[CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.]

pahannock at 9:30 A. M., Reed master, from Havana via intermediate Florida ports, to J. W. Perkins & Co. No departures.

VICKSBURG, August 27.—Passed up: Olive Branch, at 3 P. M.; Grand Era, at 7 P. M. Down: Governor Allen, at 11 A. M.; Nick Wall, at 5 A. M.; Nick Longworth, at 6 P. M. River falling. Weather clear and warm.

LOUISVILLE, August 27.—The river still falling, with thirty inches on the falls. Weather pleasant.

CINCINNATI, August 27.—River falling with eight feet in the channel. Weather clear.

ST. LOUIS, August 27.—Departed: St. Joseph for Memphis; Rubicon for Vicksburg; Bismarck for New Orleans. River still receding. Business active.

MARKETS.

Domestic Markets.

NEW YORK, August 27, Evening.—Cotton dull; sales 450 bales; middling uplands 19¾c. Flour heavy; 5@10c lower. Wheat steady. Corn dull. Mess pork $28 25. Lard: Kettle 17@17¼c. Groceries quiet. Naval stores firm. Freights firmer.

CINCINNATI, August 27.—Flour: Family $5 75@6. Wheat $1 10@1 12. Corn 75@77c. Oats 48@50c for new. Rye 82@83c. Barley $1 15@1 25. Cotton unchanged and nominal, 18½@18¾c. Whisky 90@91c. Provisions dull. Mess pork $28 50. Bulk meats: Shoulders 13c; sides 15c. Bacon: Shoulders 14¼c; clear rib sides 17c; clear sides 17¼c. Lard 15¾c. Butter 28@32c.

ST. LOUIS, August 27.—Tobacco unchanged. Cotton nominal; middling uplands 17½. Bagging unchanged. Flour $4 50@5 25. Wheat: red fall $1 12@1 13 for No. 2; $1 18@1 19 No. 1. Corn: mixed 63@65c. Oats 35@37c. Barley $1. Rye 73@75c. Highwines steady. Provisions unchanged. Lard 15½@16c.

Foreign Markets.

FRANKFORT, August 27.—Bonds closed firm at 91⅝@91½.

PARIS, August 27.—Bourse dull. Rentes 71 20.

[Yesterday's Evening Dispatches.]

LONDON, August 27.—Thursday evening Prussian headquarters were at Bar-le-Duc, and the advance had reached a point midway between Chalons and Epernay.

The march on Paris is to be conducted leisurely by the Prussians, as no further opposition is contemplated.

There is authority for saying that the fortifications of Paris, unless manned by 300,000 men, are worthless.

French reports say that Luneville is so filled with Prussian wounded that three thousand of them were left unsheltered.

Bismarck's son is more seriously wounded than at first reported, and has been sent home.

Bourges, the capital city of the Department of Cher, is fortifying. It is stated that the Emperor and the members of the Senate and Corps Legislatif will go there. The right wing of the French army has already taken that direction.

Austria has concurred in the declaration of neutrality accepted by Italy.

The Russian Minister has returned to St. Petersburg from Vienna. The object of his visit was to express on the part of Russia a strong desire to improve their relations with Austria. Austria reciprocates, and is anxious to contribute to its fulfillment.

Ratifications of treaties guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium were exchanged here to-day by the various European powers.

The junction of Bazaine with McMahon has not yet been effected.

The Prussian Prince Royal has issued a proclamation saying that Prussia makes war against the Emperor, not against the people. The people have nothing to fear.

The Prince announces his purpose to restore every line of travel interrupted or destroyed by army operations, so that labor and commerce may everywhere be renewed. The French officials are ordered to remain at their posts. Personal safety is guaranteed.

The Prussians, according to French accounts, are distinguishing themselves by traditional acts of pillage and brutality.

PARIS, August 26, Midnight.—The following news has been made public at the office of the Minister of the Interior:

The Prussians are passing through Nancy going toward Chalons.

The siege of Toul has been abandoned owing to vigorous resistance of the garrison.

Prussian scouts cut the railway at Famonilly, between Montmedy and Mezieres. They were repulsed by the French sharpshooters, and the road repaired.

The Prussians at Stenay are falling back on Dun, further South.

PARIS, August 27.—The King and the Crown Prince are moving on the city, via Marne and the Aube. They commit fearful pillage and unheard of outrages.

MANNHEIM, August 27.—French General Bataille is recovering rapidly.

General LeGrande, killed at Gravelotte, left eleven daughters.

BERLIN, August 27.—The reserves are organizing here under General Caustern and at Glogau under Lowenfield.

A lady residing near Hamilton, Canada, was awakened from a disturbed sleep the other night, to find that a sneak thief had dropped down the chimney, and was in the act of collecting her jewels. She got out of bed with so much rapidity that he lost presence of mind, and jumped through the window into the yard, a distance of nearly a hundred feet.

