brother a name in Israel, he will not perform the duty of my husband's brother.

Then the elders of his city shall call him, and speak unto him, and if he stand to it, and say, I like not to take her;

Then shall his brother's wife come unto him in the presence of the elders, and loose his shoe from off his foot, and spit in his face, and shall answer and say, So shall it be done unto that man that will not build up his brother's house.

And his name shall be called in Israel, the house of him that hath his shoe loosed.

What is the object of this law? Evidently the preservation of families and family inheritances. And now I challenge the gentleman to bring forward a solitary instance in the Bible where a married man was compelled to obey this law. Take the case of Tamar! Certainly the brother that was to have married her could not have been a married man, because she had to wait until he grew up. Then take the case of Ruth. You know how she lost her noble Mahlon afar off beyond Jordan, and how she returned to Bethlehem, and goes to Boaz, a near kinsman, and demands that he shall marry her. Boaz says--"There is another kinsman. I will speak to him." It is asked--"Didn't Boaz know whether the near kinsman was married?" But yet that was not the business of Boaz. The divine law required that this man should appear at the gate of the city before the elders, and there either marry her or say that he was disqualified because he was already a married man; and there is no proof in the Bible that Boaz had been married; nay, more than this, old Josephus, the Jewish historian, asserts that the reason why the near kinsman did not marry Ruth was that he had a wife and children already, so I judge that this law, which is said to be general, is that that I laid down--"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another," etc. He refers me to Numbers XXXI, 17th and 18th verses:

Now therefore, kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him.

But all the women-children, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.

This passage has nothing to do with polygamy. It is an account of the results of a military expedition of the Jews against the Midianites; their slaughter of a portion of the people, and their reduction of the remainder to slavery--namely the women for domestics. My friend dwells upon thirty-two thousand women that were saved! What were these

among the Jewish nation—a people numbering two and a half millions? He quoted Deuteronomy XXI, 10th and 13th verses:

> When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thy hands, and thou hast taken them captive;
> And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her that thou wouldst have her to thy wife;
> Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shalt shave her head, and pare her nails;
> And she shalt put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month; and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband and she shalt be thy wife.

This passage is designed to regulate the treatment of a captive woman by the conqueror who desires her for a wife, and has no more to do with polygamy than it has to do with theft or murder. Not a solitary word is said about polygamy, no mention is made that the man is married, therefore every jurist will agree with me that where we find a general law we may judge a special enactment by the organic fundamental principle.

He quoted Exodus XXII chapter, 16 and 17; and Deuteronomy XXII, and 28 and 29:

> And if a man entice a maid that is not betrothed, and lie with her he shall surely endow her to be his wife.
> If her father utterly refuse to give her unto him, he shall pay money according to the dowry of virgins.

In Deuteronomy it is said:

> If a man find a damsel that is a virgin, which is not betrothed, and lay hold on her, and lie with her, and they be found;
> Then the man that lay with her shall give unto the damsel's father fifty shekels of silver, and she shall be his wife; because he hath humbled her, he may not put her away all his days.

My friend appeared to confound these two laws, as if they had reference to the same crime; but the first is the law of seduction, while the second was the law of rape. In both cases the defiler was required to marry his victim; but in the case of seduction, if the father of the seduced girl would not consent to the marriage, then the sum usual to the dowry of a virgin should be paid him and the offense was expiated. But what was the penalty of rape? In that case there is no ambiguity—the ravisher marries his victim and paid her father fifty pieces of silver besides. But what has this to do with polygamy? He says it is a general law and applies to married men. This cannot be so, because it is in conflict with the great law of Leviticus XVIII, 18.

I tell you, my friends, these are simple down right assumptions. The position is first taken, and therefore those passages adduced to sustain that position; and this gentleman goes on to assume that all

These men are married men. It is a tremendous fact that if a man seduce a girl or committed a rape upon her, he was bound to marry that girl. It is a tremendous fact that the same law gives to the father the right of the refusal of his daughter, therefore the father has the power to annul God's law of marriage.

