

OBJECTIONS
TO THE
BOOK OF MORMON
AND DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS
ANSWERED AND REFUTED

BY ELDER J. R. LAMBERT



LAMONI, IOWA

Published by the Board of Publication of the
Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of
Latter Day Saints

1908

OBJECTIONS

TO THE

BOOK OF MORMON

AND THE BOOK OF

DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS

Answered and Refuted.

BY ELDER J. R. LAMBERT.

PUBLISHED BY THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER DAY SAINTS.

LAMONI, IOWA:
HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE.

INDEX.

THE BOOK OF MORMON.

- Anti-polygamy, 47.
- Barges of the brother of Jared, the, 65.
- Blood of Christ, 56.
- Character of the errors claimed, 34.
- Charge of plagiarism, 67.
- Circulation of the blood, 52.
- Contradiction, 35.
- Dark color of Lamanites, 46.
- Fraud claimed, 39.
- Great conversions, 58.
- Hebrew, 74.
- History of plates, 14.
- Holy Spirit given before Christ came in the
flesh, the, 61.
- How inspired, 32.
- Imperfect grammar, 27.
- Infidel quibble, 40.
- Introduction, 3.
- Jesus the God of Israel, 55.
- Journey to the Red Sea, 36.
- Manner of translation, 25.
- Metallic plates, 10.
- Modern words used in the translation, 47.
- Moroni's rent, 29.
- Old objection, an, 40.

- Place of Christ's nativity, 54.
 Plates filled, 59.
 Rapid growth in population, etc., 43.
 Reformed Egyptian writing, 70.
 Repetition of "thereof," 31.
 Spalding story, 76.
 Special criticism answered, 50.
 Too much darkness, 40.
 Too rapid, again, 52.
 Word "Jew," the, 60.
 Writing on brass plates, 12.
-

THE BOOK OF DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS.

- Adam-God theory, 105.
 Baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost, 104.
 Blessing of children, 109.
 Book of Doctrine and Covenants, the, 79.
 Book of Enoch, 90.
 Book of Mormon equal to the Bible, 96.
 Charge of changing revelations examined, 85.
 Charge of popery examined, the, 100.
 Church organization, 98.
 Did John tarry? 98.
 Did Rigdon write it? 79.
 Did the predictions fail? 114.
 Does the book teach stealing? 112.
 Failure of the critics, 118.
 False notions, 104.
 Infant baptism charged, 107.
 Is the Devil Lucifer? 106.
 Joseph and his posterity, 102.
 Nauvoo House to be an abiding place, 117.
 New covenant, 99.

- Section 22 : 7, examined, 108.
Section 110 is not a revelation, 109.
Seventeenth section Doctrine and Covenants, 87.
Some did not believe, 95.
Teachings of the book pure and divine, 119.
Tithes and offerings, 110.
Title of the book, 79.
True church, the, 95.
Visit to Independence, Missouri, falsely represented, the, 91.
Was he a false prophet? 93.
What kind of evidence is this? 102.
Who will be damned? 97.
Zion to increase in beauty, 117.

OBJECTIONS TO THE
BOOK OF MORMON ANSWERED
AND REFUTED.

INTRODUCTION.

In the following pages we undertake to answer and refute the leading objections urged against the claims made by the Latter Day Saints for the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, so far as they have come under our notice. These objections will furnish the reader with a fair sample of the supposed strong points relied upon by many ministers and some lecturers who are not ministers, in their efforts to put down and "stamp out" the faith and doctrine of the people who believe that the above-named books, like the Bible, contain a revelation of God's will to man. How far they have been successful in their warfare, or consistent and just in their attacks, we leave the reader to judge.

This review is written for the benefit of all who may honestly suppose that the criticisms referred to in this little work are sufficient grounds to overthrow the historical, doctrinal, and prophetic claims put forth by the books against which the criticisms are made. Also for the benefit of those who believe that the books are just what they claim to be; and who, because of this belief, are constantly brought in con-

tact with that upon the strength of which they are asked, and sometimes vehemently urged by the clergy of the day to renounce their faith.

If the clergymen who have made these criticisms against the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants are proper representatives of the Church of Christ and the gospel of Jesus, they are bound by the common rules of honor and fairness to apply the same rules of interpretation to the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants, that they would apply to the Bible and Christianity when defending them before the infidel world.

The Bible claims to contain a record of the gospel or doctrine of Jesus Christ; and so do the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants. Clearly, then, these books must be examined on their proper claims; and if put to one side, it must be done, first, by the rules and tests furnished by the Almighty himself, and contained in the Bible; and, second, it must be done in harmony with the methods employed and the interpretations applied when defending Christianity and the Bible against the attacks of the skeptic and infidel.

According to the Bible, God has always refused to be committed by rules of human origin, or to have his work tried and rejected by human wisdom. He has in his wisdom furnished the rules and tests by which all that claims to be of divine origin may be properly tried, and if found true, accepted; but if found to be false, rejected and exposed. Why do not these clergymen call the attention of the people to these divine rules and tests, and by them try the claims and statements of these books? We must allow them to speak for themselves through one of their number. After holding a number of debates with the Latter Day Saints, in some of which he affirmed the faith and doctrine of the Christian Church, he now says:—

The Bible knows nothing about this fraud.

Indeed! God knew that many thousands of people would honestly embrace this delusion (?) (Mormonism so called), but provided them with no means of protection against it! He knew that it would become necessary for his servants, the so called orthodox ministers, to expose the fraud (?), but furnished them with no means by which it could be done! All this being true, we can hardly blame these gentlemen for turning their backs on the Bible, and seeking to settle the whole question in some other way. If God, who is infinite in wisdom and love, has left his people of all ages in this exposed and dangerous condition, how can these critics, or anybody else, have perfect faith in him?

When Jesus came, he appealed directly to the Scriptures in proof of his mission and work. But the Jews, who professed great faith in God and reverence for the Scriptures, were not willing to have the matter settled in that way. Perhaps they thought that the Scriptures knew nothing about that great impostor, so, like the ministers of our time, who also reject and oppose the doctrine of present revelation from God, they proposed to try his wonderful claims in the ordinary way, and the result of this exhibition of human wisdom was the death of Jesus on the cross, and the rejection of his doctrine!

These ministers are accustomed to meeting infidelity. They know what policy must be pursued in defending the Bible when it is attacked, in order to insure success. They know that if narrow and superficial views are entertained and defended by the minister his case is gone. They know that when the skeptic insists upon a forced interpretation of some passage of Scripture, ignoring what is written upon the same topic elsewhere in the Bible, it is unjust, and they would not permit it for a moment. And yet when they are seeking to make points against the faith and claims of the Latter Day Saints, they indulge very largely in this mode of interpretation!

They know, too, that it is comparatively easy for some men to raise questions and difficulties, and abuse people, calling them rascals, ignoramuses, and cowards; and yet this is a large part of their stock in trade in nearly all their controversies with the Latter Day Saints.

See how some of them talk when they are about to meet infidelity. When giving an outline of his nine lectures to be delivered against infidelity last May (1891), in Woodbine, Iowa, one of them was reported as saying the following:—

It takes no intelligence to tear down a system, or to abuse people. A child can ask more questions in a few moments than a philosopher can answer in a lifetime.

We will take these men at their word; but every intelligent and unbiased listener who has had the privilege of hearing many of them make their attacks on the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saints knows that this very policy of asking questions for the apparent purpose of confusing and entrapping rather than eliciting truth, raising questions of difficulty when there are no grounds for them when viewed from a Bible standpoint, striving "to tear down" the house in which we have chosen to live, and at the same time persistently refusing to defend their own, and scandalously abusing the people who have done them no wrong, are the leading lines of policy pursued by them.

If the object of these men in making these attacks is to keep people from embracing error and reclaim those who are supposed to be deluded, we would reasonably expect them to manifest a degree of love and sympathy for the erring ones. If this is their object, why do they, as a rule, tear, and plunge, and strike, more like madmen than ministers of the meek and lowly Jesus. We may make some allowance for men giving way, momentarily, to a wrong feeling, in the heat of debate; but how shall we

account for it when these characteristics are manifested in all, or nearly all, their work? Let us admit, as we would like to do, that our opponents are honest in their attacks on the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saints; then, as a matter of course, the objects of such opposition can never become an incentive to ill feeling and unkind treatment nor to an utter disregard of the leading rights of those who are supposed to be the pitiable dupes of a gross and dangerous imposture.

In examining the statements of the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, our opponents pass hurriedly along, not stopping long enough at any one point to give it a fair and proper investigation. They hastily state that to which they object, frequently not even stopping to read it, and then plunge on to the next point. They frequently omit to give references to those passages which they condemn, which practice is decidedly objectionable in a critic. Indeed, the whole character of these strictures is such as to produce its strongest effects upon the minds of ignorant people, superficial thinkers, and those who are greatly blinded by religious bias; but they are not such as to induce an honest and intelligent Latter Day Saint to renounce his faith. To thinking people, who desire only the truth, a few points carefully and fully examined in such a way as to give evidence that the critic is not only willing but anxious that the hearer and reader should see all sides of the question, would be worth more than all these unfair efforts put together. I refer, of course, more particularly to lectures and debates delivered from the rostrum, although the written criticisms partake largely of the same character.

These clergymen surely know that the only just and safe way of interpreting the statements of Jesus, the apostles, and the prophets, is to consider every objectionable statement in the light of all that is

written upon it, and especially is this true of all the stronger statements of the Bible. Why do they ignore this rule in the interpretation of the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants? They know, too, that there are many historical statements of the Bible which deal largely with the wonderful and miraculous, and on this account the infidel and skeptic reject them. Why, then, do they make this one of their strong objections to the Book of Mormon?

The leading infidel says:—

The Bible represents the infinite God as interfering with and concerning himself about the most trivial affairs of life, which, if there be any such God, he would not do.

These men urge the same objection against the Book of Mormon. It is very difficult, as a rule, to get the opponents of Christianity to give any one doctrine or statement of the Bible a fair and full investigation. They prefer to hurry along, touch on a great many passages, present partial statements, pass over a great deal of ground, and thus make a big show, hold up to ridicule the what to them are objectionable statements, and thus make out their case. Why do these ministers pursue this same course?

Now if the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants cannot be put down without standing upon infidel ground, and employing infidel methods and interpretations, what is the conclusion in every intelligent mind? This: that these books represent God, Christ, and the gospel, as they are taught in the Bible. And if they do, where is the danger in receiving them? And if they do not, then why do these critics refuse to deny them from a Bible standpoint in public debate? If it be said the danger lies in believing that the gospel teachings of these books came from God, whereas they were stolen from the Bible, then, we reply, will the principles and truths

of the gospel be less potent and effectual in their grand results because we believe that God has again commanded the people to obey them?

Again: Kersey Graves and other infidel writers claim that Christianity is of human and heathen origin, and they undertake to prove it in very much the same way that these men undertake to prove that the purported revelations of God in the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants are of human origin, and are frauds; and they are equally as successful as these ministers in their efforts against the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants.

The truth is that no individual who has an intelligent and defensible faith in God, and confidence in the Bible, can accept the methods, arguments, and interpretations of these men as correct, when they are seeking to overthrow the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saints, without having that faith and confidence seriously weakened. If the acceptance of such a course as right does not weaken one's faith, it is because his faith was very far from what it should have been to begin with, in which case the tendency is to prevent him from having proper and intelligent faith in God and the Bible. Thus the tendency of such a course is, what it always has been, to move one class farther away from God, and to prevent another class from drawing nearer to him in his own appointed way.

THE AUTHOR.

CHAPTER I.

THE BOOK OF MORMON.

METALLIC PLATES.

The first objection we note is that the Book of Mormon claims to have been written on metallic plates, and was preserved by miraculous power. We are told that we have not a hint that any part of the Bible except the ten commandments was written on imperishable material.

Let us notice the strength of this criticism. Are not the ten commandments, which were written on two tables of stone, as true and reliable as any other part of the Bible? Let us suppose that the entire Bible had been written on tables of stone, or metallic plates, would that fact have rendered it worthless, or untrue?

There was no miracle wrought, we are told, to preserve the Bible; it was subject to the same vicissitudes as all other books. This statement is made, we presume, upon the hypothesis that if the Almighty had exercised any degree of miraculous power in the preservation of the sacred manuscripts, these men would have been sure to have known it! This, it is needless to say, we are not quite prepared to admit. Does the Bible say that no such power was to be exercised? No, it does not intimate anything of the kind. What then is the authority for the statement? No authority is given. It is a bare assumption, and according to the expressed views of many eminent defenders of Christianity there are much better grounds for an opposite belief. The preservation of the manuscripts, their translation into the different languages of the earth, their

remarkable purity, considering the hands through which they have passed, and the Bible being placed in the hands of the people, is urged by some as one of the strong evidences of the divine origin of Christianity. Lyman Abbott, in Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, article Bible, says:—

The method in which the books which we now possess have been selected from a greater number, the principles upon which they have been gathered together in one volume, and the manner of their almost miraculous preservation, constitutes the subject of an important part of biblical history.

Will these critics tell us that it is contrary to the statements of the Bible or out of harmony with the character of God that he should exercise his providence and power in the preservation of his word? If not, where is their point?

It is evident, too, that the ancient Hebrews did write on imperishable material, including metallic plates. And if those who came from the land of Jerusalem, six hundred years before Christ, exercised the care to place their history and sacred writings on metallic plates, does that, in any degree, prove the Book of Mormon to be a fraud?

In the days of Job writing on imperishable material was understood:—

Oh that my words were now written! oh that they were printed in a book! That they were graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock forever.—Job 19: 23, 24.

It was understood and practiced in the days of Moses:—

And they made the plate of the holy crown of pure gold, and wrote upon it a writing, like to the engravings of a signet, Holiness to the Lord.—Exodus 39: 30.

In the Apocrypha we have the following plain statements:—

And they commanded that this writing should be put in tables of brass, and that they should be set up within

the compass of the sanctuary, in a conspicuous place: and that a copy thereof should be put in the treasury, that Simon and his sons may have it.—1 Mach. 14: 48, 49, Douay Translation.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, about A. D. 70, Titus, the Roman general, called at Antioch, and the people presented to him a petition against the Jews. Of this transaction Josephus says:—

Whereupon the people of Antioch, when they had failed of success in this their first request, made him a second; for they desired that he would order those tables of brass to be removed, on which the Jews' privileges were engraven, etc.—Josephus vol. 6. p. 132.