Chillicothe, Ohio, has an ordinance closing even apothecaries' shops on Sunday, so that the inhabitants must either be taken sick early on Saturday night, or put off their illness till Monday morning, which is exceedingly inconvenient for those who have much business to attend to on week days.

A Boston editor rejoices in the great accomplishments of a gentleman of that city in the shooting line. That gentleman shot fatally, for sport, nineteen harmless pigeons in succession, losing but one shot out of twenty. He would be a good man for either Napoleon or King William.

A woman not far from Atchison, Missouri, whose husband had just been buried by the Masonic fraternity, said to a friend, in giving an account of the obsequies, "Oh, you ought to have been there; we had a splendid time!"

Cornwall, Connecticut, has had but two births in a number of years, and never expects to have any more. The fact is that the inhabitants are so used to active, open air pursuits that they can't stand confinement of any sort.

Miss Helen Taylor, who is impracticably described by a Cincinnati paper as "a daughter-in-law of John Stuart Mill," writes against fox-hunting from a society-for-the-prevention-of-cruelty-to-animals point of view.

A young lady who went to see the "Merry wives of Windsor," was anxious to know which was Mr. Windsor, as she did not see his name printed on the bills.

The youth who cried "Excelsior" didn't know that he was naming five out of every six saloons in the country.

The Great Digger, otherwise known as General McClellan, thinks the Prussian Crown Prince insane. After Paris has been captured, the eminent master of shovels will console himself by conclusively proving that it ought not to have been taken according to the rules of "strategy, my boy."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

A shark, twenty-two feet long, having a small junk shop and a newly-born baby in his capacious stomach, has been captured off Havana. A post-mortem examination revealed, also, that this huge gentleman had never been troubled with toothache.

POLYGAMY.

The Debate at Salt Lake City—Elder Pratt Quotes Scripture—The Question Stated—Marriage Defined—The Mormon Argument—Dr. Newman's Reply—The Argument to Prove that the Jews Practiced Polygamy—How it was Answered—Dr. Newman's Argument Summed Up.

[Correspondence New York Tribune.]

SALT LAKE CITY, August 15.—After six days of negotiation, the debate on polygamy, between the Rev. Mr. Newman and Elder Orson Pratt, was agreed on at noon of the twelfth, the question to be, "Does the Bible sanction polygamy?" Elder Pratt to take the affirmative, Mr. Newman the negative. Three sessions, of two hours each, equally divided between the disputants, and to take place on three successive days, commencing on the twelfth, were agreed on. Elder Pratt chose Judge Snow as Moderator; Mr. Newman chose Judge Hawley, and they together chose Marshal Patrick. The preliminaries had been settled only two hours previous to the opening of the debate, and so only about 2000 people were present. Elder John Taylor opened the session with prayer, and then Elder Pratt commenced, citing Deut. xxi., 15, 16, 17: "If a man have two wives," etc.; Ex. xxi., 7-10: "If a man sell his daughter," etc.; Deut. xxv., 5 and onward: "If brethren dwell together," etc.; Numb. xxxi., 17, 18, concerning saving the Midianitish virgins; Deut. xxi., 10-13: "When thou goest forth to war," etc., as sanctioning and commanding polygamy, because, as he affirmed, the twelve tribes of Israel originated in polygamy and practiced it down to the coming of Christ, both monogamous and polygamous marriage being recognized among them and these texts were of general and not special application.

He cited Exodus xxii., 16, 17, requiring a man who should seduce a maid to marry her; and Deuteronomy xxii., 28, 29, requiring the same in case of rape, and claimed that there was no exception in these laws in favor of married persons, forgetting, apparently, that the cohabitation of a married man with a woman other than his wife was adultery, punishable, not by compulsory marriage of his victim, but by death.

His next point was made in Hd Chronicles, xxiv., 2, 3, 15, 16, which relates that Jehoiada, the priest, gave two wives to Joash, the king, and then says that Joash did right all the days of Jehoiada, and that the latter lived to a ripe old age, died and was among the kings, because he had done right both toward God and toward His house. Next we were referred to Hosea, chapters ii. and iii., where it is said that God commanded Hosea to take a harlot and an adulteress to wife, and it was claimed that God commanded polygamy, and also sometimes suspended His own laws, and even ordered them to be broken, not for our example and imitation, said Mr. Pratt, but for a special purpose. His law requiring a man to espouse the widow of a deceased brother, which is in opposition to the law of consanguinity, and his command to Abraham to slay Isaac, in contravention of the law against murder, were other instances of the same kind, showing that the Lord has a right to change His law if he so please. And if He so command us, we must obey. Suppose, said he, it should be proved that the Bible sanctioned polygamy? That would be no reason why we should practice it. We must have a command of our own. The people in these valleys do not practice polygamy because Moses authorized it, nor because the eminent men of Bible times practiced it.

MR. NEWMAN'S REPLY.