The next passage is the 2nd Chronicles, XXIV and 3rd, etc. It is the case of Joash the king, and when he began to reign Jehoiada was high priest. He was more than that--he was regent. My friend in portraying the character of this great man said that because he took two wives for King Joash he was so highly honored that when he died he was buried among the kings. But the fact is, he was regent, and there was royalty in his regency, and this royalty entitled him to be interred in the royal mausoleum. All that is said in Chronicles is simply an epitome--a summing up, that King Joash had two wives. It does not say that he had them at the same time; he might have had them in succession. I give you an illustration: John Milton was born in London, 1609. He was an eminent scholar, a great statesman and a beautiful poet; and John Milton had three wives. There I stop. Are you to infer that John Milton had these three wives simultaneously? Why you might, according to the gentleman's interpretation 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 and 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 2nd 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 whoredoms, departing from the Lord.

That is, says Newcomb, a wife 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 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 XXXIV 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 terribleness 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, 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 III, 2nd 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 and 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 have found 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 or 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 practice 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 today 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 committed in your city, would it be fair for Eastern papers to say that the Mormons are a murderous people? No, I should rise up in defense 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 have proved the contrary today, 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 XVIII, 18—"Neither shall a man take one wife unto another."

In this code the following things are forbidden: incest, polygamy, fornication, idolatry, beastliness, etc.; 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 XVIII, 18.

APPENDIX III. NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS

The following editorials are suggestive of comments made by local and national newspapers about the debate.

Newman was born in New York City, he was raised in New York state, and he was a minister to some of the people of New York state. With this in mind, it is interesting to note the opinions of some of the New York papers about the debate.

New York Times:[1]

> The factitious importance which the discussion will give to the Mormon views of the marriage relation is greatly to be depreciated. By engaging in it Dr. Newman virtually admits that the laws prohibiting polygamy are based upon an interpretation, which may be right or wrong, of the Sacred Scriptures. The first words of the "Articles of agreement" which are to bind the disputant, are, "The question to be discussed is "so and so:" which implys a matter open to dispute, and inferentially, make the issue of that dispute of importance in deciding whether polygamy should or should not be tolerated within our territories. That the tournament of quotations now in progress at Salt Lake will not in the least affect the marriage laws of the states is but trifling consolation in view of the mischief which may be done to weak-minded people, who would repudiate the plainest dictum of common sense in the nineteenth century, if they were once convinced that it did not hold good in the time of the Flood. There is but little doubt that both the Mormon elder, Orson Pratt, and the anti-polygamous champion who opposes him, will each claim the victory when the fight is over. With every respect for Dr. Newman's good intentions, we cannot help feeling that, like the gallant Don, he will be obliged to see a success where a scornful and unsympathetic public will see failure. Polygamy finds no favor among any people who have reached an advanced post in civilization, but its sturdiest enemies will be annoyed at the spectacle of a learned, earnest man sitting down gravely to dispute its Divine authorization with the leaders of a people who practice it in obediance to the pretended revelations vouchsafed to an illiterate imposter.

---

[1] New York Times, August 14, 1870.

1

New York Tribune:

Since the days of chivalry we do not know that anything pluckier has been recorded than the visit of the Rev. J. F. Newman to Salt Lake City to do battle, logical and exegitical, with the wicked and obscene dragon of polygamy. It must have required a good deal of enthusiasm to go all that distance to refute what all virtuous persons consider to be an immorality, and all sensible persons an absurdity. But Mr. Newman was, in a manner, constrained to go. He had preached a sermon on the subject, was heard of in Utah; whereupon the Utah Telegraph asked why he did not come to that territory to preach it "in the new Tabernacle, before 10,000 Mormons, with Orson Hyde or some other prominent Mormon to answer." Mr. Newman immediately packed his trunk, bought his railway ticket, and started very much as Don Quixote would have done under like circumstances. But it was one thing to go to Utah, and quite another thing to get either Brigham or his man Orson to meet him in debate. Young, coolly, for August, replied that he had given no challenge; nor did the great Orson show any desire to enter the lists. Apparently, Mr. Newman had his long journey for his pains. But Young was too shrewd a man not to see that he had lost ground by declining the contest; and he therefore sent Mr. Newman an invitation to come and preach in the Tabernacle. Mr. Newman replied that he had already made arrangements to preach in the M.E. meeting house. And he did preach there "for three mortal hours," in a "sweltering August afternoon," a sermon brimful of texts, to prove that there might be concubinage among the Jews, but that, in our sense of the word, they had no polygamy. Since then, the battle royal itself has finally been arranged and fought. . .