WRITING ON BRASS PLATES.

The Book of Mormon not only claims that the record from which it was translated was kept on metallic plates, but it claims that the little Nephite colony which came out from Jerusalem about six hundred years before Christ secured and brought with them certain plates of brass which are called “a record of the Jews from the beginning, even down to the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah.” It also claims that this record contained the five books of Moses with “the prophecies of the holy prophets from the beginning even down to the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah, and also many prophecies which have been spoken by the mouth of Jeremiah.”—Book of Mormon p. 10, par. 46.

Now it is claimed by some, in their infidelic methods to overthrow the claims of the Book of Mormon, that the Jews, or ancient Hebrews, never wrote on brass plates: that there is no history to show that they did; that the word *brass*, as found in the Old Testament, means *copper*, etc.

To this objection, urged with far more vehemence than wisdom, by a very late opponent, we offer the following reply: In defending the historical

part of the Book of Mormon we are not under obligations to prove that every historical statement which it makes is contained in some other history. The book contains its own history; and it is required of our opponents to prove this history to be false if they can. Let them prove from reliable history that the Jews never wrote on brass plates. Until they do this, so far as this point is concerned, they have simply done nothing. The idea that when any purported history is quoted we may safely denounce it as false unless the same matter can be found in some other history, is absurd on its very face. It is as inconsistent as it would be for us to denounce the statements of an individual as false unless it could be proved that somebody else had made the same statements before he did! To say that the originals for which we have the word *brass* in the Old Testament always mean *copper*, is affirming much more than we know in order, it would seem, to make a point against the Book of Mormon. It would be no more wide of the truth to say that these same originals always mean brass, and nothing but brass. If they always mean copper, how does it come that the learned have translated them brass? In Abbott's Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, article Brass, we have the following:—

In many places in the Old Testament the correct translation of the word *nechosheth*, so frequently translated "brass," would probably be copper, although it may sometimes possibly mean bronze, which is a composition of copper and tin, while brass is copper and zinc, etc.

Abbott does not say that brass would always be a wrong translation, nor does he positively affirm that copper would ever be the correct translation. He seems to be somewhat in doubt, as others have been, with reference to the whole matter. If the ancient Hebrews knew how to manufacture bronze, it is possible, if not probable, that they also knew how to manufacture brass.

Robert Young shows, in his Analytical Concord-

ance, that brass was plentifully used by the Hebrews:—

Brass was much used by the ancient Hebrews, and made into altars, bars, fetters, gates, greaves, helmets, household vessels, idols, instruments of music, lavers, mirrors, pillars, sacred vessels, shields, sockets for pillars, etc.

He gives the Hebrew word from which we get the word *brass* with four different formations, but in every case gives the literal, or root meaning, as *brass*, *copper*. This seems to indicate that the Hebrew words *nachush*, *nechushah*, *nechash*, and *nechosheth*, may mean either brass or copper.

We have already shown that the Hebrews did write on metallic plates, and that according to Josephus and the Apochrypha they wrote on brass plates in exact accordance with the statements of the Book of Mormon. These considerations leave the criticism made against the Book of Mormon without any foundation upon which to stand, save a few unproved assertions of the critic.

HISTORY OF PLATES.

While writing on plates is the matter under consideration, we call attention to an objection lately brought to our notice. An opponent engaged in public debate on the question of the Book of Mormon, on the last evening of the discussion, and in the last speech in which he was permitted to introduce new evidence, read page 43, paragraph 46, of the Book of Mormon, and affirmed that it contained a "positive contradiction" concerning the plates on which Nephi wrote. The supposed contradiction is, we presume (though he did not define it), where it is claimed that Nephi says he was commanded of the Lord to make plates, and then, when he made them, he did not know that he would be "commanded of the Lord to make these plates!"

This criticism fairly illustrates the general char-

acter of the objections urged against the claims made for the Book of Mormon. The situation is this: We affirm that the book is true, and that it contains a revelation of God's will to man. We furnish the evidence upon which we found these claims, and our opponents signally fail to meet it fairly and properly. They then proceed to make their criticisms and urge their objections against the book, relying largely upon defects in arrangement and wording, and upon the supposed or real ignorance of the people concerning the contents and wording of the book. All that we can be justly required to do, under these circumstances, is to show that the criticisms and objections urged are invalid and, therefore, insufficient.

We have already seen that we are under no obligations to show that the style of composition in which these Book of Mormon writers wrote is up to the standards which human wisdom has devised. If the statements made are in no sense misleading, if they are in harmony with all known truth, in the Bible and out of the Bible, then, clearly, we are not at liberty to reject their claim for being true. Nephi, who is the reputed author of the paragraph to which objection is had, made no pretensions to scholarly ability, as a writer, but he did claim to record the truth, and seemed to labor under the impression that for this sole reason the professed people of God, *everywhere*, ought to believe the things which he wrote. At the close of his second and last book Nephi says:—

And now I, Nephi, cannot write all the things which were taught among my people; neither am I mighty in writing, like unto speaking. . . . But I, Nephi, have written what I have written; and I esteem it as of great worth, and especially unto my people.—Pages 110, 111, par. 1.

Let us read the paragraph referred to above, that we may properly estimate the strength of our opponent's objection:—

And it came to pass that the Lord commanded me, wherefore I did make plates of ore, that I might engraven upon them the record of my people. And upon the plates which I made, I did engraven the record of my father, and also our journeyings in the wilderness, and the prophecies of my father; and also many of mine own prophecies have I engraven upon them. And I knew not at the time when I made them, that I should be commanded of the Lord to make these plates; wherefore, the record of my father, and the genealogy of his forefathers, and the more part of all our proceedings in the wilderness, are engraven upon those plates of which I have spoken; wherefore, the things which transpired before I made these plates, are, of a truth, more particularly made mention upon the first plates.—1 Nephi 5: 46.

The paragraph itself, without any reference to connecting passages which throw much light upon the whole matter, shows that Nephi had two sets of plates, designated as “these plates” (the ones on which he is now writing, a translation of which we have in the first and second books of Nephi, in the Book of Mormon), and “those plates,” or “*the first plates.*” “The first plates” are the ones upon which the record was kept for about thirty years after they left Jerusalem. At the expiration of this time the Lord commanded Nephi to make “other plates,” upon which he was to make a brief but very carefully prepared record, making a specialty of doctrine and all spiritual matters. In making this second record, Nephi frequently alludes to the first. When he began to write on this second set of plates, he had all the data before him which was to compose his record for thirty years, and like other historians, he did not always mention facts in the exact order in which they occurred; but if we will read the record, as a whole, all will be plain. When Nephi says, “And I knew not at the time when I made them, that I should be commanded of the Lord to make these plates,” “*them,*” refers to the first plates; “*these,*” to the second, upon which he was then writing. Let

us read the next paragraph, or a portion of it, (the forty-seventh,) as found on pages 43 and 44:—

And after I had made these plates by way of commandment, I, Nephi, received a commandment, that the ministry, and the prophecies, the more plain and precious parts of them should be written upon these plates: and that the things which were written, should be kept for the instruction of my people, who should possess the land, and also for other wise purposes, which purposes are known unto the Lord; wherefore I, Nephi, did make a record, upon the other plates, which gives an account, or which gives a greater account of the wars, and contentions, and destructions of my people. And this have I done, and commanded my people what they should do, after I was gone, and that these plates should be handed down from one generation to another, or from one prophet to another, until further commandments of the Lord. And an account of my making these plates shall be given hereafter; and then, behold, I proceed according to that which I have spoken, and this I do, that the more sacred things may be kept for the knowledge of my people.

Please bear in mind that this second set of plates has been made; that Nephi is now writing upon them, but that he has not yet come to the right place in his record, considering the order of events as to time, to give an account of the making of these plates, but states that it "shall be given hereafter." Read also the first part of paragraph 5, on page 62.

We now come to the time when Nephi made the plates, or "*these plates*," a record of which we have on pages 65, 66, paragraphs 5 and 6, the greater portion of which we herewith present, beginning with the last sentences of paragraph 5:—

And thirty years had passed away from the time we left Jerusalem. And I, Nephi, had kept the records upon my plates, which I had made of my people, thus far.

And it came to pass that the Lord God said unto me, Make other plates; and thou shalt engraven many things upon them which are good in my sight, for the profit of thy people. Wherefore, I, Nephi, to be obedient to the commandments of the Lord, went and made these plates

upon which I have engraven these things. And I engraved that which is pleasing unto God. And if my people are pleased with the things of God, they will be pleased with mine engravings which are upon these plates. And if my people desire to know the more particular part of the history of my people, they must search mine other plates. And it sufficeth me to say, that forty years had passed away, and we had already had wars and contentions with our brethren.

The above methods and order of keeping records among the Nephites were imposed on Nephi's successors, as may be seen from the testimony of Jacob, the brother of Nephi, and his first successor:—

For behold, it came to pass that fifty and five years had passed away, from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem; wherefore, Nephi gave me, Jacob, a commandment concerning the small plates, upon which these things are engraven. And he gave me, Jacob, a commandment that I should write upon these plates, a few of the things which I considered to be most precious: that I should not touch, save it were lightly, concerning the history of this people, which are called the people of Nephi. For he said that the history of his people should be engraven upon his other plates, and that I should preserve these plates, and hand them down unto my seed, from generation to generation. And if there were preaching which was sacred, or revelation which was great, or prophesying, that I should engraven the heads of them upon these plates, and touch upon them as much as it were possible, for Christ's sake, and for the sake of our people: for because of faith and great anxiety, it truly had been made manifest unto us concerning our people, what things should happen unto them.—Page 112, first half of par. 1.

At the close of Jacob's record, page 131, paragraph 9, we have the following:—

And I, Jacob, saw that I must soon go down to my grave; wherefore, I said unto my son Enos, Take these plates. And I told him the things which my brother Nephi had commanded me; and he promised obedience unto the commandments, etc.

All who will carefully trace the history of these

plates from their origin to the time when Joseph Smith delivered them back into the hands of the angel of God, will find in this alone such a class of evidences as makes it strongly probable that the Book of Mormon, instead of having been made from fiction, was formed out of existing *facts* and *truths*, as therein set forth.

Mormon, who lived and figured in the fourth century of the Christian era, with his Son Moroni, were the last ones who had these plates in their possession before they were hid up unto the Lord. Mormon made an abridgment of the whole record, which was completed by his son, calling it after his own name; hence the name of the book, "Book of Mormon." But from the Words of Mormon, on page 139, we learn that when he had proceeded with his work of abridgment down to the reign of King Benjamin, about four hundred years after Lehi and his family left Jerusalem, or two hundred years before Christ, he was led to search the records which had come into his hands, and upon doing so he found this more important record of which we have been speaking. He was highly pleased with it, and concluded to finish out his abridged account from its contents; not only this, but to put the plates containing this desirable record with his other plates, in order to carefully preserve them. This is what he says on this point:—

But behold, I shall take these plates, which contain these prophesyings and revelations, and put them with the remainder of my record, for they are choice unto me; and I know they will be choice unto my brethren. And I do this for a wise purpose; for thus it whispereth me, according to the workings of the Spirit of the Lord which is in me.

Let us note a few points, drawn from what we have presented; but which are still more clearly seen by a more complete reading of the Book of Mormon.

1. In the abridged record made by Mormon, he

did not use the more valuable and precious record which was commenced in the days of Nephi and kept up by his successors, until he came to the reign of King Benjamin, or about two hundred years before Christ.

2. From the reign of King Benjamin to the close of his life, some four hundred years after Christ, Mormon made up his abridged record from this more sacred record referred to, and from what he himself wrote.

3. Mormon not only uses this precious record in making his abridgment, but he takes the plates on which the record was made and puts them with his other plates in order that they might be carefully preserved.

4. Mormon is not only pleased with this record, after he has examined it, but he decides to keep the plates with his other plates, because the Spirit of the Lord which is in him, reveals to him that this is needful "for a wise purpose" known unto the Lord.

5. More than nine hundred years before this Nephi claimed to have received a command from God that he should record the things of the ministry, "and the prophecies, the more plain and precious parts of them," on these plates:—

And that the things which were written, should be kept for the instruction of my people, who should possess the land, and also for other wise purposes which purposes are known unto the Lord.—1 Nephi 5:47.

Did Spalding, or Rigdon, or Joseph Smith put all these coincidents concerning the plates, and many more like them, into the minds and writings of these different authors of the Book of Mormon, who wrote from about 600 B. C., to A. D., 420? Is it likely that any of these men could originate such a scheme as this, in which events (as a rule), names, and dates all appear in their proper time and in their proper order? A leading church member once said to the writer that he was satisfied that the Book of Mormon

is the Solomon Spalding Romance; "for," said he, "it sounds just like a nice novel when one reads it." The reply was, in substance, as follows:—

"Truth is sometimes 'stranger than fiction.' When you read the Book of Mormon you probably had it fixed in your mind to begin with that the whole thing is nothing more than a novel. I have read but very few novels, but I would like to ask you a question or two: Did you ever read a novel in which names, dates, and events are dealt with as they are in the Book of Mormon—I mean, of course, one which covers a space of not less than one thousand years? Did you ever read a novel which claimed to be a history of a prehistoric people, and of the dealings of God with them, that so completely harmonized with the established facts of the country and people it claimed to represent, as shown by archæological discoveries brought to light after the novel was written, and with the Bible, Old Testament and New, as does the Book of Mormon?"

To this he replied: "Well, no; I can't say that I ever did. That is one thing that bothered me when I read the book. I noticed that so many names and events would be dropped in a natural easy way, but wherever they had any connection with the future, according to the prophecies of the story, they would come up all right in their time and place."

"How do you account for all these things?"

"I don't account for them at all; but the whole thing sounds to me like a made up story."

I need hardly inform the reader that this is precisely the way a certain class of people talk about the Bible and Christianity. They feel that the whole thing is a fraud, and they will have it that it is a fraud, notwithstanding the vast amount of evidence, and the character of the evidence, brought forth to support it.