Mr. Newman said he had desired nine hours for the discussion of this question, but having been reduced to three by mutual consent, he would proceed at once to define the question: Does the Bible sanction polygamy? does it now, or did it formerly? Does the Bible, in the received English translation, in the Septuagent or Greek translations, or in the original Hebrew sanction—sanction—that is command, not tolerate, not suffer or regulate, but command polygamy? Here followed an exposition of the derivation and meaning of the word, being a plurality of wives or husbands, not of wives only. The correct word for that was polygamy. There was another word closely connected with these—polygandry—a plurality of husbands. It seemed to him that if a man might legally and rightfully have many wives, a woman might have many husbands. [Applause from the women—'sh—'sh—'sh and hisses from the men.] Mr. Newman maintained that the Bible, as it stands, is authentic, the fact that the original manuscripts had been lost being of no consequence; that it was composed of history, biography, prophecy, law, poetry, instruction, etc., and that we should not confound historical statements with precept and injunction. The New Testament was a commentation on the old. He held, further, that if any part of the Bible had in effect been repealed, then it is not now of binding force.

He then passed to a close analyzation of the marriage established by God in the time of man's innocency—between one man and one woman, in its nature, its elements, its design, its rights and obligations, and its defenses—and maintained that polygamy, invented by man since his apostacy, struck down and destroyed this Bible-marriage in all its essential features. It defeated its three-fold object, by lessening his capacity for companionship, and by causing a preponderance in births of one sex, thus tending to the extinction of the race, and defeating pro-creation: by giving man more license in sexual intercourse, and thus encouraging lasciviousness. It relieved man of his obligations of reciprocal love and mutual affection; it augmented his authority while lessening his power to protect woman. In the course of this exposition of the true and exposure of the spurious marriage, he drew a picture of the monogamous home, and, sharply contrasting it with that of the polygamist, compelled an involuntary burst of applause.

He next turned his attention to Elder Pratt's texts, referring to Deuteronomy xxv, 5, and onward; he went back to the antedeluvians after his opponent, and exposed the absurdity of attacking the assumption, that because God made and married but one woman to the first man, therefore that was the model for all subsequent marriages; by such reasoning as that offered, namely: if that be so, then, because God gave them but one garden to till nobody should ever till two gardens; or because God clothed them with skins nobody should ever use anything else for clothing. In this there was a failure to distinguish between the essentials and the incidentals of marriage. He maintained that when Cain murdered Abel he was not married, and therefore his crime could not have grown out of monogamy; while, on the other hand, Lamech, the first polygamist, slew a man on the assumption that he had come to claim his rights. The first marriage in Eden was not a historal fact merely, for, coming down the stream of time, we find it referred to by Malachi, by Jesus, and St. Paul, as the expression of a great law. And so the hammer fell.

SECOND DAY—AFFIRMATIVE.

There were about 4000 people present. After prayer, Mr. Pratt began by insisting that the original manuscript copy of the Bible was lost. He, however, accepted it as it stands, as conclusive evidence of polygamy. He denied that the Savior said that marrying more than one woman constituted adultery, and challenged the proof. He admitted Mr. Newman's definition of the term sanction, in its full force. He had brought force yesterday, passage after passage from King James' Bible, in which polygamy was commanded under penalty of the heaviest curse of the law. If this was not sanction he did not understand Webster or Newman. He had waited in vain for some rebutting testimony, but absolutely none had been adduced. He maintained that the crimes of Lamech, of Cain, the transgression of Adam or anybody else had no connection with the form of marriage. They merely proved, historically, that both polygamists and monogamists might be wicked men. All the remarks of his friend Newman about marriage were as applicable to plural as to single marriage. He refuted the idea that polyandry was as justifiable as polygamy, because it tended to produce sterility rather than fertility of the woman, and destroyed all knowledge of the father.

Mr. Pratt then went into an elaborate argument to prove that God was better pleased to see a few righteous men marry many wives, and beget and bring up troops of children, in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, than he was with the monogamous marriage of the wicked, in which He had no part, except that He permitted it, who would lead their children to destruction by their evil teaching and example. The assumption of self-righteousness on the part of the polygamists in this did not seem to strike him as absurd, nor the fallacy of his assertion that God dispensed his blessings unevenly, as, for example, to the righteous many wives, to the wicked none, which, as well as the last proposition mentioned, he claimed the Scriptures bore witness to. He was happy, he said, to have Dr. Newman and his friends, full of philanthropy, as it were, come here and endeavor to reclaim them from their beastly habits, rather than enact laws to imprison their men and leave their women to suffer. He ended by a severe arraignment of monogamous nations for their prostitution, infanticide, etc., alluding to New York in particular, a part of whose creed it was to have but one wife around, and then to debauch themselves and each other in dens of prostitution. He called upon his distinguished friend to lay before the people the refutation of those passages of the Bible he had adduced the day before sanctioning polygamy. He asked him to prove that those laws were limited, if they were limited.

MR. NEWMAN'S SECOND SPEECH.