We do not here attempt any abstract of the arguments. Much as we respect Mr. Newman, we do not consider that such of them as were drawn from the manners and customs of the Jews had any pertinence or consequence. We believe that, with Christianity came a better, and a nobler, and a purer Dis ensation. The polygamy of the Jews, or the concubinage, was temporal and local, and not of Divine ordination. If otherwise, why do not the Jews, as a body, now practice it? They virtually acknowledge that there was no command of perpetual validity to maintain polygamy; for while, in matter of their law, they are nearly as strict as ever, they cheerfully obey our laws of marriage. To be sure, they could not do otherwise without being sent to the Penitentiary; but we have no reason to believe that they wish to do otherwise.

We prefer to base our hostility to polygamy upon the fact that all modern civilized nations are monogamous, so far as

---

[1] "That Discussion," Millennial Star, XXXII (Sept., 1870), 603.

> that word implies having one wife at a time. Mr. Newman shows that such is the doctrine of Christianity; and being its doctrine, there is no room left for an argument.

Another New York paper, the New York Sun, suggests that Doctor Newman was "sent upon a polemical[1] crusade, which, it was trusted, would have the effect of firing the religious mind of the country and convincing (the) citizen of the necessity of submitting to liberal blackmailing." However, the Sun pointed out:

> It is plain that the Apostle carries too many guns for the Chaplain of the Senate, and the consternation of those who sent him on his errand is as great as that of the confident French advocates of the "On to Berlin" cry, at the unexpected results of that little adventure.[2] Why does Dr. Newman travel two thousand miles when so much work is left undone in his own stamping ground in the Gomorrah of Washington? Why does he not rather go, like the prophets of old, to men in high places there?[3]

The Deseret News depreciates the idea that Newman's trip was a polemical crusade, but it is possible that the News was wrong, for many serious steps were taken to control Mormon polygamy after this.

New York Star:[4]

> The Rev. Dr. Newman, of Washington, who expected to make a little cheap notoriety by attacking the lion in his den, the Brigham in his lair, arrived in Salt Lake City and notified Young that he was ready to open the discussion of the divine authority of polygamy. The Saint thereupon responded that he never invited or consented to such discussion. The latter shows more

---

[1] Act or practice of disputation.

[2] Franco-German war was in progress.

[3] Deseret Evening News, September 8, 1870.

[4] Whitney, Orson F. History of Utah, Vol. II (Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons Company, 1893), p. 486.

> gumption than his orthodox opponent. Controversy is the devil's weapon. It makes more sceptics than converts. The expectation that such a controversy would overturn that peculiar tenet of the Mormon religion was as chimerical as would be an attempt to "dam up the Nile with bullrushes," or to bolt a door with a carrot.

There is something strange, to say the least, about these New York reports. Newman was the home town boy. Yet at least four New York papers criticized him severely. Why? Would not the home town papers have given the victory to Newman even if the decision was doubtful? Possibly, and yet this contrary result might be explained on the basis of political motives. Newman was a radical Repbalican. President Grant was also a radical Republican, and had only won the election of 1868 by a majority of 300,000 popular votes. This was a low margin. His opponent in 1868 had been Governor Horatio Seymour of New York. It is possible that the other home town boy, Seymour, exercised considerable influence on the papers of New York, and this the adverse reactions to Newman could be accounted for.

In a sense, the attitude of the New Orleans Times can be accounted for in a similar manner. Newman was from the north; he had served as a missionary in New Orleans. He was of a different political opinion than the New Orleans Times. Not only this, but the controversy between the Methodist Episcopal Church, South and the Methodist Episcopal Church, North over ownership of the southern meeting houses was still a big issue. No doubt these conditions influenced the mind of the editor of the Times:

> New Orleans Times:[1]
>
> Larson Newman has certainly failed in his effort to achieve

---

[1] Ibid., p. 484.