But let us return; we are not quite through with the story of the plates. The record was finished,

sealed, and hid away in the earth by commandment of God, with a promise that it should be brought forth to the people in the Lord's own time, and in the Lord's own manner. This was done more than four hundred years after the birth of Christ.

Away down in 1820, at Palmyra, New York, the Lord begins to train an illiterate boy, who was in the fifteenth year of his age, that he might become a proper instrument to do the Lord's work. In this first revelation he is pointed to Christ and commanded, to "*hear him.*" In 1823 the angel of God tells him where the plates are, when he can procure them, and gives him necessary instructions concerning the Lord's work, which, according to Bible prophecies, was to be reestablished in the last days, and the gospel preached for a witness unto the nations, just prior to the second advent of Jesus Christ. (Acts 3: 20, 21; Isa. 40: 1-10; 29: 9-24; Matt. 24: 14; Rev. 4: 6, 7.)

In 1827, this young man, then twenty-two years old, secured the plates according to promise, and in 1828 he commenced to translate. After a sufficient amount of the record had been translated to cover one hundred and sixteen pages of foolscap paper, what seemed to be a sore calamity befell him. The manuscript fell into the hands of an enemy, and it could not be recovered. After much sorrow and repentance, the Lord again speaks to this young man, July, 1828. (D. C. sec. 2.) Among other things he says:—

The works, and the designs, and the purposes of God, can not be frustrated, neither can they come to naught, for God doth not walk in crooked paths; neither doth he turn to the right hand nor to the left; neither doth he vary from that which he hath said; therefore his paths are straight and his course is one eternal round.

Remember, remember, that it is not the work of God that is frustrated, but the work of men; for although a man may have many revelations, and have power to do many mighty works, yet, if he boasts in his own strength,

and sets at naught the counsels of God, and follows after the dictates of his own will, and carnal desires, he must fall and incur the vengeance of a just God upon him.

The Lord then proceeds to call his attention to the sacredness of the trust which had been reposed in him; that he had been guilty of transgressing the commandments and laws of God; that if he was not careful he would fall and lose his gift, but that if he would repent of the wrong done, he was still chosen, and "again called to the work."

In July or August, 1828, Mr. Smith is again commanded to translate, but is informed by revelation that his enemies, in their frenzied efforts to destroy him and the work which he was seeking to establish, had changed the wording of the manuscript, and thus laid a cunning trap for him. But the Lord tells him not to translate the same account over again, but instructs and commands him as follows:—

And now, verily I say unto you, that an account of those things that you have written, which have gone out of your hands, are engraven upon the plates of Nephi; yea, and you remember, it was said in those writings, that a more particular account was given of these things upon the plates of Nephi.

And now, because the account which is engraven upon the plates of Nephi, is more particular concerning the things, which in my wisdom I would bring to the knowledge of the people in this account, therefore, you shall translate the engravings which are on the plates of Nephi, down even till you come to the reign of king Benjamin, or until you come to that which you have translated, which you have retained, and behold, you shall publish it as the record of Nephi, and thus I will confound those who have altered my words. I will not suffer that they shall destroy my work; yea, I will show unto them that my wisdom is greater than the cunning of the devil.

Behold, they have only got a part, or an abridgment of the account of Nephi. Behold, there are many things engraven on the plates of Nephi, which do throw greater views upon my gospel; therefore, it is wisdom in me, that

you should translate this first part of the engravings of Nephi, and send forth in this work. And, behold, all the remainder of this work, does contain all those parts of my gospel which my holy prophets, yea, and also my disciples, desired in their prayers, should come forth unto this people. And I said unto them, that it should be granted unto them according to their faith in their prayers; yea, and this was their faith, that my gospel which I gave unto them, that they might preach in their days, might come unto their brethren, the Lamanites, and also, all that had become Lamanites, because of their dissensions.—D. and C. 9: 8-10.

It will be seen from the above instruction, given to Mr. Smith, that "the more sacred" and precious record, kept on the second set of Nephi's plates, is the very one from which we get the Book of Mormon, down to the reign of King Benjamin, the very time when Mormon commenced to use this same record in making up his abridgment! This is the same record which God's Spirit so strongly indorsed, according to the Book of Mormon, nearly six hundred years before Christ! The one which was indorsed again in a similar manner, through Mormon, about four hundred years after Christ! This is the record which the Lord now, in 1829, gives such a strong indorsement, and by his wisdom and power, places in the hands of the people! Did all this originate in the brain of the learned Spalding, or in that of the "ignoramus," Joseph Smith? Never! It requires more blind credulity to believe it than it requires intelligent faith to accept the book for just what it purports to be.

Let us suppose that the manuscript had never been stolen, and that Joseph Smith had published the abridged record of Mormon down to the time of the reign of King Benjamin; who cannot see that, in that case, there would have been room for justly severe criticism. But God foresaw what would transpire. He made ample provision for the strange

emergency. He acted like himself, and caused "the wrath of man to praise him!"

There is no contradiction, no inconsistency, no misleading statement, in all that we have examined; but, on the contrary, there are strong evidences of truth and divinity.

MANNER OF TRANSLATION.

Next, an attack is made on the manner in which the Book of Mormon was translated, as claimed by these critics. They quote from a prefatory note to the Book of Mormon, which claims to be a translation from the plates, in which the writer, Moroni, makes the following statement:—

And now if there are faults, they are the mistakes of men, etc.

"A greater lie," says one leading critic, "was never uttered;" and he undertakes to prove that the statement is false by asserting that Joseph Smith was inspired to translate, Oliver Cowdery to write, and by means of the "urim and thummim" every word was given as though it came directly from the mouth of God. It is not necessary for me to notice the manner of translation here, as the statement to which this critic objects has direct reference to the record as written by the ancient Nephites, the completion of which took place some fourteen hundred years before the Book of Mormon was translated! Moroni's position is that God had furnished the means of interpretation, so that a correct translation of the record would be placed in the hands of the people; but he, with other writers of the book, provide for possible error or mistake, at the same time claiming that the book, as a record, is true. The first writer, Nephi, says on page 1, paragraph 1:—

And I know that the record which I make is true; and I make it with mine own hand; and I make it according to my knowledge.

The record was made according to Nephi's knowledge, not according to the knowledge of God; but the things recorded are true.

Page 131, paragraph 8:—

And it came to pass that I, Jacob, began to be old; and the record of this people being kept on the other plates of Nephi, wherefore, I conclude this record, declaring that I have written according to the best of my knowledge, etc.

Page 495, paragraph 1:—

And whoso receiveth this record, and shall not condemn it because of the imperfections which are in it, the same shall know of greater things than these. Behold, I am Moroni; and were it possible, I would make all things known unto you.

This is the same Moroni who wrote the prefatory note objected to, and his statements show that he was conscious that the record was more or less imperfect, as it left his hands, after the work of abridgment had been completed. The same admission is made by Moroni on page 500, paragraph 8.

From the above statements we learn, first, that the different writers of the Book of Mormon agree concerning the imperfections of the record; and, second, that Moroni, who was the author of the language objected to, has a style of expression peculiar to himself, in whatever part of the book it is found, which is evidence in favor of the record; and, third, the statement of Moroni, that "if there are faults, they are the mistakes of men," applied wholly to the errors that might be made in writing, and not to the translation. Therefore, what these critics denounce as a lie is strictly true, and the whole criticism stands to the discredit of the critic, rather than to the discredit of the claims of the Book of Mormon.

It is an opportune time just now to show that it stands to the credit of these Book of Mormon writers that they did not claim perfection for their work. The best friends of Christianity and the Bible are

being compelled to admit that the writers of the Bible, including the prophets and apostles, may have committed many minor errors in manner of composition, dates, etc., but that these do not invalidate the claims of the Bible to being a true record, and containing a revelation of God's will to man. These Book of Mormon writers placed themselves in harmony with the important thought which is now forcing itself upon the attention of all intelligent Christian people; viz., that men, although inspired of God, are but fallible, and all their work more or less imperfect. It is the grand truths which inspired men have uttered, together with the Holy Spirit, which are to be our guide, rather than the imperfect manner in which these truths may have been expressed.

IMPERFECT GRAMMAR.

The Book of Mormon is rejected on account of the imperfect language and bad grammar found therein. These critics select such phrases as best suit their purpose, and then hold up the whole thing to ridicule, saying, "Here is your fullness of the gospel." They call our attention to such phrases as "enormity of our numbers," "more history part," "it supposeth me," etc.

Now there is a marked difference between the things recorded and the manner of recording them. The claim made by the Book of Mormon is that the things which were written are true, the manner of writing them imperfect. However, when these phrases which look so bad by themselves are read in their proper connections, what is meant is easily understood, and their use leads to no serious results; so that whether we account for these errors by claiming that the translator was left to express sentiment given, in his own words, or that the bad language is due entirely to the mistakes of the writers, makes no difference so far as the argument

is concerned; for if the things recorded are true, and the objectionable phrases are easily understood, then the claims of the book are not invalidated in the least by the criticisms made. Again, I need hardly remind the careful reader that if a like selection of improper phrases should be made from the Bible, it could be held up to ridicule, and its claims rejected upon the same grounds.

But we are told that the cases are not parallel. The Bible was translated by human wisdom, while it is claimed that the Book of Mormon was translated by inspiration. True, but the argument is this: The Book of Mormon is not what it claims to be, and is unworthy the confidence of intelligent people, because these imperfections are in it. And if this objection is a valid one, then the Bible is not what it claims to be, and is unworthy the confidence of intelligent people, because these imperfections, with some more serious ones, are in *it*. Before our opponents make their claim good, on this point, they must show, (first,) that the imperfections in the Book of Mormon were not found in the record as it left the hands of the Nephites, and that the book, as we now have it, is not a correct translation of what was found on the plates; and, (second,) that all the errors found in the Bible are not due in any degree to the original writers, but are the blunders of copyists and translators. Can they show that such are the facts? Can any one of them show them to be facts? If not, where is the point and force of the criticism?

At this point, we guard against an advantage which might be sought against our position. It is not claimed that the language of the Book of Mormon, as a rule, is equal to that of the Bible; but it is claimed that the Bible contains examples of bad grammar, and that there are other errors in it, which are more serious than any which can be found in the Book of Mormon.

Evidently, the true position is this: If the Book

of Mormon must go down because of bad grammar and error in statement, so must the Bible; and if when this point is urged against the Bible, it is found that it does not invalidate its claims, then clearly it does not invalidate the claims of the Book of Mormon.

Some of our opponents greatly misrepresent us on this point. When they discover that the force of the objection is turned aside, they become wrathful, and seek to take advantage of us by appealing to the supposed ignorance of the masses, and thus place us at a disadvantage before the people. They say:—

When these men see that they cannot defend their own miserable book, they make a thrust at the Bible, and try to destroy it. Seeing they cannot bring the Book of Mormon up to the standard of the Bible, they seek to drag the Bible down to the standard of the Book of Mormon.

Our position is this: If our claims for the Bible are true, they are also defensible. If not defensible, then they are simply traditionary, but not true. We are not making any “thrust at the Bible,” but at the false positions and reasoning of our opponents. If their positions are admitted as true, then the Bible must go down; if ours are admitted, it will stand. We feel strongly disposed to defend that Book of books, even though the Book of Mormon should rise up and stand with it. When we have truth on our side, we do not need to assume certain positions in order to put down infidelity, but opposite ones in order to put down the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saints!

MORONI'S RENT.

In this connection we call attention to a quotation from the Book of Mormon found on page 327, paragraph 8:—

And when Moroni had said these words, he went forth among the people, waving the rent of his garment in the

air, that all might see the writing which he had written upon the rent, etc.

This is what one critic calls "rich." He uses it as a kind of climax for the sake of effect, we suppose. He describes the hole in the garment, the writing made on the hole, the hole being fastened on the pole (nailed on we suppose), and then the waving of it in the air. This breaks the monotony somewhat, and makes lots of fun for the boys. But as this seems to be his stronghold on the bad language of the Book of Mormon, we will stop long enough to see how much there is in it. If this passage affords him no valid support, then his case is a hopeless one. This critic, like many others, seldom stops long enough to investigate a matter when trying to make out his case against the Latter Day Saints; but he plunges along, touching here and there, very much after the style of R. G. Ingersoll in his lecture on "The Gods."

On the preceding page of the Book of Mormon, paragraph 7, we have a plain history of the beginning of this transaction, and it spoils all the fun which this minister makes for the boys. It reads as follows:—

And it came to pass that he rent his coat; and he took a piece thereof, and wrote upon it, In memory of our God, our religion, and freedom, and our peace, our wives, and our children; and he fastened it upon the end of a pole thereof

Here we have it so plain that no one can misunderstand. Moroni tore off a piece of his coat; he wrote upon this piece, fastened this piece to a pole, and in paragraph 8, by an exchange of words, called "metonymy," which figure is in constant use, this piece is called "the rent." This is all there is in it. In "Course of Composition and Rhetoric," by Quackenbos, pages 248 and 249, we have the following statements concerning this figure:—

Metonymy is the exchange of names between things

related. It is founded, not on resemblance, but on the relation of, 1, Cause and effect; as, "They have Moses and the prophets," *i. e.*, their writings.

Now the rent made in the coat, and the piece torn off, are related to each other, not by resemblance, "but on the relation of cause and effect." Thus this leading critic's climax of absurdities falls to the ground as harmless as the drop of a feather. And while he may be thinking about the best way to revise his position, we kindly ask him to reconcile 2 Corinthians 8:1 with the rules of grammar:—

Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia.

REPETITION OF "THEREOF."

The frequent use of the word *thereof* as it occurs in the Book of Mormon, is ridiculed. We call attention to Exodus 25:23, 29:—

Thou shalt also make a table of shittim wood: two cubits shall be the length thereof, and a cubit the breadth thereof, and a cubit and a half the height thereof.

The word occurs three times in one verse.

And thou shalt make the dishes thereof, and spoons thereof, and covers thereof, and bowls thereof, to cover withal: of pure gold shalt thou make them.

Here it occurs four times in one verse!

And if they be ashamed of all that they have done, show them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and all the forms thereof; and all the laws thereof; and write in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them.—Ezekiel 43:11.