Mr. Newman devoted about five minutes to a notice of Mr. Pratt's scattering remarks, and then asked if the gentleman had adduced a law sanctioning polygamy. Law, he said, was the expression of the legislative will. In legislating on any subject there must be a grand organic act referring to that subject, in the light of which the general code and all particular laws must be interpreted. No such law had been, or could be, produced, commanding polygamy, but, on the other hand, in Leviticus xviii, 18, we had such a law prohibiting it—"Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister, to vex her, to uncover her nakedness, besides the other in her lifetime," or, as the marginal reading is, "take one wife to another." This rendering was sustained by Cookson, Bishop Jewell, Dr. Edwards, and Dr. Dwight. According to Dr. Edwards, the Hebrew words translated "a wife to her sister," were found in the original but eight times, and in each case they referred to inanimate objects, such as the wings of the cherubim, mortices, tenons, etc., and signified coupling together, one to another. They denoted the exact likeness of one thing to another, and here forbade, as the margin expressed it, the taking of one wife to another in her lifetime. But suppose, said Mr. Newman, as the polygamists claim, that it means to prohibit the marriage of two literal sisters, the Mormon practicing that must admit that he was living in violation of God's law.

Mr. Newman then examined the texts quoted by Mr. Pratt on the day before, showing that his construction of them was based on a gratuitous assumption on his part that the Israelites were a polygamous nation when the law of Moses was given. Not one of these vaunted texts mentioned polygamy, nor, construed in the light of the great prohibition of polygamy he had presented, could any sanction of it be tortured from them. He examined them seriatim, and showed conclusively that they bore no such construction as Mr. Pratt had given them, considered by themselves.

Mr. Newman then made a telling allusion to Mr. Pratt's having given up the question at issue at the close of his hour, on the day before, by saying in effect that the Mormons claimed no right to practice polygamy because God commanded it, and his people practiced it in ancient times, but because they had been expressly commanded of God for themselves to do it, and asked him why, then, he had endeavored to drag the Bible into the question, in the *Seer*, in his correspondence with him in a New York journal, and from this stand.

He then charged that Mr. Pratt had brought nothing but downright assumptions as yet, unsupported by a particle of evidence, to the support of the affirmative of the question under debate. He had assumed that the Hebrews were a polygamous nation in the wilderness; that these laws were given to regulate an institution already existing; that they were general in their application, applying to all, which he (Dr. Newman) had proved they were not; and none of these assumptions had he proved. He denied that the Hebrews were a polygamous nation at that time, and challenged the proof of the contrary. He reaffirmed that among the laws God gave them after He has called them for a special purpose, regulating the commerce of the sexes, was the great law, Thou shalt not take one wife to another. That was the great law of marriage as established by God in the time of man's innocence; re-established at the time of the flood, recorded by Moses, re-enacted by Christ and St. Paul, and denied that Mr. Pratt had adduced one word from the Bible that directed or permitted any other kind of marriage. It was no evidence to bring passage after passage, which his learned friend knew, if construed in favor of polygamy, would be in direct opposition to the great central law on this subject.

No abstract can do justice to Mr. Newman's argument of this day. His rendering of Leviticus xviii., 18., and his positive denial that the Israelites in the wilderness were polygamous as a nation, seemed to startle the audience, and altogether the effort impressed them so that they had little to say on dispersing.

THIRD DAY—MR. PRATT.

This was Sunday, and there were about 6000 persons present. The debate was opened by singing as well as prayer. Mr. Pratt admitted that arguments had now been adduced on both sides. In answer to Mr. Newman's challenge, he entered into an arithmetical calculation to prove that the Israelites were polygamous in the days of Moses. He took Mr. Newman's statement of the entire number of them—2,500,000. He claimed that from the law of Pharaoh commanding the destruction of the male infants of the Hebrews, and on account of its execution in one out of every five hundred cases each year, for eighty years, there were 400,000 more marriageable women than men. In Numbers i, 46, he found the number of men, above twenty years of age, stated at 603,550, and he calculated the whole number of families at 30,000 from the 22,273 families whose first-born were males, given in Numbers iii. 43. From these statistics he deduced that there were 1,003,550 women and 603,550 men older than twenty years, and 892,900 children under twenty years, divided into 30,000 families. He then apportioned to each of the 30,000 heads of families seven wives and seventy children, leaving 573,550 unmarried men, and 793,550 unmarried women over twenty years of age, and concluded that he had thereby established that Israel was both polygamous and monogamous in the time of Moses.

He next attempted to demonstrate that the regulation of an institution was not sanction, nor was it condemnation; for while it was claimed that God gave laws regulating monogamy, it would hardly be admitted that this regulation condemned it.