notority through a preaching match with Brigham Young. Nearly all the papers of standing in the country, including those of his own political complexion, depreciate his movement as undignified, useless, and more or less damaging to the general cause of Christianity. . . It is conceded that in the observance of all social amenities, the preservation of self-respect, and the display of courteous fineses, Brigham has gotten the better of him. In the first place the Dector lost his temper and was in consequence betrayed by Brigham into issuing an imprudent, bombastic challenge. This the Prophet accepted, turning the discussion over to two of his henchmen in a manner so redolent of contempt and conscious superiority as to call forth another bitter angry rejoinder from the Parson, in such marked contrast to the Mormon affability displayed that he was at once placed at a hopeless disadvantage and forced to preach with his fangs drawn. He therefore returns without accomplishing any good, a living example of Brigham's great tact and intelligence. Out-generaled if not out-preached, he will have the sorry satisfaction of knowing that he has unwillingly contributed more to the Prophet's fame than any other living man. It is to be hoped the lesson may not be lost upon the Parson, inconsiderably lessening the arreganee for which he has always been so offensively distinguished, and in teaching him that the appointed path for the disciples of Christ to tread is that of humility. . .We fear he has devoted himself so assiduously to the study of scripture as to prejudice the worth and influence of other useful books. We recommend one in particular to his closer attention-Chesterfield.

It is difficult to account for the attitude of the Boston Banner of Light. This newspaper also criticised Newman.

Boston Banner of Light:[1]

The Dr. Newman who went forth from Washington to Salt Lake City to take Mormonism by storm by flourishing his Orthodox Bible in its face, has had to come away after a pretty severe tilt with one of the leading Elders, leaving his Bible behind him. It must have been extremely humiliating. Elder Pratt took his Bible out of his hands, and opened it again and again to pages that taught and upheld the polygamy doctrine, reading off whole volleys of historical texts that went to establish the leading Bible characters, esteemed Saints by Orthodoxy, as regular Mormons. Dr. Newman craw-fished amazingly on this part of the argument and was at last rather glad to abandon it to his Mormon opponent. Nor did the latter leave his visible advantage unimproved; he charged home

---

[1] Ibid.

vigorously on the reverend Doctor and pointed him truimphantly to the practices of such cities as New York, where it was an acknowledged part of civilization to hold one wife, but debauch as many others as possible in the open dens of iniquity. They committed sin enough every twenty-four hours, according to Elder Pratt, to sink them in hell permanently. And he likewise points, and justly too, to the pollution and infanticide of the nation at large; while a handful of people, practicing "Bible Marriage" in the mountains beyond the plains, are threatened with extermination. He declares himself quite ready to compare the piety and pollution of one side with the same qualities of the other. Somebody carrying more guns than Dr. Newman will have to be sent out missionarying among the Mormons.

The Philadelphia Press had its own reporter in Salt Lake City for the debate. Its report was mostly pro-Newman. In an article titled "The Mormon Imbroglio," it said:

> . . . The challenge to the discussion was thrown out by the Mormon leaders, evidently under the impression, that it would not be accepted, and that Newman could bring them to scratch only by accepting terms which would give them very unfair advantage.[1]

Even though the report was pro-Newman the Philadelphia Press did admit:

> From the standpoint of a Mormon believer, with the peculiar perversion to which his moral and intellectual nature has been subjected in order to render him a tool of a dispicable hierarchy, we are not sure that Mr. Pratt's argument is not of the most effective character possible.[2]

A Washington, D.C. paper, the Daily Morning Chronicle, also had its own special correspondent in Salt Lake City for the debate. This correspondent's general reaction throughout most of his reports was pro-Newman. An example is found in his report of the debate on the first day.

---

[1]"The Mormon Imbrogilio," Deseret News (Weekly) XIX (September 14, 1870), p. 373.

[2]Ibid.

Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington, D.C.):[1]

> Dr. Newman seemed to make a great impression among the people. They heard him closely, and at the close of the arguments, and when the audience were dispersing, I heard several warm and admiring remarks from some of the women auditors, whom I knew to be Mormons. If the Doctor were speaking on the affirmative of this question, the interest of the women might be accounted for on personal considerations and a desire to conquer his affections; but since he is on the negative and sworn to one wife only, I must refer it entirely to his argument.