Here we have it nine times in one verse!! Can they beat the above passages with any they can find in the Book of Mormon? If not, why do they make this criticism? They come to us with the Bible in their hands as ministers of the gospel, representing

the Church of God, and we are under no obligations to apologize for what the Bible says, nor for how it says it.

HOW INSPIRED.

The prophets and apostles were inspired of God to write and speak; and yet each one had his distinctive style of expression. This seems to plainly indicate that, as a rule, God gave the sentiment,—the ideas,—but these men were left to express these ideas according to their own language, and their own knowledge.

“Horne’s Introduction,” page 515:—

When it is said, that Scripture is divinely inspired, we are not to understand that God suggested every word, or dictated every expression. From the different styles in which the books are written, and from the different manner in which the same events are related and predicted by different authors, it appears that the sacred penmen were permitted to write as their several tempers, understandings, and habits of life, directed; and that the knowledge communicated to them by inspiration on the subject of their writings, was applied in the same manner as any knowledge acquired by ordinary means. Nor is it to be supposed that they were even thus inspired in every fact which they related, or in every precept which they delivered. They were left to the common use of their faculties, and did not, upon every occasion, stand in need of supernatural communication; but whenever, and as far as divine assistance was necessary, it was always afforded.

Also page 521:—

But with respect to the choice of words in which they wrote, I know not but they might be left to the free and rational exercise of their own minds, to express themselves in the manner that was natural and familiar to them, while at the same time they were preserved from error, in the ideas they conveyed. If this were the case, it would sufficiently account for the very observable diversity of style and manner among the inspired writers. The Spirit guided them to write nothing but truth concerning religion, yet they might be left to express that truth in their own lan-

guage.—Quoted by Horne from “Parry’s Inquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Apostles.”

The claim made by the Book of Mormon writers, that they made the record according to their knowledge, and that there are imperfections in it, but that the things recorded are true, is a proper and defensible position, and stands to the credit of those who composed the book.

But we raise a question here: How do these critics account for these errors in language? According to their theory Solomon Spalding wrote the historical part of the Book of Mormon, Sidney Rigdon the doctrinal part. These objectionable phrases and words are nearly all from the historical part of the book, hence Spalding was the man who wrote them. But according to the testimony of Matilda Davison, Spalding’s widow, who was the leading witness in favor of the Spalding tale, “Rev. Solomon Spalding . . . was a graduate of Dartmouth College;” was “an educated man, and passionately fond of history.” Did this man introduce into his work such phrases as “enormity of our numbers,” “more history part,” etc.? If it be said that Rigdon copied and changed the original manuscript, then, we reply; first, Mrs. Davison does not claim that Rigdon had changed her husband’s romance, or added anything to it, except a few “pious expressions;” and, second, if Rigdon introduced into Spalding’s Romance the doctrinal part of the Book of Mormon, and changed the Romance itself, how does it come that Spalding’s old neighbors, including his Brother John, when they heard “copious extracts” “read and repeated” from the Book of Mormon, in 1834, (at least twenty-two years after they had heard the Romance read!) could recognize, at once, the identical work of Solomon Spalding? The statement of Mrs. Davison is that “the historical part was immediately recognized by all the older inhabitants, as the identical work of Mr. Spalding, which had been deeply impressed years

before." In this connection it is necessary for the reader to consider that the doctrinal part of the Book of Mormon constitutes a large portion of the book, and is closely interwoven with the historical matter all the way through the book.

There is, therefore, no escape for those who assume this to be the true origin of the book from the position that the "Rev. Solomon Spalding," "an educated man, and passionately fond of history," who "was a graduate of Dartmouth College," was the man who used in his composition the "egregious grammar" of the Book of Mormon, held up to ridicule by all who write against it.

CHARACTER OF THE ERRORS CLAIMED.

We are told by one of these critics:—

There were five thousand blunders in the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon.

Where is the proof? And when that is forthcoming, let the true character of these blunders be shown. Are they such as to mislead on a single principle of doctrine, or fact of history? In public debate with one of our ministers this same critic was urged to produce some of these errors that they might be examined before the audience. Did he produce ten, five, or even *one* of them? No. When there are so many conceptions without a single birth, some one is certainly an object of pity.

This is a favorite means of attack on the Bible with the infidel, and these men are supposed to know it. The infidel says the Christian admits that there are many thousands of errors in the Bible, therefore it cannot be the word of God. Yes, the errors are there, but the questions are, How did they get there? and are they of such a character as to invalidate the claims of the Bible? We conclude on this point with a quotation from "Companion to the Revised Version

of the New Testament," by Alexander Roberts, D. D., page 1:—

The number of various readings in the New Testament has been differently estimated at different times. Nor could this have been otherwise. Every new manuscript which is discovered increases the amount, and every more accurate examination of already known manuscripts tends to the same result. Hence, while the varieties of readings in the New Testament were reckoned at about 30,000 in the last century, they are generally referred to as amounting to no less than 150,000 at the present day.

CONTRADICTION.

It is claimed that the Book of Mormon contradicts itself in stating, first, that Lehi and his family were commanded of God to leave Jerusalem, and second, that they were driven out by their enemies. Here are the statements of the Book:—

And it came to pass that the Lord commanded my father, even in a dream, that he should take his family and depart into the wilderness.—Page 3, par. 12.

And they have sought to take away the life of my father, insomuch that they have driven him out of the land.—Page 13, par. 6.

When the preceding paragraphs are considered, all is plain, and this supposed contradiction, like many of the same kind in the Bible, is not real. In the first instance, Nephi is giving a history of the teaching and prophesying of his father in Jerusalem. He informs us that the Jews mocked him, became angry at him, and sought to take away his life. (See page 3, paragraphs 9, 10.) And at the very time when Lehi's life was in danger, the Lord spoke to him, and among other things, said:—

Behold they seek to take away thy life.—Par. 11.

Then follows the statement that God commanded Lehi to depart and he went.

In the second instance, we have an account of Laman and Lemuel, and others, rebelling against

Nephi and those who believed his teachings. They wanted to go back to Jerusalem, but Nephi, in attempting to dissuade them from their purpose, tells them of the impending woes that hang over the doomed city, and in describing their wickedness, says:—

And they have sought to take away the life of my father, insomuch that they have driven him out of the land.

Both statements are true. The remote cause, or necessity, of Lehi's departure from the land of Jerusalem was the wickedness of the people. Had he not departed, he would have been slain. The direct cause of his leaving, at the time he did, was the commandment of God.

In Matthew 27: 44, we read, "The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth." But in Luke 23: 39-42, we read that one of the thieves did not "cast the same in his teeth," but confessed him to be the Lord, and asked to be remembered when he should come into his kingdom. Here is a slight discrepancy, while in the other case there is none. Why do not these men urge this, and others which exist, against the Bible?

JOURNEY TO THE RED SEA.

Next, we are gravely told that in three days Lehi and his family traveled from Jerusalem to the Red Sea. "It would," it is said, "require nearly three weeks." As usual, we have bare assertions where proof is needed, and where it would answer the purpose far better if it could only be Lad. What an easy way this is of disposing of such important claims as are set forth in the Book of Mormon! One man rises, gives a reference or two, makes some strong assertions, and then jumps to the next point, and treats it in the same way! That portion of his audience who are so disposed, accept his conclusions as sufficient, without further investigation, and then,

I suppose, feel that they are well prepared to answer to God in the day of judgment! What a mistake!

Let the Book of Mormon speak for itself. On pages 3 and 4, paragraphs 13, 14, we read:—

And it came to pass that he departed into the wilderness. And he left his house, and the land of his inheritance, and his gold, and his silver, and his precious things, and took nothing with him, save it were his family, and provisions, and tents, and departed into the wilderness; and he came down by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea; and he traveled in the wilderness in the borders which are nearer the Red Sea; and he did travel in the wilderness with his family which consisted of my mother Sariah, and my elder brothers, who were Laman, Lemuel, and Sam.

And it came to pass that when he had traveled three days in the wilderness, he pitched his tent in a valley by the side of a river of water. . . . And it came to pass that he called the name of the river Laman, and it emptied into the Red Sea; and the valley was in the borders near the mouth thereof.

One very simple thing is always necessary in the examination of historical statements; viz., to bear in mind that the history was written after the events occurred, and the events are not always recorded in the order in which they occurred. This, as every good critic knows, is frequently the case in the Bible history, and it has been made the occasion of severe criticism by its opponents. However, in the above account there is nothing difficult.

The plain statements are these: They traveled three days in the wilderness, when Lehi pitched his tent in a valley which was by the side of a river, which river emptied into the Red Sea. How far it was from Jerusalem to the wilderness is not stated, nor do our critics inform us. How far the place of encampment was from the Red Sea is not stated, but "the valley," in which they encamped, "was in the borders near the mouth thereof"—the mouth of the river. If it be said, "We have no account of any dis-

tance being traveled by them before the three days' journey," we reply, neither have we any account of their encampment for the night before the one which occurred at the end of three days' travel in the wilderness; and if this was the first, then it is probable that they traveled at nights as well as in the daytime. However, as it is in Bible history, so it is in the Book of Mormon, many things occurred which were not recorded. It is not at all probable that they stepped right out of the capital city into the wilderness.

The Red Sea has two large arms, one of which we now call the Gulf of Suez, the other, the Gulf of Akabah. The latter extends towards Jerusalem, and is about one hundred miles long. The Hebrews called any large body of water a sea, lake, or pool. The Gulf of Suez is frequently referred to as the Red Sea, in the Bible, because it is a part of it. The Gulf of Akabah is also a part of it, and when they came to this gulf, if this was the course of their travel, they came to the Red Sea. It is not over one hundred and sixty miles from Jerusalem to the Gulf of Akabah, and but little more than this to the Gulf of Suez. We will suppose that they traveled twenty-five miles before striking the wilderness, and that they were twenty-five miles from the mouth of the gulf when they encamped. This would leave one hundred and ten miles to be traveled over in three days; *i. e.*, thirty-seven and two thirds miles per day. All this is within the statements of the record, and furnishes no proper data upon which to reject its statements. We have reason to believe that the people were strong, they were lightly laden, and fleeing before their enemies. More than this, God had commanded them to go, and they had just claim upon him for all needed strength.

If it be said they meant the Gulf of Suez when they spoke of the Red Sea, we reply, if they did, then they traveled, it is probable, about one half of the entire distance before striking the wilderness,

which would make the case still worse for the critic.

But just to show how reckless these men become when seeking to make a point against the Book of Mormon, we call attention, once more, to the statement that it would have required fully three weeks to make the journey. Three weeks would give eighteen days for travel. One hundred and sixty divided by eighteen would show eight and eight ninths miles per day. Rather slow for a small company fleeing before their enemies!

FRAUD CLAIMED.

In the Book of Mormon, page 8, paragraph 32, Nephi says that Laban's sword was "of the most precious steel." Here one of our leading critics affects to see fraud. He says,

They knew nothing about steel at that time.

How does he know that the Hebrews knew nothing about steel, six hundred years before Christ? This same criticism was made in the debate with E. L. Kelley at Kirtland, Ohio, in 1884. However, the unanswered reply of Elder Kelley is a sufficient refutation:—

Again, he asserts as an objection to the Book of Mormon, that it speaks of steel and its uses, and that the Jews knew nothing of steel, that it was not known in old Bible times; only mentioned, he says, once, and that in the Book of Job. That should have been enough to remove his objections, but he is keen to find fault, and "a drowning man will catch at straws." In 2 Samuel 22:35, it is stated, "He teacheth my hands to war; so that a bow of steel is broken by my arms." This was only ten hundred and eighteen years before the time of Christ. The same thing occurs in Psalms of David, chapter 18, verse 34, as well as in Job 20:24; and this is said to be the oldest book in the Bible.

My friend does far better with his stories than he does in dealing with things that can be tested right here in this discussion. If he wishes to succeed, he had better go on

telling his yarns, and not undertake to handle edged tools.—Braden-Kelley Debate, p. 127.

AN OLD OBJECTION.

Next, we have the old, old objection. Those who were not of the tribe of Levi offered sacrifices, which, says the critic, they had no right to do. Book of Mormon, page 10, paragraph 46. Why does he not give us the proof texts so as to break this terrible monotony?—Where is the proof that none, outside of the tribe of Levi, under any circumstances whatever, can officiate in the priest's office? Let those who assume this position to be true furnish the proof texts and then we can examine them. Samuel, who was of the tribe of Ephraim, offered a sucking lamb as a burnt offering to God. (1 Samuel 7:9.) David, who was of the tribe of Judah, offered burnt and peace offerings. (2 Samuel 6:18.) Notwithstanding the priesthood rights bestowed upon the tribe of Levi, men of other tribes could officiate in the priest's office, when properly called to do that work.

INFIDEL QUIBBLE.

The Book of Mormon is condemned because it represents God as concerning himself with what they call the trivial affairs of life. It is claimed that God does not do that kind of work. This is an old infidel objection to the Bible. The infidel objects because God tells his people how to build boats; how to build houses; how to make garments; what to eat and what not to eat; what to wear; and, says Mr. Ingersoll, he gave "a recipe for making hair oil." Let these critics fix up their own text book, so it will be clear from this same charge, or let them come out and oppose the Bible, so we will know where to find them.

TOO MUCH DARKNESS.

According to the account given in the Book of Mormon, page 438, paragraphs 3, 4, 5, there was

darkness upon the face of this land for the space of three days, at the time of Christ's crucifixion. "The Bible says the darkness lasted three hours, but the Book of Mormon three days," say our critics. They then proceed to ridicule the description given of the darkness, that it was so great that it could be felt, etc., and some of them conclude the point by saying, "Sidney Rigdon wrote this big tale."