He next took up what Mr. Newman claimed to be the great law prohibiting polygamy, Levitices xviii, 18. According to King James' translation, it read: "Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister." His friend Newman, together with Messrs. Dwight, Edwards, and others, disagree with that translation, and somebody had inserted a different reading in the margin, viz: "Thou shalt not take one wife to another." Mr. Newman held this marginal reading, and not the text, to be correct. These great commentators who thus alter King James' translation, as well as the translators, were monogamists—monogamists contending with each other. Mr. Newman argued that the Hebrew contained something a little different from King James' translation. He had examined the text in the Hebrew, and he affirmed that there was no word in the original of the text that could be translated *wife*. It was manufactured scripture, for which there was no reason but that the translators were monogamists, and were afraid they should not find anything in the Bible condemning polygamy, and, therefore, manufactured it. If they had the right to manufacture a word to sustain them, then he had the same right, and to make it read, "Shalt not take one sister to another." This was the true rendering. It was a part and portion of the law of consanguinity which filled the rest of the chapter, prohibiting the marriage of sisters in that day, because of the tendency to quarrel between blood relations. He defied Mr. Newman and all the world of Hebrew scholars to find any word in the original to be translated wife, if the rendering be given that is in the margin, because there is no noun preceding the words "one to another."

He referred again to the unlimited nature of the commands adduced by him from the Bible on the first day of the debate. Mr. Newman had judged all those passages by the great foundation principle he claimed to have found in Leviticus xviii, 18, which he had proved that Mr. Newman had misapprehended. That failing, therefore, those passages stood good, unless something else could be adduced against them.

If the passage forbidding the king to multiply wives unto himself confined him to one wife, then the same command confined him to one horse. The married kinsman of Boaz acknowledged that the law was binding on him by saying, "Go and redeem *my right*," The passages from Matthew and Malachi, made so much of by Mr. Newman referred to divorce and not polygamy. The marrying of a second wife without putting away the first was not adultery. The words "duty of marriage" meant more than betrothal. According to Gibbs, Professor of Theology in Yale College, it meant cohabition. Hosea did not divorce one harlot before he married the other. Here was a law of God, general in its nature, or if limited it couldn't be proved. There was no law against it. It stood as immovable as the Rock of Ages, and would stand when heaven and earth should pass away. It was a law that was binding on ancient Israel. He was sorry he had not more time, but, having discussed the subject, would leave it to all candid persons to judge.

MR. NEWMAN CLOSES THE DEBATE.

Mr. Newman said that it was unfortunate that his distinguished friend, in his wonderful numerical calculation, had based it on the assumption that the slaying of the male children of the Hebrews continued through eighty years and failed to prove it. Until he could prove that, his argument had no more foundation than a vision. Respecting the great law prohibiting polygamy, he reaffirmed that the marginal translation was perfect to a word. The gentleman had labored hard to show that God didn't mean what he said—"One woman to another." He admitted the trahslation in seven of the eight passages to be correct, why not in the eighth? His admission knocked his argument to pieces. He challenged him to meet him on paper, any time, or anywhere, on the Hebrew of this text. The marginal was the true rendering. He referred in his opening speech to the margin to strengthen his argument, and it was a poor rule that wouldn't work both ways. Suppose it meant what Mr. Pratt claimed. Dr. Newman proved yesterday that this law of Moses is not kept by the Mormons. Where was his solemn denunciation of this violation of Divine law? Yesterday he pronounced a curse on him that confirmeth all the words of this law to do them. Did not that curse rest on him and his people? To save polygamy, he stood here in the sight of God and His angels, and before this intelligent audience acknowledged that this people set God's law at defiance. What respect was due his argument from the teachings of Moses in support of polygamy?

Respecting the parallel between the King's multiplying wives and horses, there was no law in regard to horses, but there was in regard to wives. If on an equal footing, then there was no limit to the number of wives a man might have. A passage of Scripture was often quoted in favor of polygamy to the effect that if a man forsake his wife he shall have a hundred. If it was good to forsake his wife, in that sense, it would be better to forsake the hundred. Then he should have 10,000. This is is the argument in [Mr. Pratt's book, "The Seer." Why, such a man would keep the Almighty busy creating wives for him. [Sensation.] He regretted that he hadn't time to notice all the points made by his opponent; he desired to do so; he had pleaded for more time, so had his friends, but it had been denied him.