On the local scene there also appeared disagreements as to who actually won, Newman or Pratt, but most pro-Newman papers did give the debate to Newman in the long run, but usually with some reservations. Said the Salt Lake Tribune:[2]

> We do not think, then, that Dr. Newman proved that the Jewish Law did not sanction polygamy, because his only direct evidence rested upon a disputed translation, which cannot be said to prove anything until the Doctor's rendering is accepted and endorsed by Christendom as a whole. . .
>
> While, then we consider Dr. Newman weak--as all men must be--in endeavoring to positively prove that Moses did not legislate for polygamy, or that the Hebrews were not polygamous, we hold that he touched a vital point.

The Ogden Junction, a Mormon managed newspaper claimed a complete victory for Orson Pratt.

Ogden Junction:[3]

> His effort produced a contrary effect from that intended, and from many remarks we heard afterward, and the feelings of disgust and indignation prevailing, which were only repressed from utterance by the rules governing the debate, we were led to conclude that the subtle Dr. had confirmed the faith of the believers in polygamy and driven out the last lingering doubts of its truth from the minds of the

---

[1]Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington, D.C.), August 19, 1870.

[2]Salt Lake Tribune, August 27, 1870, p. 3.

[3]Ogden Junction, August 17, 1870, p. 2.

wavering.

Perhaps the most nearly correct report from a Mormon paper came from the Salt Lake Herald. Its criticisms are a bit overdrawn, but in many respects they are correct.

Salt Lake Herald:[1]

> But one impartial opinion can be entertained with regard to the result. Dr. Newman's failure to sustain his position was painfully palpable, even to his admirers. But both gentlemen laid themselves open to criticism and wandered from the subject. The question to be discussed did not involve anything concerning the morality of cities in Christendom, the longevity of monogamic and polygamic nations, the practice of the Mosaic law in Utah, the rights of civil government, nor half a hundred other points dragged in. It was purely and simply "Does the Bible Sanction Polygamy?" which was lost sight of once or twice by Professor Pratt, and only referred to semi-occasionally by Dr. Newman, as Artemas Ward used to return to his subject, "The Babes in the Wood." There was an apology for Professor Pratt in the fact that on the first day he laid down a line of Biblical argument which Dr. Newman did not even pretend to touch in his first reply; and on the second day Professor Pratt had nothing to combat but some glaring assertions. . .
>
> We have heard nobody satisfied with the discussion. All agree, so far as we have conversed with monogamists and polygamists, that Dr. Newman was a huge failure; that he was to vapid and bombastic; dealt too much in assertions and too little in proof; that he mangled scripture horribly; said there were things in the Bible which he did not show by proof, and which are not in it; and denied that certain facts are in it which thousands who heard him now are recorded there. They agree, too, that Professor Pratt did not do justice to himself, to his subject and the people by not allowing himself time to sum up; and that he was too gentlemanly for his opponent, and (sic) should have dealt more in that kind of assertion which was the reverend gentleman's staple article. But we think he did better not to imitate a bombastic egotism that was offensive to decency and did injury to the speaker's eloquence. . . He took a position so weak and untenable that all his strength could not sustain it, and he miscalculated the intelligence of the audience to whom he addressed himself.

Newman did wander from the subject, and so did Pratt; Newman did use too much assertion and not enough proof, and judging from

---

[1]Salt Lake Herald, August 17, 1870, p. 1.

his language, he may have been too vapid and bombastic at times, so in this sense the Herald hit the nail on the head, but the Herald's failure to present Newman's good points wants of a certain objectivity.

These brief articles can hardly be considered as a ballot in favor of Pratt as most of them spend more time attacking Newman than in criticizing the debate. However, they do indicate that a lot of newspapers thought the debate injured monogamy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Bainton, Roland. Here I Stand: A Life of Martin Luther. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950.

Bancroft, Hubert Howe. History of Utah, 1540-1887. San Francisco: The History Company, 1889.

Berrett, William E. and Burton, Alma P. Readings in L.D.S. Church History: From Original Manuscripts. Vol. I,II,III. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, 1955.

Brembeck, Winston L. and Howell, William S. Persuasion: A Means of Social Control. Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.

Brigance, William Norwood (ed). A History and Criticism of American Public Address. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1943.

Buckley, James M. A History of Methodism in the United States. Vol II. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1897.

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Journal of Discourses. Vol. VI, XIII, XXI, XXIII. Liverpool, England: Asa Gaikin, 1859.

_____. The Missionary's Hand Book. Independence, Mo.: Zion's Printing and Publishing Company, 1937.

Gilmore, Joseph H. Outlines of Logic. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1879.