Hold on, gentlemen! Are you not getting things mixed? You have told us all along that Spalding wrote the historical portion of the Book of Mormon, but now, all at once, Sidney Rigdon becomes the historian! Better be a little careful lest you convince all your thoughtful hearers and readers that your theory is but a myth. However, it makes but little difference to us whether you attribute it to Rigdon or Spalding. Just fix it up to suit yourselves. We are not able to say, but it may be the better way, notwithstanding the testimony of your witnesses that the historical part of the Book of Mormon is the identical "Manuscript Found," written by "Rev. Solomon Spalding," when you find a few pages that you think Spalding would not have written, to ascribe them to Rigdon; and when you find that which you think Rigdon would not have written, ascribe it to Spalding. This may be safer than to stick too closely to the witnesses, or to your own stated theory; for who knows but what it may become necessary to attribute the whole thing to Sidney Rigdon, and to do away with the Spalding "Manuscript Found" business altogether? And, if so, this policy would have a tendency to prepare the way, you know.

If Rigdon was the author of this account, and it was written for the sole purpose of deceiving, why did he not make it three hours instead of three days, as it would have been much more likely to deceive when made to harmonize with the Bible account, as to length of time?

The truth is, there is no contradiction. The Bible gives an account of the darkness that prevailed at Jerusalem, the Book of Mormon, of the darkness that prevailed on this continent. Each book gives its own history. Suppose I should say there was a destructive hailstorm in China, on the 4th of July, which lasted three hours, and our wise critics should say "There was a destructive hailstorm in Canada on the 4th of July, which lasted three days," would the two accounts be in conflict with each other? Certainly not.

As to the darkness, which is made the occasion for ridicule and discredit, when we read the account, all is plain. The storm lasted about three hours, "And then behold there was darkness upon the face of the land."

And it came to pass that there was thick darkness upon the face of the land, insomuch that the inhabitants thereof who had not fallen, could feel the vapor of darkness; and there could be no light, because of the darkness; neither candles, neither torches; neither could there be fire kindled with their fine and exceeding dry wood, so that there could not be any light at all; and there was not any light seen, neither fire, nor glimmer, neither the sun, nor the moon, nor the stars, for so great were the mists of darkness which were upon the face of the land.

And it came to pass that it did last for the space of three days, that there was no light seen; and there was great mourning, and howling, and weeping among all the people continually; yea, great were the groanings of the people, because of the darkness and the great destruction that had come upon them.

The historian uses the term *darkness* to designate both the intense vapor which hung over them, and the darkness produced by this vapor. But he does it in such a way as to make his statements plain and consistent. It was the "*vapor* of darkness" which they felt, and it was because of these "mists of darkness which were upon the face of the land," that they could not kindle a fire, and a light would not burn.

RAPID GROWTH IN POPULATION, ETC.

Now we are told that,

In less than sixty years they [the Nephites] became two great nations, had vast armies, on both sides, and many wars.

Where is the proof? The statement is not only destitute of proof, but it is false. There is nothing said in the Book of Mormon about vast armies on both sides, or about two great nations, within sixty years after they left Jerusalem. Will this critic give the proof or correct the statement?

The Nephites and Lamanites were divided in less than thirty years after they left Jerusalem. (Book of Mormon, page 63, paragraph 2; page 65, paragraph 5.) The first mention of wars and contentions is found on page 66, paragraph 6:—

And it sufficeth me to say that forty years had passed away, and we had already had wars and contentions with our brethren.

What was the character of these wars is not stated, but there is no account of bloodshed up to this date. In James 4:1, we read:—

From whence come wars and fightings among you?

And James was writing to the church.

The first mention of armies, not "great armies," is found on page 130, paragraph 7; page 131, paragraph 8:—

And they sought by the power of their arms to destroy us continually; wherefore, the people of Nephi did fortify against them with their armies, and with all their might, trusting in the God and rock of their salvation; wherefore, they became as yet, conquerors of their enemies.

And it came to pass that I, Jacob, began to be old, etc.

Jacob was born in the wilderness after they left Jerusalem, and it is fair to assume that he was not less than eighty years old, at this time, when he

delivered up the plates to his Son Enos. Paragraph 9 contains the following statement:—

And I, Jacob, saw that I must soon go down to my grave; wherefore, I said to my son Enos, Take these plates.

So, it was probably more than eighty years, instead of less than sixty, before armies are even mentioned. But the supposed strong point in this criticism is not original with our later critics. It has been relied upon by many others. The claim is that they became so numerous in so short a time that the statements of the Book of Mormon are not reliable; but whether it was Spalding or Rigdon who wrote "this big tale," our critics do not say.

Let us examine the account a little more closely. Ishmael with his wife, two sons, and five daughters, came with them. The entire household came, which may have included, as it often did, a number of servants. (Book of Mormon page 12.) His two sons had families. Ishmael was evidently old, as he soon died in the wilderness; therefore, it is probable that his two sons had passed middle age and had large families. Lehi had five sons, two of whom were born in the wilderness, soon after he left Jerusalem. Then we have Zoram, and perhaps a number of others not mentioned.

We have then, Lehi and wife, with their two sons, Jacob and Joseph, 4; Laman, Lemuel, Nephi, and Sam, the elder sons of Lehi, with their wives, 8; Zoram and his wife, 2; Ishmael and his wife, 2. (Lehi's sons and Zoram married the daughters of Ishmael.) Ishmael's two sons with their families, perhaps not less than twelve in each family, twenty-four. It is fair to add at least three for persons who have not been named, which would give us, in all, forty-three. But as Jacob and Joseph were born in the wilderness soon after Lehi left Jerusalem, we will call the number of the little colony forty-one.

Mr. Morris, in "Present Conflict of Science with

the Christian Religion, or Modern Skepticism Met on its Own Ground" page 555, cites Malthus as authority for the statement that,

In ordinary circumstances, a population tends to double every twenty-five years.

If this be true, it is fair to assume that the Nephites, under the circumstances which they were placed, would double at least every twenty years. This would give us at the end of the first twenty years a population of 82; at the end of forty years, 164; sixty years, 328; eighty years, the probable time of Jacob's death, and the time when armies are first mentioned, 656. We will suppose that two thirds of this number were Nephites, the other third Lamanites. This would bring the Nephite population at 437.

One of the Hebrew words from which we get the word army is *gedud* which literally means "troop." It is applied to a small or large number of soldiers. Jacob evidently used the term *army*, or its equivalent in their language, to mean "a small body of soldiers," which, by the way, is one of the definitions of troop.

Thus we see that there is nothing incredible, or inconsistent, in the account referred to by our critics.

Mr. Morris devotes about twelve pages of his book to an examination of a similar objection to the Bible. We herewith present the objection as he presents it to the reader:—

"And the children of Israel gat them up and departed out of Egypt, about 600,000 men beside children, and a mixed multitude went up also with them, and flocks and herds, even very much cattle." Such, in brief, is the record of the Hebrews' sojourn in the land of Egypt.

This account is held to involve a serious difficulty, and which has been vehemently urged by the enemies of the Bible as an argument against its credibility. This difficulty lies in their vast and extraordinary multiplication during their stay in Goshen; and the objection based upon it is usually put something after this manner:—

“We are told that the family of Jacob, numbering in all seventy souls, went down into Egypt and dwelt there; and that after a period which could not have exceeded 215 years, their descendants numbered more than 600,000 males, 20 years old and upward; and these, according to the usual ratio, represent an aggregate population of nearly two and a half millions of both sexes and all ages. Such an increase has never been known, and is at variance with the established laws of physiology. The Bible history of this people, therefore, is incredible, and must be rejected.”—“Present Conflict,” pages 549, 550.

By comparing the above with the manner in which our opponents put their objections against the Book of Mormon, we may easily see how closely they pattern after their infidel opponents (?); and yet the people pay them well for lecturing against infidelity! How can we evade the conclusion that such critics have learned from their infidel opponents the best methods of attacking the Book of Mormon?

DARK COLOR OF LAMANITES.

Referring to the Lamanites, whose skins became dark, and who became a savage and loathsome people, we are told that when they were converted they became beautiful and fair, *all at once*. The strongest account we have of this in the Book of Mormon is found on page 424, paragraph 9:—

And it came to pass that those Lamanites who had united with the Nephites, were numbered among the Nephites: and their curse was taken from them, and their skin became white like unto the Nephites; and their young men and their daughters became exceeding fair, and they were numbered among the Nephites, and were called Nephites.

This account does not state whether the change was immediate as claimed by some of our critics, or whether it was the work of more or less time. The history was written after the event occurred, and, for aught we know, it may have been years before the desirable change was fully effected. However,

this much we do know, that the book states that the curse was placed upon them because of their rejection of truth and light; and it was certainly within the province and power of God to remove the curse when they became obedient to the gospel; nor would such a manifestation of power be contrary to any portion of his word.

MODERN WORDS USED IN THE TRANSLATION.

These critics say that according to the Book of Mormon, Alpha and Omega, the first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, were used five hundred years before the invention of the Greek alphabet. What right have they to assume that these words were transferred, and not translated, from the Nephite language? Alpha and Omega have been incorporated with the English language, because of the manner in which they are used in the Bible. They are evidently translations of words which had a similar meaning in the Nephite language. If our critics desire to make a fair criticism on the Book of Mormon, why do they not undertake to show that the translator could not use these terms in translating the Nephite language, because the Nephites knew nothing of the Greek language?

ANTI-POLYGAMY.

These words are quoted:—

Wherefore, this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes. For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people: otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things.—Book of Mormon, p. 116, par. 6.

“Here,” says our critic, “was a door left open for the introduction of polygamy.”

It is but fair to state that this criticism is not indorsed by all who oppose the Book of Mormon. Numbers of other critics, who were not of our faith,

have read the Book of Mormon, and after reading it, have frankly stated that so far as that book is concerned, there is nothing in it that can be justly construed as either authorizing or permitting the practice of polygamy; but this opponent, and the polygamous Mormons of Utah, see in it an open door through which polygamy may step in without conflicting with the teachings of the book. The only possible show for this inference is found in the words:—

Otherwise, they shall hearken unto these things.

What things? If it be said the things which are written concerning David and Solomon; *i. e.*, that they had many wives and concubines, of which we read in the same paragraph, then, we reply, in the same paragraph we also read the sweeping commandment, of unlimited application, which forbids both the practice of polygamy and concubinage. Here it is:—

For there shall not any man among you have save it be one wife: and concubines he shall have none.

And the reason given for this commandment is:—

For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me; thus saith the Lord of hosts.

It would be difficult to find a more sweeping prohibition of polygamy and concubinage than the one couched in the above language. Now, we ask, By what rule of interpretation do these most bitter opposers place a doubtful and farfetched inference against a positive command, found in the same paragraph? Would they allow an infidel opponent to interpret the Bible in this way? If they would, then that opponent would show that the Bible sanctions polygamy, slavery, adultery, and many other things which all good people condemn.

In close connection with the positive commandment of this paragraph we find the following:—

Behold, David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord, wherefore, thus saith the Lord, I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem, by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a righteous branch from the fruit of the loins of Joseph.

This puts the matter in good shape. The people had been excusing themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David, and Solomon his son; but Jacob, having received "his errand from the Lord," presents to them the word of God on this subject, showing that the practices of David and Solomon in having many wives and concubines, is abominable before him. Then, to show what would be the results of a failure to keep his commandments, God adds these strong words:—

Wherefore, this people shall keep my commandments, saith the Lord of hosts, or cursed be the land for their sakes.

"These things" evidently refer to the commandments prohibiting polygamy and concubinage, with the instruction connected herewith, such as:—

For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women. And whoredoms are an abomination before me.

The word "otherwise" makes the prohibiting commandment still more sweeping and emphatic. God had, by his arm of power, led the people out from the land of Jerusalem, having important and special purposes in view; but he gives us to understand that "otherwise ["in a different manner; by other causes; in other respects"], they shall hearken unto these things."

On page 117, paragraph 9, Jacob informs us that the commandment referred to was given to their fathers. He says:—

Behold, the Lamanites, your brethren, whom ye hate, because of their filthiness and the cursings which hath come upon their skins, are more righteous than you: for

they have not forgotten the commandment of the Lord, which was given to our fathers, that they should have save it be one wife; and concubines they should have none; and there should not be whoredoms committed among them. And now this commandment they observe to keep.

The Book of Mormon, on this point, is in harmony with God and his word.

For if I will, saith the Lord of hosts, raise up seed unto me, I will command my people.

In harmony with this, he commanded Adam, Noah, Jesus, and Paul, Lehi, and Joseph Smith. Through the last named, he said to the Latter Day Saints, in February, 1831.

Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else"—Doctrine and Covenants 42:7.

In March of the same year, he said:—

And again, I say unto you, that whoso forbiddeth to marry, is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man; wherefore it is lawful that he should have one wife, and they twain shall be one flesh, and all this that the earth might answer the end of its creation.—Doctrine and Covenants, 49:3.

There is no door left open for the introduction of polygamy in the Book of Mormon, nor in the Doctrine and Covenants.

SPECIAL CRITICISM ANSWERED.

As an objection to the Book of Mormon a reference is given, and this statement made:—

A man begins to get old when his father was one hundred and eighty years old.

Now just see what our critics will do in their unholy warfare! The account reads as follows:—

And it came to pass that I began to be old, and an hundred and seventy and nine years had passed away from the time that our father Lehi left Jerusalem.—Book of Mormon, p. 133, par. 7.

The above statements were made by Enos, the son of Jacob. One year is added on to make it sound better, we suppose, but this is not the worst mistake. There is no evidence that Jacob, the father of Enos, was yet living, but it is plainly implied that he died soon after he delivered up the plates to his Son Enos. On page 131, paragraphs 8 and 9, we have the following:—

And it came to pass that I, Jacob, began to be old. . . . And I, Jacob, saw that I must soon go down to my grave; wherefore, I said unto my son Enos, Take these plates.

On the same page, paragraph 1, we have the opening words of Enos, which also imply that Jacob was dead:—

Behold, it came to pass that I, Enos, knowing my father, that he was a just man: for he taught me in his language, and also in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

Jacob “began to be old,” and saw that he must soon go down to his grave, at the time he delivered up the plates, and it is probable that he died before Enos wrote a word on the plates.

A short time ago, we noticed the statement that, “in less than sixty years they [the Nephite colony] became two great nations, had vast armies on both sides and many wars.” Well, it was at this very time, when Jacob “began to be old,” that the word “armies” is first mentioned, though nothing is said about large armies nor about two great nations. And if Jacob, the father of Enos, was at that time one hundred and eighty years old, as stated by the critic, then instead of it being less than sixty years after Lehi left Jerusalem, it was three times sixty, that is one hundred and eighty! Now, we ask, which one of these positions will the critic stand by? and which one will he throw away?

CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD.

A statement from the Book of Mormon page 147, paragraph 6, is quoted:—

Blood cometh from every pore.

“The Nephites,” it is said, “understood the circulation of the blood one thousand years before the world knew anything about it.” We reply, the Book of Mormon gives its own history, and for aught we know, the Nephites may have understood the circulation of the blood. Let our critics prove that that history is false if they can. However, we are by no means compelled to admit that they understood the circulation of the blood in order to account for the above passage. The words are a portion of a prophecy of King Benjamin, concerning the suffering of Christ, made about one hundred and twenty-four years before Christ came in the flesh. Hence, the sentiment, if not the exact words, was given by the Holy Spirit. The prophets often spoke that which was far beyond their natural or human understanding. Benjamin may therefore have used the objectionable words without understanding the circulation of the blood as we now understand it.

TOO RAPID, AGAIN.

Our attention is called to a passage in the Book of Mormon, page 317, paragraph 2. It is not read or quoted, but this statement is made:—

From twenty-four women, in sixty odd years, we have a great nation. They are as numerous as the Nephites.

We give the reader the advantage of the full statement:—

And the people of Ammon did give unto the Nephites a large portion of their substance, to support their armies; and thus the Nephites were compelled, alone, to withstand against the Lamanites, who were a compound of Laman and Lemuel, and the sons of Ishmael, and all those who had dissented from the Nephites, who were Amalekites,

and Zoramites, and the descendants of the priests of Noah. Now those descendants were as numerous, nearly, as were the Nephites; and thus the Nephites were obliged to contend with their brethren, even unto bloodshed.

The other part of the statement necessary to an understanding of this point, is found on page 181, paragraph 17, where we read that the wicked priests of King Noah, stole "twenty and four of the daughters of the Lamanites" and carried them into the wilderness. From these two statements the critic gets his material for the assertions made.

We notice; First, that it is the old objection over again; viz., they became too numerous in too short a time; and, like the infidel who brings this and other objections against the Bible, our critics presume, in their criticism, that a complete record was made of all that occurred, which is very far from being true, both as to the Bible and the Book of Mormon. The record was necessarily brief, at the first, and it was afterwards abridged by Mormon and Moroni. Second, these priests of King Noah did not become a great nation, but joined themselves to the nation of the Lamanites. Nor is it said they became as numerous as the Nephites, but nearly as numerous. Third, the number of these priests of Noah is not given; but from the reading on pages 163, 164, paragraphs 1 to 5, we learn that King Noah and his priests were very wicked men. They had many wives and concubines, lived riotously, taxed the people "one fifth part of all they possessed." The number may have been several hundred for aught we know. Fourth, the Nephite force was greatly reduced by dissensions. Fifth, it is probable that the wives and children of the priests, who were numerous, also joined the Lamanites, and were numbered with the priests.

From the above considerations it will be seen that the statement that the descendants of the priests of Noah "were as numerous, nearly, as were the Nephites," is not incredible; but it is possible, if not

probable, that the whole difficulty was caused by a typographical error in the word "descendants," and that it should be dissenters, making it to read as follows:—

Now those *dissenters* were as numerous, nearly, as were the Nephites.

The word "those" being used instead of the word "these," favors this construction, as it seems to refer back to the statement,

And all those who had dissented from the Nephites, who were Amalekites, and Zoramites, and the descendants of the priests of Noah.

PLACE OF CHRIST'S NATIVITY.

Our critics claim that the Book of Mormon conflicts with the Bible in stating that Jesus was to be born at Jerusalem. "The Bible," they affirm, "says he was born in Bethlehem." Why do not these men furnish the statement in full, and not stop at a comma in the middle of the statement which defines where Jesus was to be born? The statement reads as follows:—

And behold, he shall be born of Mary at Jerusalem, which is the land of our forefathers.—Book of Mormon, p. 223, par. 2.

The clause, "which is the land of our forefathers," designates the place meant by the phrase, "at Jerusalem," showing that the prophet had particular reference to the land of Jerusalem. The prophet stood upon this continent while Jerusalem is on the Eastern Continent, hence the distance was great and the word "at" was not out of place. Bethlehem is situated only five miles south of Jerusalem. Webster says of the word "at,"

In general it denotes nearness of presence, as at the ninth hour, at the house; but it is less definite than in or on; at the house may be in or near the house.

In harmony with this definition, "at Jerusalem,"

may be in or near Jerusalem; and certainly, for one speaking upon this land, five miles should be considered near the city. The Book of Mormon is right; he was born "at Jerusalem, which is the land of our forefathers." The Bible is right, he was born in Bethlehem of Judea, which is only five miles south of Jerusalem.

JESUS THE GOD OF ISRAEL.

"We are told," it is said, "that Jesus is the very eternal Father. Proof?" Where do they expect us to get the proof? If we bring it from the Bible, we are gravely told that that is no proof at all, as wicked men can speak and write the truth, according to the Scriptures, as well as righteous ones. Why do these critics appeal to the Bible when they think it is on their side, if it is no proof for us when on our side? What right have they to do this? And when it comes to a question of doctrine, like the one we are considering, if it is not to be settled by the Bible, by what authority is it to be settled? Will these gentlemen please explain?

The Bible teaches that Jesus is our Creator; that by him, through him, and for him, were all things created. (John 1: 10; Colossians 1: 16.) He is frequently called God in the New Testament; and that he is called the Son of God, all are aware. He is also called by Isaiah the prophet, "The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."—Isaiah 9: 6.

The Book of Mormon teaches that Jesus is our Creator; that by him, through him, and for him, were all things created. It calls him God, the Son of God, and the "very eternal Father," or "the eternal God." Where is the conflict?

These critics ask for "proof." When they come before the people affirming the Book of Mormon is a fraud, and is entirely of human origin, it is their

business to furnish the evidence to sustain their claims.

BLOOD OF CHRIST.

Objection is made to the Book of Mormon, because, as they say, it teaches, that the swords of the converted Lamanites were cleansed by the blood of Christ. Why do these men who profess to be honest, pass over so many points without either quoting or reading from the very book which is on trial? Why not let the book speak for itself?

Here are the facts in the case. Many of the Lamanites had been converted and they refused to take up arms, any more, against their brethren, the Nephites. Their king, Lamoni, delivers an address to his brethren who had been converted, presenting his views. Now, suppose these gentlemen could show some of these views to be erroneous, would that make the history false? Certainly not. Because Simon wanted to purchase the gift of God with money, after he had been baptized, it does not prove that the Acts of the Apostles, ascribed to Luke as the historian, is a fraud. (Acts chapter 8.)

But let us see how much there is in the criticism:—

Now my best beloved brethren, since God hath taken away our stains, and our swords have become bright, then let us stain our swords no more with the blood of our brethren. Behold, I say unto you, Nay, let us retain our swords, that they be not stained with the blood of our brethren: for perhaps if we should stain our swords again, they can no more be washed bright through the blood of the Son of our great God, which shall be shed for the atonement of our sins.—Book of Mormon, page 271, par. 6.

From the above language, which is but a short extract from the king's speech, we learn; first, that he understood that they were saved and made pure through the atonement of the Son of God; and, second, that when he speaks of their swords being "washed bright through the blood of the Son," he

uses figurative language which is easily understood and not at all improper. It is no more improper for swords to be "stained" by crime, and "washed bright through the blood of the Son of our great God," than it is for individuals to defile their garments through sin, and make them pure and white through obedience to the gospel.

Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white.—Rev. 3: 4.

And he said unto me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.—Rev. 7: 14.

We cannot think that these clergymen supposed there was anything in this objection, for such a supposition on their part, would compel us to believe them to be almost grossly ignorant. The probable truth is that they have catered to the supposed ignorance of a certain class of hearers and readers in order to appear to make a point against the Book of Mormon. However, such an effort places a man very low as a critic, and indicates that his case is a bad one.

In order, it would seem, to create a difficulty where there is none, one critic says:—

I do not know why they buried their weapons of peace.

If he had read a portion of paragraph 7, on same page, he might easily have found out. It reads as follows:—

And now it came to pass that when the king had made an end of these sayings, and all the people were assembled together, they took their swords, and all the weapons which were used for the shedding of man's blood, and they did bury them up deep in the earth; and this they did, it being in their view a testimony to God, and also to men, that they never would use weapons again for the shedding of man's blood.

OBJECTIONS TO THE
GREAT CONVERSIONS.

Reference is made to page 478, and the following statement made:—

Millions were converted, but in the next paragraph they are all turned into Lamanites again.

Here our critic represents this wholesale conversion as though it was accomplished in a few minutes of time; and then, in the next few minutes, they were all turned into Lamanites again! Let us read the account:—

And it came to pass in the thirty and sixth year, the people were all converted unto the Lord, upon all the face of the land, both Nephites and Lamanites, and there were no contentions or disputations among them, and every man did deal justly one with another.—Par. 2.

And it came to pass that Nephi, he that kept this last record, (and he kept it upon the plates of Nephi,) died, and his son Amos kept it in his stead; and he kept it upon the plates of Nephi also; and he kept it eighty and four years, and there was still peace in the land, save it were a small part of the people who had revolted from the church, and took upon them the name of Lamanites; therefore there began to be Lamanites again in the land.—Page 479, par. 6.

From the closing part of paragraph 5, we learn that a hundred and ten years had passed away before Nephi died. Amos, who succeeded Nephi, kept the record eighty-four years, which brings us to A. D. 194. They were all converted in A. D. 36, so the time which intervened was one hundred and fifty-eight years! At the expiration of this time they did not all turn into Lamanites again, as falsely stated, but “a small part of the people revolted from the church,” and “there began to be Lamanites again in the land.” This last account is not in the next paragraph, as our critic has stated. The statement of their conversion is in paragraph 2; that of the small dissension which occurred, in paragraph 6. These

five paragraphs cover a period of one hundred and fifty-eight years.

Such work as this opens the eyes of those who wish to see men and things as they are, and they are no longer at a loss to understand why such men can so readily denounce their opponents as "liars" and "cowards;" "for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh."—Matthew 12: 34.

Now we have a citation to the Book of Mormon, page 494, paragraph 1, but it is found best to neither read nor repeat the passage. The Book of Mormon is a terrible thing—just horrible to think about—but it suits some of its opposers much better, a great deal of the time, to tell how it reads than it does to read it. Why does it? Who is it that is seeking to deceive the people, those who are constantly calling attention to the Bible as the leading standard of authority, and trying the statements of all other books claiming to contain revelations from God by this standard (allowing them to speak for themselves), or those who tell us that this question cannot be settled by the Bible; and when condemning the Book of Mormon and Doctrine and Covenants studiously prevent these books from fully and fairly speaking for themselves?

PLATES FILLED.

After naming the page, our critics say:—

The plates were full. No more room. What did he write on?

The record does not say the plates were full. Let us read it:—

Behold my father hath made this record, and he hath written the intent thereof. And behold, I would write it also if I had room upon the plates; but I have not; and ore I have none, for I am alone.

Mormon had written the "intent," or purpose of the record. Moroni desired to write also, but there

was not room enough upon the plates, so he contented himself with adding such items of history and doctrine as were necessary before hiding up the record. He filled up the plates which he had, but there was not room on these plates for these additional items of history and doctrine, and also a statement of the purpose or design of the record, such as he wished to write.

THE WORD "JEW."

Now our attention is suddenly called to another great blunder (?) of the Book of Mormon, viz., the word "Jew" used before the return from Babylonish captivity. This objection was fairly met and shown to be foundationless, by Elder E. L. Kelley, in the Kirtland debate in 1884, and yet this critic continues to urge it when there is no opponent present who is at liberty to speak. Elder Kelley met the objection in the following manner:—

As I examine these objections it becomes more and more apparent that Brother Braden has not made any criticism on the Book of Mormon yet that will stand the test of examination; neither will he. That you may see how much his assertions are worth, just note the fact that he said on the last evening of the discussion, that the word "Jew" was not known to Bible writers until after the Jewish captivity. In 2 Kings 16:6, the King of "Syria drove the Jews from Elath." This was about seven hundred and forty-two before Christ, and one hundred and twenty years before the Jewish captivity. The word "Jew" is found in Jeremiah 34:9, five hundred and ninety years before Christ, and long before the return of the Jews from their captivity. The word was in use seven hundred and ten years before Christ, in the time of Hezekiah, King of Judah (2 Chronicles 32: 18.) It was applied to all Israelites five hundred and eighty years before Christ, Daniel 8:12 [3:8].—Braden and Kelley Debate, pages 126, 127.

By reference to what is said of the use of the word "Jew," as found on the one hundred and eighth page of the Braden and Kelley Debate, it is evident

that after Elder Kelley's reply on this point, his opponent severely revised his statements before allowing them to go into print; and even then, his weakness on this point is clearly apparent.

THE HOLY SPIRIT GIVEN BEFORE CHRIST CAME
IN THE FLESH.

Objection is made to the Book of Mormon because it states that before Christ came in the flesh the Holy Spirit was given; that Lehi preached the atonement six hundred years before Christ; that they had a church or churches among them.

The above objections may be fairly stated in this form: The Book of Mormon teaches that the gospel is the only plan by which man can be saved, and that it was preached, and obeyed, and was efficacious unto all who properly received it from the time that man became an alien to God. Why did not this critic undertake to show that this claim is contrary to the teaching of the Bible? He has simply and only compared the teaching of the Book of Mormon on these points with the dogma of the church which he represents, thus virtually asking the people to take it for granted that his church is right, and, per consequence, all that is in conflict with his church is wrong. We must remind our critic that what the Disciple or Christian Church believes and teaches is not the standard in this controversy. Its representatives are at liberty to believe and teach what they think to be right, as are all others, but when it comes to controversy of this kind, the Bible should be the standard. If the Book of Mormon is in harmony with the Bible, we cannot consistently reject it because that upon some points its teachings are plainer and more complete. The question is, Does the Bible teach that for more than four thousand years the world was without the gospel? Peter says, speaking of Christ,

Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved.—Acts 4:12.

Jesus said,

I am the way, the truth and the life: no man cometh unto the Father but by me.—John 14:6.