He would now take up his argument where he had left it yesterday, and apply the great law he had proclaimed on that occasion. In the Bible there were at most twenty-five or thirty cases of polygamy recorded out of the millions of people of whom it was the history, and upon the example of these the polygamists of our day rested their case. In considering them he divided the period before the law was given from that afterward. He then showed that Abraham was not a polygamist, that Hager was brought to him by his wife Sarah, and that immediately thereafter she saw her wrong, but laid it on him; and that God sent the polygamous child away, the parents consenting. Abraham married Ketmah after Sahra's death, not before, etc. This remarkable patriarch was a monogamist, not a polygamist. [Sensation]. Jacob, he said, was inveigled into polygamy before he was converted at the brook Jabbok, and only lived in it twenty-two years of the one hundred and forty-seven of his life. Moses, it was said here, was a polygamist, and Miriam was struck with leprosy because she murmured at it. Zipporah, the daughter of Jethro, and the Ethiopian woman, were the same person, Midian and Ethiopia the same part of Arabia. Moses then stood forth as a monogamist—this lawgiver of a polygamous nation, who should by all means have had a hundred wives. As to Gideon, he was an idolater as well as a polygamist, and if his polygamy was law for us, then equally was his idolatry. The Bible was silent as to both. For Elkannah, he could prove that Hannah, the mother of Samuel, was his first wife, and God's hearing her prayer, was a blessing on monogamy. Sacred writ says Hannah, being barren, Elkanah took another wife. Then David, the warrior, king, and poet, he had ten wives, and was an adulterer, and a murderer. If God's words to him, as was claimed; "I gave thee thy master's wives into thy bosom," sanctioned polygamy, then God's words, "I will take thy wives and give unto thy neighbor, and he shall lie with them," sanctioned adultery and incest. David repented and put away his wives eight years before his death. What of Solomon, the great polygamist—the man with a thousand wives? It was said his greatness was predicted, and his polygamous birth and marriages thereby approved. But the greatness of Christ was also predicted. Did that justify and approve his betrayal and crucifixion? Again, he was told that if his doctrine was true Solomon was a bastard, and by the law couldn't come into the house of God at all, yet he built the Lord a house. This arose from a misunderstanding of the word. With us it meant offspring born outside of lawful wedlock—monogamous matrimony. But it couldn't be proved from Jewish law that the offspring of a Jew and Jewess was a bastard. It was the offspring of a Jew and a Pagan that was meant by bastard. So that Solomon and others were exonerated. The geometrical progression of the evil of polygamy was seen in the cases of Saul, David and Solomon. Saul had one wife and one concubine, David had ten, Solomon a thousand! And it broke the kingdom assunder.

He had been challenged to prove that polygamy was adultery. Here Mr. Newman made an elaborate analysis of adultery, and kindred words, in the Greek and Hebrew, and ended by affirming that under the Jewish dispensation the cohabitation of a man with any other woman than his wife was regarded as adultery; the word including, as they used it, fornication, adultery, and even the salacial lusts of the heart. Therefore, as a Christian minister, he proclaimed the fact polygimy is adultery. [No, no, no, from the audience.]

The polygamists claimed the right, under the Federal constitution, to practice it as religion. He was as proud as his opponent of our religious liberty. But the law of limitation applied to it the same as to the movements of the heavenly bodies. The Hindoo mother might come here, and throw her infant into the lake, and, according to the Mormon theory, the civil government could not prevent it. Yes, it could, they say, because it is murder. It is not murder, said Mr. Newman, it is divested of every attribute of murder. It is a religious act. Yet, we have the right to prevent it. So we have the right to legislate with regard to marriage—to restrict men to one wife each. He was not in favor of harsh legislation, and would exert his influence to prevent it should it be proposed. But he asserted the principle that the civil government had the right to limit religious liberty within the bounds of decency, and so far as might be needful to secure the well-being of society. He alluded to the bearing of polygamy on the perpetuity of the national life, denying what was claimed for it, and naming Greece, Rome, France, Germany, England, as living proofs to the contrary, while Turkey, the latest edition of a polygamous country, was fast passing away. Our own country was just in its youth; it was destined to outlive the hoary past; it would go on and on in greatness and power and glory until it had solved all those great problems of religious liberty and civil rights intrusted to it.

These were the arguments for monogamy. When they could be overthrown we might receive polygamy as taught here. But until it could be proved that the original law of marriage had been abrogated; that there was no distinction between law and practice; that polygamy was a preventive of prostitution, and was not adultery; that it tended to the perpetuity of the national life and the elevation of woman—until then we could not give up this grand idea that God's law condemns polygamy and commands monogamy; that the dearest interests of men and women and of the rising generation as well, demand of us the establishment and maintenance of monoganious marriage in our country. Then would be realized the happy picture of the Scriptures, where the husband and wife were one and the two were equivalent, where parents should bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, where men should provide for their families, for we are told that he who will not do this is worse than an infidel. Then, then, indeed, would monogamy stand forth as the grand truth.

Under the regulations adopted by the Louisville Medical College, five beneficiary students will be admitted from this State. They will be received upon the nomination of the member of Congress for the district in which the applicant resides. We have already published a card from Hon. L. A. Sheldon, inviting applicants to submit to a competitive examination, and intimating his intention of selecting the most competent, as proved by the result. The other members from Louisiana will perhaps adopt a similar plan. Information as to requirements may be had by addressing Dr. E. S. Gaillardet, Dean of the College, at Louisville.

FOR NEW YORK VIA HAVANA.—Messrs. George A. Fosdick & Co. will dispatch the fine, first-class side-wheel steamship Bienville, Captain J. B. Baker, commander, on Friday next, for the above ports: This will be the first clearance of a New York steamer for Havana since the establishment of quarantine. The Bienville has ample freight capacity and unsurpassed cabin accommodations. Her skillful and polite officers will make the voyage pleasant for passengers. Agents' office, 30 Carondelet street.