Joy, James R. "Newman, John Philip," Dictionary of American Biography. Vol. XIII, 1934.

Neff, Andrew L. History of Utah: 1847-1869. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1940.

Pratt, Orson and Newman, John P. A Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Newman, Pastor of the Metropolitan Methodist Church on Plural Marriage to Which is Added an Answer by Elder Orson Pratt, One of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1870.

_____. The Bible and Polygamy. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Steam Printing Company, 1877.

Representatives of Utah Religious Denominations. World's Fair Ecclesiastical History of Utah. Salt Lake City: George Q. Cannon and Sons, 1893.

Roberts, Brigham H. A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Vol. 5. Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1930.

Robertson, Frank C. A Ram in the Thicket. New York: Hastings, Company, 1959.

Smith, Joseph. History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Vols. II and VI. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1948.

Smith, Joseph Fielding. Essentials in Church History. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1953.

Stenhouse, T. B. H. The Rocky Mountain Saints. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1873.

Stevens, Abel. Supplementary History of American Methodism. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1899.

Stone, Irving. Men to Match My Mountains. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1956.

Sutton, Wain (ed.) Utah, A Centennial History. New York: Lewis Historical Publishing Company, Inc., 1949.

Sweet, William W. Methodism in American History. New York: Abingdon Press, 1942.

Thonssen, Lester and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: Ronald Press, 1948.

Tullidge, Edward W. History of Salt Lake City. Salt Lake City: Star Printing Company, 1886.

_____. Utah and Her Founders. New York: Tullidge, 1870.

University of Deseret. Third Annual Catalogue of the Officers and Students in the University of Deseret for the Academical Year 1870-1871. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Office, 1871.

"University of Rochester," Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed., Vol. XXIII, 430.

U. S. Congressional Globe. 1869-1874.

Wallace, Karl R. (ed.). History of Speech Education in America. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Whitney, Orson F. A Popular History of Utah. Salt Lake City: News Press, 1916.

_____. History of Utah. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press, 1893.

Woodward, W. E. Meet General Grant. New York: Garden City Publishing Company, Inc., 1928.

Wrage, Ernest J. Baskerville, Barnet. American Forum. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Young, Levi Edgar. "Orson Pratt, Scientist and Philosopher," Utah Educational Review. (1919), 23-24.

ARTICLES AND PERIODICALS

Corinne Daily Reporter, 1870.

Cummings, Benjamin F. "Orson Pratt," Parry's Monthly Magazine, Vol. X (1889), 24.

Daily Morning Chronicle (Washington, D. C.), August 19, 21, 24, 26, 1870.

Deseret Evening News, 1870-1893.

Herald (Salt Lake City), 1870.

Littell's Living Age (Boston). 4th Series, Vol. XVIII (1870).

Lund, Anthon H. "Debate," Liahona: The Elder's Journal, Vol. IX (September 19, 1911), 199.

New York Times, 1870.

Millennial Star. Vols. XXXII and XXXIII (1870-1871). London: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Ogden Junction, 1870

The Seer, Vols. I and II (1853-1854).

Tribune (Salt Lake City), 1870.

OTHER SOURCES

Benson, Frank T. Jr. "An Analysis of Orson Pratt's Invention in the Pratt-Newman Debate." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Speech, University of Utah, 1950.

Board of Missions of the Methodist Church. Letter from M. Dorothy Woodruff, Research Librarian Board of Missions of the Methodist Church, New York. May 3, 1960.

Brigham Young University, Personal interview with Dr. Ellis T. Rasmussen of the College of Religion, April 17, 1960.

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Personal interview with A. William Lund, Assistant Church Historian, January 22, 1960.

"Executive Papers." Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1870.

General Services Administration. Letter from Harold E. Hufford, Archivist in Charge of Legislative Branch, General Records Division, The National Archives, April 27, 1960.

Journal History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. MSS. Historian's Office, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Lyon, Edgar T. "Orson Pratt--Early Mormon Leader." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Chicago, 1932.

Storrs, Dee Leon. "Index to Mormons and Mormonism and Related Topics as Contained in the Congressional Globe (1833-1875), Thirty-third to Forty-second Congress." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Library Department, Washington University, 1957.