Whoever, therefore, was saved before Christ came in the flesh, was saved by and through him. Christ “is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe.” (1 Timothy 4:10.) He tasted “death for every man.” (Hebrews 2:9.) It must be, therefore, that the atonement of Christ reaches back to Adam and forward to the last man who shall live on the earth, and who shall need salvation. In Revelation 13:8, Christ is called “The Lamb slain from the foundation of the world;” and in Hebrews 13:8, we have the significant statement, “Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.” He was, is, and will be, the same Redeemer and Savior to all who believe on his name. No other view places God before the people in his true character—the God of justice, love, wisdom, power, impartiality, unchangeableness, of whom we read in the Bible.

Whoever is saved by Jesus Christ is saved by the gospel. There is no Christ without the gospel, and no gospel without Christ. Hence when the apostles and ministers preached Christ to the people, anciently, they also presented to them the principles of the gospel. (1 Cor. 2:3, 5; 1:17; Acts 16:30, 33; 10:47, 48; 9:18, with 22:16; 19:1, 6; 8:5, 6, 12, 13, 35, 36.) If, therefore, Jesus Christ was a Savior to the people before he died on the cross as well as afterwards, he was a Savior through the gospel plan, and that is the only plan which has been given of God for the salvation of the human family. Paul was right:—

But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.—Galatians 1:8.

John was right:—

Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.— 2 John 9.

This “whosoever” makes it apply to everybody, in all time and establishes the gospel plan as the only means by which we can come to God:—

Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever.

In Genesis 14: 18-20, we read:—

And Melchisedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God.

He blessed Abraham, and Abraham “gave him tithes of all.” In Galatians 3: 8, we read that the gospel was preached unto Abraham, “saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” Did Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob partake of this blessing and receive salvation? If so, by whom? and through what means? Jesus said:—

Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven.—Matt. 8: 11.

In Hebrews 4: 2, we read that the gospel was preached unto the children of Israel in the wilderness.

From Hebrews 11: 25, 26, we learn that Moses made a wise choice:—

Choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.

Paul says this of the children of Israel who “passed through the sea”:—

And did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.—1 Cor. 10: 4.

Surely these ancient worthies knew something of Christ and the gospel.

Concerning the bestowment of the Holy Spirit before Christ came in the flesh, it is only necessary to say that it is the result of obedience to Christ or the gospel, and hence belongs to the people of God in all ages. We read in Numbers 11: 24, 29, that the Spirit rested upon the seventy elders:—

And it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them, they prophesied, and did not cease.

Eldad and Medad remained in the camp, and the Spirit rested upon them, “and they prophesied in the camp.” When Moses was informed what was going on, he did not say, “We must stop this, for it is about fifteen hundred years too soon for the bestowment of the Spirit,” but he talked in harmony with what is written in the Book of Mormon:—

Would God that all the Lord’s people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them.

How will this critic fix this up so it will harmonize with his theology? Peter, when referring to the prophets, says:—

But holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.—2 Peter 1: 21.

He also says that the “Spirit of Christ” was in these prophets, “when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow.” (1 Peter 1: 11.) In the face of these declarations of Scripture, and many more similar ones, this critic rejects the Book of Mormon, because those of whom it speaks preached the atonement, spoke of “the suffering of Christ, and the glory that should follow,” enjoyed the Holy Spirit, etc., before Christ came in the flesh! The fact that the Holy Spirit was not given, as an abiding Comforter, while Christ was with his people, is not proper grounds for believing that none could receive that Spirit before he came in the flesh.

Ekkllesia is the Greek word from which we get "church," and it literally means "that which is called out." Wherever and whenever, therefore, God had a people who truly believed in him, and who were called out of the world to his special service, they constituted his church. The church is the place provided of God for such as shall be saved:—

And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.—Acts 2: 47.

Moses was in the church in the wilderness. (Acts 7: 38.)

We find, then, that the statements of the Book of Mormon concerning the antiquity of the gospel, the bestowment of the Holy Spirit, and the existence of the church, before the day of Pentecost, are in harmony with what is written in the Bible; and right here we are willing to leave it.

THE BARGES OF THE BROTHER OF JARED.

Nearly all our critics refer to the barges that were built by the brother of Jared and his brethren, —Book of Mormon pages 504, 505,—ridicule the whole thing, and pass on to the next point. Who could not do as well as this if he was so disposed? They say:—

Now the Lord turned into a ship carpenter, etc.

Did he not turn into a ship carpenter about two hundred years before this time, when he commanded Noah to build an ark, giving him the dimensions, style, etc., and telling him, as a kind of finishing touch, we suppose, to "pitch it within and without with pitch" (Gen. 6: 13, 16)? We suppose the Lord having not forgotten the business of shipbuilding within these two hundred years, was able to tell the brother of Jared how to build the eight barges. Why not?

But they would like to know the length of these barges as the book says they were "the length of a

tree." We reply, the length of the trees out of which the barges were built is not given, but that fact does not invalidate the credibility of the record. The obvious purpose of the statement is to show that they were not governed by any definite measurements as to the length of the barges, but by the length of the trees out of which they proposed to build.

A great deal of sport and ridicule is made out of the purported statements of the Lord to Jared concerning the means of obtaining light and air in the barges, and especially the provision for a hole in the bottom of each barge. Our opponents can easily believe that Jonah lived "in the whale's belly" for "three days and three nights," and then was thrown up on the shore so that he could go and perform his mission, because it is in the Bible, you know. They can believe that Samson tore the lion to pieces with his hands, when it roared at him, and that the next time he passed that way the carcass had become a beehive; they can believe that Samson caught three hundred foxes,

And took firebrands, and turned tail to tail, and put a firebrand in the midst between two tails. And when he had set the brands on fire, he let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks, and also the standing corn, with the vineyards and olives.

They can believe that Samson withstood the Philistines, singly and alone, smiting them "hip and thigh with a great slaughter;" that the "two new cords" with which they bound him were nothing more than the weakest wrapping twine would be to us, and after snapping the cords, he grabbed hold of the jaw bone of an ass, and with it slew one thousand men! All this, and much more of the same kind must not be subjected to criticism at all, when found in the Bible, but when we find the marvelous or even that which seems to border on the marvelous in the Book of Mormon, the book must be laid to one side at once.

The placing of a hole in the bottom of each barge was not in conflict with the art of shipbuilding; and had our critics learned a little more about it, they might have spared themselves the trouble of a great deal of ridicule.

CHARGE OF PLAGIARISM.

Next we have a partial quotation from the Book of Mormon, page 54, and the statement that it was "borrowed from Shakespeare." Lehi, speaking of his death, to his sons, said:—

Awake! and rise from the dust, and hear the words of a trembling parent, whose limbs ye must soon lay down in the cold and silent grave, from whence no traveler can return; a few more days, and I go the way of all the earth.

The statement of Shakespeare is this:—

The undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns.

By a careful comparison it will be seen that both the wording and sentiment are somewhat different. Lehi is speaking of the body and grave at death; Shakespeare evidently refers to the spirit and the world of spirits. Lehi says, "The cold and silent grave, from whence no traveler can return;" Shakespeare, "The undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

Is this partial agreement of wording and sentiment between Shakespeare and the Book of Mormon good grounds for the charge of fraud against the latter? To affirm that it is, is tantamount to saying that Lehi, living six hundred years before Christ, could not possibly have given expression to the same thought, using part of the same words as are expressed and used in Shakespeare's Hamlet, which is absurd. Let it be shown that this statement is borrowed from Shakespeare if it can be done; as yet, we have nothing more than an immodest expression

of opinion on this point, and we refuse to have the matter settled in that way.

In this connection it is well to notice that the leading claim of infidel authors is that Christianity is of human and heathen origin and is unworthy the confidence of intelligent people. Kersey Graves, in his "Sixteen Crucified Saviors; or Christianity before Christ," devotes nearly eight pages of his work to an "address to the clergy," in which he claims that they are left without excuse for believing and teaching that Christianity is of divine origin. Whoever will take the pains to read his work, and other similar ones, will discover that he makes a better showing than our critics do in their attacks on the Book of Mormon and the Doctrine and Covenants; but, at the same time, his methods in treating the subject, and his manner in drawing conclusions, are superficial, unfair, and unreliable. He presents twenty distinct reasons which he claims are fatal to the claims made by the Christian ministry for the religion of Jesus Christ, and without doubt they are considered all-sufficient by those who are already inclined to reject the claims and teachings of the Bible. And it is noticeable that these infidel writers nearly always assume an air of importance, and they plainly give their readers to understand that their opponents must give up their religion, at once, or manifest to the world that they are superstitious and ignorant, or willingly corrupt. Listen to a few of the statements of Mr. Graves:—

Friends and brethren—teachers of the Christian faith: Will you believe us when we tell you that the divine claims of your religion are gone—all swept away by the "logic of history," and nullified by the demonstrations of science? The recently opened fountains of historic lore, many of whose potent facts will be found interspersed through the pages of this work, sweep away the last inch of ground on which can be predicated the least show for either the divine origin of the Christian religion, or the divinity of Jesus

Christ. For these facts demonstrate beyond all cavil and criticism, and with a logical force which can leave not the vestige of a doubt upon any unbiased mind, that all its doctrines are an outgrowth from older heathen systems.—Page 19.

You must abandon such exalted claims for your religion, or posterity will mark you as being “blind leaders of the blind.” They will heap upon your honored names their unmitigated ridicule and condemnation. They will charge you as being either deplorably ignorant, or disloyal to the cause of truth. And shame and ignominy will be your portion. The following propositions (fatal to your claims for Christianity) are established beyond confutation by the historical facts cited in this work, viz.:—

1. There were many cases of the miraculous birth of Gods reported in history before the case of Jesus Christ.

2. Also many other cases of Gods being born of virgin mothers.

3. Many of these Gods, like Christ, were (reputedly) born on the 25th of December.

4. Their advent into the world, like that of Jesus Christ, is in many cases claimed to have been foretold by “inspired prophets.”

5. Stars figured at the birth of several of them, as in the case of Christ.

6. Also angels, shepherds, and magi, or “wise men.”

7. Many of them, like Christ, were claimed to be of royal or princely descent.

Mr. Graves continues in this strain, affirming that the lives of many of these Saviors were threatened in infancy; that some gave early proof of divinity; they retired from the world and fasted; like Christ, they declared, “my kingdom is not of this world;” some preached a spiritual religion; were “anointed with oil;” crucified for the sins of the world; rose from the dead; ascended back to heaven, etc., etc.—Pages 20, 21.

It will be seen from the above that our critics are not the only ones who can furnish the people with a long list of assertions. However, Mr. Graves does tell us where his proof can be found (such as it is),

but even this some of our leading opposers frequently fail to do. Would it not be well for these critics and Mr. Graves to confer together and decide definitely which party has the better grounds for rejecting divine claims made; and when they have written up their decision and signed it, give us the benefit of perusal?

CHAPTER II.

REFORMED EGYPTIAN WRITING.

The Book of Mormon claims to have been written in "reformed Egyptian," but we are told that this cannot be true, because the hatred of the Jews to the Egyptians was such as would prevent them from borrowing anything from them. But how do they know that this hatred would prevent them from accepting and using the "language of the Egyptians?" It is simply the opinion of the critics placed in opposition to the historical statements of the Book of Mormon. "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7: 22), and this learning was of great benefit to him. It is probable that the Hebrews continued to use, more or less, the wisdom, or learning of the Egyptians; and it cannot be proved that they did not understand, and when necessary, use their language.

In the debate with Elder Kelley, at Lamoni, it was claimed that the aborigines of America did not use Egyptian; that it was once thought they did, but had been found to be a mistake; but in the lecture, delivered afterwards, the same critic said that Sidney Rigdon knowing that the aborigines had Egyptian, put it into the Book of Mormon. Here is a plain contradiction. Which statement would our critic have us believe? Again: He has gone back once

more on his own stated theory, and the testimony of his witnesses, that Spalding wrote the historical portions of the Book of Mormon, and attributes this important part of the history to Rigdon! Is not this clear evidence of a bad case?

Since it is now admitted that the aborigines used Egyptian, we are under no obligations to prove it; and as the Book of Mormon claims to be a history of the aborigines of America, we thus establish harmony between the claims of the book and the facts in the case, and it remains for our opponents to prove that whoever wrote the historical part of the Book of Mormon learned all that he knew about the use of reformed Egyptian from the antiquarian discoveries which had been made before the Book of Mormon was written. Why did not our critic show to what extent it had been proved that the aborigines of America understood and used Egyptian, previous to the time when the Book of Mormon was written? If Spalding wrote the historical part of this book, these discoveries must have been made and published previous to the year 1812. On the other hand, if it be claimed that Sidney Rigdon revised and changed the history, we say again, How did it come that the witnesses, after the lapse of twenty-two or twenty-three years, recognized the Book of Mormon as the identical work of Solomon Spalding, that is, the historical portion of the Book of Mormon? At this juncture, we have a right to demand that our critic and all who agree with him on this point, take a position, and either hold to it, or give it up as lost. Who did write the historical part of the Book of Mormon, Spalding, or Rigdon? If the former, did Rigdon change the history? If he did, to what extent did he change it? and where do we find the proof?

The first writer of the Book of Mormon makes this statement with reference to the language of the record:—

Yea, I make a record in the language of my father, which consists of the learning of the Jews, and the language of the Egyptians.—Page 1, par. 1.

On page 141, paragraph 1, we read that King Benjamin taught his three sons,

In all the language of his fathers, that, thereby they might become men of understanding.

And in speaking of Lehi who came out from Jerusalem, King Benjamin says:—

For he having been taught in the language of the Egyptians, therefore he could read these engravings, and teach them to his children, that thereby they could teach them to their children, and so fulfilling the commandments of God, even down to this present time.

The last writer of the Book of Mormon, Moroni, makes the following statements concerning the language of the record, and their knowledge of Hebrew also:—

And now behold, we have written this record according to our knowledge, in the characters which are called among us the reformed Egyptian, being handed down and altered by us, according to our manner of speech. And if our plates had been sufficiently large, we should have written in Hebrew; but the Hebrew hath been altered by us also.—Page 500, par 8.