Captain McAnnally, of the Texas State police, went down on Cedar Bayou, not far from Houston, to arrest a man charged with offenses. McAnnally was chased through a prairie by fifteen or twenty men, and took refuge in a house, which the pursuers surrounded. Finding that they would fire into the house, and thereby endanger the lives of ladies in it, the Captain surrendered to them. A part of the party demanded his death, but others dissented. He was finally released.

Messrs. Fritz Wissinger & Co., proprietors of the Southern House, beer saloon and restaurant, No. 134 Common street, sent a huge cask of lager beer to our editorial rooms last evening. Though it is excellent now, yet, as it will improve with age, it will not be tapped till precisely eleven o'clock to-day. No free lunch will be dispensed with it.

The Democracy of Illinois has been nominating candidates for Congress, and the Chicago *Times*, which is a little hard to please, is in raptures because the very best men have been selected in every instance. Perhaps the *Times* did not sit up with the defeated candidates before it made that announcement.

The Louisville *Courier-Journal* declares that all the fools are not dead in Kentucky, and that a great many of them belong to the Democracy. The trouble with us is that the fools in Louisiana have killed the Democracy, and are now in a savage condition of orphanage.

Monetary--Commercial.

MONETARY.

OFFICE OF THE DAILY REPUBLICAN, SATURDAY EVENING, August 27, 1870.

The money market exhibits the same features noticed yesterday. On the street At notes, with unquestionable collaterals, are quoted at 1½@1¾ ₱ cent per month, and first class business paper, without collaterals, at 1¾@2½. Mortgage paper rules at 10@12 ₱ cent ₱ month for A1, and 13@15 for second class.

Gold opened at 116⅛@116⅜ (against 116¾ at New York) and closed, at 116@116⅛ (against 116½). The movements showed a fair degree of activity, the sales including $10,000 and $10,000 at 116; $10,000 at 116¼; $5000, $5000, $5000 and $10,000 at 116⅛; $10,000 at 116⅛@116⅜, $1500, $5000, $15,000 and $15,000 at 116⅜; $7000 at 116⅜@116⅝; $7000 at 116⅝@116¾, and $20,000 at 116¾. Nothing reported in silver.

Operations in Foreign Exchange were again very limited the sales of sterling reported being confined to £2000 private bankers' at 128⅞, a small amount of bank at 129¼ and £600 do. at the same. Sterling is quoted nominal at 126@127 for good to A1 bill of lading and clear and 128@130 for bank.

Domestic Exchange was quiet but steady. The banks drew on New York at ¼ per cent premium, and the sales included $20,000 commercial sight on New York at ⅛ premium, $30,000 do do on New York and Boston at ½ for the former and ¼ for the latter, and $30,000 bank sight on New York at 5-16.

In stocks 2 shares Mississippi and Mexican Gulf Canal were reported at $225; 50 Mississippi Valley Levee Company at $2 50; 2½ Arkansas and Delta Railroad at $4, and 50 Crescent City Slaughter-house at $15 50.

We noticed more doing in bonds, the sales of which include $500 new city seven per cents at 70½, $300 do at 71⅛, and $500 at 72; also at auction, by Alfred Bouligny, auctioneer, (by order of the Citizen's Bank), $18,000 City Consolidated (Hoyt) bonds February and August coupons were sold at 65, $20,000 old city 6 ₱ cent September and March coupons at 74¼, and $10,247 50 New Orleans City Fiscal Agency 7 ₱ cent certificates at the advanced rate of 85¾. We are informed that these securities were bought by the Citizens' Bank.

Dealers bought fiscal agency certificates at 84@—, and city seven-thirties at 74, and offered to sell the former at 85@86, and the latter at 75. $1000 of the former brought 84, at private sale. $4000 new State warrants changed hands at 72, $630 at 73, and $600 at 73½. Dealers bought new State warrants at 73½, and Metropolitan Police at 97@97½, and sold the former at 74, and the latter at —@96. Some $300 parish of St. Bernard registered scrip brought 65c. City treasury notes were unchanged. Parishes bought small sums at 20@22 discount and offered to sell at 15@18.

COMMERCIAL.

SATURDAY EVENING, August 27, 1870.

COTTON—The sales to-day were confined to 172 bales in several lots at irregular and on the whole lower prices. The business, however, was too small to serve as a basis for any change in our quotations, which we accordingly repeat for reference, viz: Low ordinary, 9½@10¼ and 11c ordinary, 11⅝@12½ and 12¾; good ordinary, 14⅝@15¾c; low middling, 16¾@17⅜c; middling, 17⅝@17¾c, and strict middling, —@18¼.

The market was depressed by the unfavorable advices from New York and Liverpool, and the inquiry was confined to three or four parties in quiet of small lots. The demand ran principally on good cottons, which were scarce, and generally held at full prices. Low ordinary brought 11c, and strict ordinary to good ordinary 12c. Some authorities alleged that middling could not be had under 17c, while others claimed to have bought as low as 17¼c.

COTTON STATEMENT.

Stock on hand September 1, 1869—bales	779
Arrived since last statement	119
Arrived previously	1,196,623
Supplemental from samples and waste, etc	9,562—1,206,295
	1,207,053
Cleared to-day	348
Cleared previously	1,177,411—1,180,399
Stock on hand and on shipboard—bales	26,166

The exports to-day comprised 299 bales to Boston, and 249 to New York.

Receipts proper since last evening 63 bales against 29 last week, and 111 last year, and since September 1, 1,141,061 bales, against 795,459 last year.

SUGAR AND MOLASSES—Only 3 hhds sugar, 1 bbl and half bbl molasses were received this morning. We note more activity to-day; 30 hhds and 41 boxes Cuba centrifugal were taken for the West at 10¼@11¼c ₱ lb. Louisiana sugar is selling in a jobbing way at 10¼@10½c ₱ lb for common, 11⅛@11¾c for fair, 12⅛c for fully fair, 13c for prime, 13¼@13½c for choice, 13¾@13⅞c for yellow clarified, and 14@14¼c for white. Cuba sugar is quoted at 10@12½c for yellow; 13@14c for white. Plantation fermenting molasses is quoted at 25@35c ₱ gallon; city refinery rebelled, 50@75c. Syrup $1 ₱ gallon.

ARRIVALS FROM THE WEST—There has been no arrivals since our review of yesterday.

FLOUR—The market is bare of superfine and double extras, while there is an active demand today for export. Prices are firm, and 6500 bbls were sold, of which 1250 and 1900 treble extra, 130, 500 and 500 choice extra on private terms; 150 and 1000 treble extra at $6 50; 200 and 300 do at $6 75; 200 choice extra at $7, and 150 do at $7 50 ₱ bbl.

CORN—The demand is slack to-day, and the sales are confined to 1000 sacks, of which 200 and 260 mixed at 80c; 120 white mixed at 88c; 150 white at 92c, and 50 at 92½c ₱ bushel.

OATS—Are dull, and prices are weaker. 1000 sacks were sold to-day, of which 200 inferior at 50c; 130 St. Louis at 51c; 400 do at 52c, and 200 old at 54c ₱ bushel.

BRAN—100 and 200 sacks sold at 95c ₱ 100 lbs.

HAY—The supply is light and prices are firm. Prime is quoted at $26@27 50; choice $28 ₱ ton.

PORK—Only a retail business is doing at $33@32 50 ₱ bbl for mess.

LARD—Tierces are scarce, and the market is bare of kegs. Tierces command 17½@18c ₱ lb. All descriptions are in request.

BACON—Shoulders are retailing at 15¾@16c ₱ lb; rib sides at 17½c; clear rib at 18¼c; clear at 19¼c; sugar-cured hams at 26@26½c ₱ lb.

BREAKFAST BACON—Ordinary is quoted at 18½@19c; choice 21@22c ₱ lb.

BALING TWINE—A day or two since, not reported, 62 bales twine sold at 18c ₱ lb.

BAGGING—The market is quiet but very firm. The retail demand for shipment to the country is fair, dealers selling at 33 ₱ yard for India in bales, 31c for do in rolls, 31@32c for hemp and flax, and 23c for domestic jute. Round lots are held at the foregoing prices.

SALT—Liverpool salt is dull, but there is a good inquiry for new cargoes. Dealers' rates $1 50 ₱ sack for coarse, and $1 65 for fine. When large lots are taken at warehouse by boats a deduction is made for drayage. Turks Island salt nominal. Table salt in pockets, 8 lbs 10c, 4 lbs 5c.

WHISKY—The market continues extremely dull, transactions being confined principally to retail and job lots. We quote nominally Western rectified $1@1 05 ₱ gallon for choice, 92½@97½c for low proof; Bourbon, $1 25@1 35 for patent and $1 50@5 for pure.

BUTTER—Choice Goshen is firm at 33c ₱ lb, but common Northern is plenty and dull at 28@32c ₱ lb. Choice Western quiet at 24@26c ₱ lb, inferior nominal.

Weekly Quotations of Hides, Etc.

Reported by Messrs. Hay & Mehle. (Their quotations represent actual sales at first hands. Expenses taken out, weighing, bundling, drayage and commission have to be added.)

Steer hides, city slaughter, over 85 lbs, ₱ lb	— @ 8½
Steer hides, city slaughter, 70 to 84 lbs, ₱ lb	8½@ 9
Steer hides, city slaughter, under 70 lbs, ₱ lb	— @ 9½
Cow hides, city slaughter, as they run, ₱ lb	— @ 9
Kips, city slaughter, 20 to 24 lbs, ₱ lb	— @13
Kips, city slaughter, 25 to 30 lbs, ₱ lb	10 @11
Calf