The foregoing statements are very plain, and furnish no evidence of fraud. Let us note a few of the points:—

1. The language in which the record was written was a combination of “the learning of the Jews and the language of the Egyptians.”

2. Lehi understood this language, taught it to his children, and it continued to be taught to each successive generation.

3. This language, which was a combination to begin with, was handed down and altered by them according to their manner of speech.

4. The Nephites understood and used Hebrew,

as well as reformed Egyptian, but in a changed form.

5. The "reformed Egyptian" was the shorter method of writing, and hence it was used in keeping their record, although it was not so correct as the Hebrew:—

And if we could have written in Hebrew, behold, ye would have had no imperfection in our record.

The American antiquities which have been brought to light mainly since the publication of the Book of Mormon, prove; first, that the ancient Americans understood the art of writing; and, second, that they used both Hebrew and another system bearing striking resemblance to the Egyptian, which latter system was a kind of phonetic (writing by sound) system. Mr. J. D. Baldwin, in *Ancient America*, published in 1871 or 1872, when speaking of the ancient inhabitants of America, says:—

They were highly skilled, also, in the appliances of civilized life, and they had the art of writing, a fact placed beyond dispute by their many inscriptions.—Page 101.

If a consecutive history of the ancient people of Central America and Mexico were ever written, it has been lost. Probably nothing of the kind ever was written in the manner which we call history, although there must have been regular annals of some kind. The ruins show that they had the art of writing, and that, at the south, this art was more developed, more like a phonetic system of writing than that found in use among the Aztecs.—Page 187.

It is not difficult to see why this reformed Egyptian has, to a great extent, baffled the skill of modern scholars. It is but little understood as it was used by the ancient Hebrews, and was changed by the Nephites according to their manner of speech. Mr. Delafield, in his *Antiquities of America*, has considerable to say of the resemblance between the Egyptian hieroglyphic system, and that used by the ancient Americans. We have room for but little:—

One of the most interesting sources of comparison

between Mexico, Peru, and Egypt, is to be found in an investigation of their hieroglyphic system. Each of these countries had a peculiar method of recording events by means of hieroglyphic signs, sculpturing them on monuments and buildings, and portraying them on papyrus and maguey.—Page 42.

It is the opinion of the author that further investigations and discoveries in deciphering Mexican hieroglyphic paintings will exhibit a close analogy to the Egyptian in the use of two scriptural systems: the one for monumental inscription, the other for ordinary purposes of record and transmission of information. We find the three species of hieroglyphics common to Mexico and Egypt.—Ibid., p. 46.

HEBREW.

In 1861 and 1866, accounts were published in the *Israelite Indeed*, *Prophetic Watchman*, and *Saints' Herald*, setting forth the discovery of certain stones containing Hebrew inscriptions, dug from the mounds near Newark, Ohio. These inscriptions contain the words "Moses," "Jew," etc., and the words found in some parts of the Bible including the ten commandments which "are given in part and entirely—the longest being abbreviated."

We call attention again to what Moroni said of the Hebrew had in use by the Nephites, and then to what the learned say of these Hebrew inscriptions which have been dug from the mounds:—

And if our plates had been sufficiently large, we should have written in Hebrew; but the Hebrew hath been altered by us also.—Book of Mormon, p. 500, par. 8.

The alphabet used, it is thought, is the original Hebrew one, as there are letters known in the Hebrew alphabet [not] now in use, but bearing a resemblance to them.—*Prophetic Watchman*.

The form of the characters is neither the modern Hebrew (adopted by the High Council in consequence of the facts that the "Cuthyium," or Samaritans, adopted the ancient Hebrew), nor is it the Samaritan, which shows again that the writer, or writers, had already forgotten much. Of one thing, however, I am morally convinced:

that this stone is a genuine relic of antiquity, as it would be a greater difficulty to believe in the invention of such a strange mixture of characters, disorder of combination, and innocent blunders, than to believe it the handiwork of a generation long passed away.—G. R. Lederer, in *Israelite Indeed*, May, 1861.

Such coincidences as the above are not the result of accident, nor of human sagacity, but they are a wonderful confirmation of the statements of the Book of Mormon concerning the languages of the ancient inhabitants of America. “The alphabet used, it is thought, is the original Hebrew one.” This shows that the correspondence between the original Hebrew and that used in these inscriptions is not complete. The change is so palpable that Lederer, himself a Jew, says it “is neither the modern Hebrew, nor is it the Samaritan,” which led him to believe, from his standpoint, that “the writer or writers had already forgotten much.”

It also confirmed him in his previous theory that,

In some remote age and in some unknown way, one or more pious and distinguished Hebrews came over to this continent, became the teachers of some of the wild tribes of America, and thus introduced not only the knowledge of the true and living Jehovah, but to some extent Jewish, or rather Mosaic rites and ceremonies also.

But how does it come that the Book of Mormon, published in 1830, and claiming to be a true history of this ancient people of America, informs us that this ancient people themselves were Israelites; that they had the five books of Moses, and the prophets down to Jeremiah; also that they understood and used the Hebrew in a changed form? Will the men who debate with infidels and lecture on infidelity tell us that all this is the work of chance?

There are a few more objections urged against the Book of Mormon, which have come under our notice, similar to the weaker ones of those which we have presented and examined. The criticisms are

cunning, but unfair; they cover a great deal of ground, but establish nothing. The facts still remain that the Book of Mormon teaches us to believe in the true God and his Son Jesus Christ: it teaches us to obey the gospel in its entirety, it enjoins obedience to the highest moral code ever known among men. No book can be produced which more fully and positively condemns sin of all kinds than does the Book of Mormon. It condemns polygamy, concubinage, and adultery. (See pages 115, 116, paragraphs 6, 7, 9; 163, 164, paragraph 1; 519, paragraph 5.) It condemns priestcraft, murdering, lying, stealing, malice, envy, with all the leading sins found in the catalogue. (Page 99, paragraphs 15, 16; page 249, paragraph 8.)

SPALDING STORY.

The theory that Rev. Spalding wrote the historical part of the Book of Mormon, and Rigdon the doctrinal part, is not defensible for the following reasons:—

1. The historical and doctrinal parts are so closely blended and interwoven, throughout the book, that it is evident that whoever wrote all or any part of the history contained in the book, also wrote the doctrine presented with it.

2. The Book of Mormon contains fifteen distinct books ascribed to about twenty-five different authors. A few of these authors wrote but little, a number of them wrote quite extensively. All the latter and leading authors present both history and doctrine, closely intermixed, in the different books ascribed to them, and the history and doctrine are written in the same style in each distinct book. This furnishes us with good evidence that the historical and doctrinal parts of the Book of Mormon were written by the same authors.

3. Notwithstanding the facts that the greater

part of the Book of Mormon was abridged by one man, Mormon; that there are certain idioms peculiar to the Nephite language, found throughout the whole record; and that it was put into English through the instrumentality of one translator; yet the different books, ascribed to different authors, contain such clear evidences of distinctive styles of composition that it precludes the claim that these different books composing the Book of Mormon are the work of but one or two individuals. Let the reader, who has ability and taste for this kind of work, carefully compare the style of Nephi the son of Lehi with that of Nephi the son of Nephi, who was the son of Helaman, who lived and wrote about six hundred years later. Let him compare the writings of Jacob the brother of Nephi, with those of Mórni, the last writer of the Book of Mormon. The truth is, there is too much similarity throughout the Book of Mormon to admit of the claim that it was written by Spalding and Rigdon, as the styles of these two men are quite dissimilar; and yet the diversity of styles is of such a character as to entirely preclude the claim that either its history or doctrine is the work of but one man.

It is difficult for us to see how any man with a fair degree of literary ability can believe that the Book of Mormon is a fraud, much less how he can believe that Solomon Spalding, who is acknowledged to be the author of the "Manuscript Story," which has been published, could have been the author of the historical part of the Book of Mormon. Nor are we alone in this, as may be seen from the statements of Mr. L. L. Rice and Professor Fairchild:—

Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found, if any explanation is required.

The theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon in the traditional manuscript of Solomon Spalding will probably have to be relinquished.—[Signed], James H. Fairchild, and published in *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

It is certain that this manuscript is not the origin of

the Mormon Bible, whatever some other manuscript may have been. The only similarity between them is the manner in which each purports to have been found—one in a cave in Conneaut Creek—the other in a hill in Ontario county, New York. There is no identity of names, of persons or places; and there is no similarity of style between them. As I told Mr. Deming, I should as soon think the Book of Revelation was written by the author of Don Quixote, as that the writer of this manuscript was the author of the Book of Mormon.

Upon reflection since writing the foregoing I am of the opinion that no one who reads this Manuscript will give credit to the story that Solomon Spalding was in anywise the author of the Book of Mormon. It is unlikely that anyone who wrote so elaborate a work as the Mormon Bible would spend his time in getting up so shallow a story as this, which at best is but a feeble imitation of the other. Finally, I am more than half convinced that this is his only writing of the sort, and that any pretense that Spalding was in any sense the author of the other, is a sheer fabrication. It was easy for anybody who may have seen this, or heard anything of its contents, to get up the story that they were identical.—L. L. Rice, of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands, in a letter written to Joseph Smith, of Lamoni, Iowa, dated March 28, 1885.

If our opponents can account for the origin of the Book of Mormon in such a way as to fasten fraud upon somebody, it is their duty to do so; but it should be done in a spirit of kindness, and with a view to save the ones who have been deceived. However, their efforts thus far have been a decided failure, and must continue to be until they find a defensible theory, and are able to make far better criticisms than the ones replied to and refuted in this review.

CHAPTER III.

THE BOOK OF DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS.

Our review of objections urged against the Book of Mormon would not be complete without an examination of the leading objections made to the above-named book; although we have already established the unscrupulous and unreliable character of our critics who are the most persistent in their opposition to our claims. When their criticisms are examined from a Bible point of view, they melt away like snow before a summer's sun. But some of the strong tendencies of our age are infidelic; these ministers are aware of this, so they use infidel arguments, infidel methods and tactics, in order to destroy our faith.

TITLE OF THE BOOK.

Notwithstanding the fact that the title of the above-named book is plainly printed in each copy, some of our critics persist in calling it the "Book of Doctrines and Covenants." Why do they do this? In the New Testament we frequently read of the "doctrines" of men and devils, but of the "doctrine of Christ." God's truth is harmonious, hence it is one; the teachings of men and devils are conflicting, hence better expressed by the term "doctrines."

DID RIGDON WRITE IT?

The position of some is that Rigdon gave all these revelations to the church. Where is the proof? They do not present it, or even make the attempt! Now it is fair to infer that these ministers who

utterly repudiate the claims of these revelations to divine origin, have cast about in their own minds, using such data as could be secured, with all the natural ability which they possess, to discover their exact human origin.

If Rigdon originated all these purported revelations of Jesus Christ, it must be admitted by every fair-minded person that he was a man of no mean ability. It must also be admitted that he was a wicked and ambitious character, and indeed this is what they claim him to have been; also, that he and Joseph Smith, another wicked and ambitious man, were in a most unholy collusion. Now in the light of these claims, we are to read the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, and we will mention just a few of the things which we encounter. (For the benefit of the reader we give section and paragraph, instead of page. We quote from the Lamoni edition, using the abbreviations D. C. for Doctrine and Covenants.)

1. According to this popular position this wicked collusion between Rigdon and Smith began long before the publication of the Book of Mormon, at least as early as 1827; but the first mention of Rigdon's name in the revelations was in December, 1830, section 34. In this communication we find the following:—

For even now already summer is nigh, and I have sent forth the fullness of my gospel by the hand of my servant Joseph; and in weakness have I blessed him, and I have given unto him the keys of the mystery of those things which have been sealed, even things which were from the foundation of the world, and the things which shall come from this time until the time of my coming, if he abide in me, and if not, another will I plant in his stead.

Wherefore watch over him that his faith fail not, and it shall be given by the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, that knoweth all things; and a commandment I give unto thee, that thou shalt write for him; and the scriptures shall be given even as they are in mine own bosom, to the salvation of mine own elect; for they will hear my voice, and shall

see me, and shall not be asleep, and shall abide the day of my coming, for they shall be purified even as I am pure. And now I say unto you, tarry with him and he shall journey with you; forsake him not and surely these things shall be fulfilled. And inasmuch as ye do not write, behold it shall be given unto him to prophesy; and thou shalt preach my gospel, and call on the holy prophets to prove his words, as they shall be given him.

Keep all the commandments and covenants by which ye are bound, and I will cause the heavens to shake for your good, and Satan shall tremble, and Zion shall rejoice upon the hills and flourish, and Israel shall be saved in mine own due time.—Paragraphs 4-6.

Thus we see that Rigdon is simply authorized to write for Joseph Smith, and to preach the gospel; while the latter holds the keys, fills the prophetic office, and has the power to appoint his successor. Does this look like the work of an ambitious and wicked man who is trying to climb into Moses' seat? Please bear in mind that these revelations were made known to the church as soon as possible after they were given, and they were put in print as early as 1832.

2. In Doctrine and Covenants 27: 2, given to Oliver Cowdery in September, 1830, we read that Joseph Smith only is to receive commandments and revelations for the church, until another be appointed "in his stead;" and from 43:1, 2, we learn that the right to appoint the successor to the prophetic office and presidency over the whole church rested solely with Joseph Smith:—

And this ye shall know assuredly, that there is none other appointed unto you to receive commandments and revelations until he be taken, if he abide in me.

But verily, verily I say unto you, that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be through him, for if it be taken from him he shall not have power, except to appoint another in his stead; and this shall be a law unto you, that ye receive not the teachings of any that shall come before you as revelations, or commandments; and

this I give unto you, that you may not be deceived, that you may know they are not of me.

Thus we see that if Rigdon, whom we are to regard as a wicked aspirant, made these revelations, he placed in them no provision by virtue of which he could aspire to the highest office in the church!

In section 107:18 we read:—

His [Joseph Smith's] blessing shall also be put upon the head of his posterity after him.

And this whole provision which is said to be manifestly unjust, because it discriminates in favor of the Smith family and against everybody else in the church, and which they declare to be worse than popery, we are to attribute to the sagacity and wickedness of the man Rigdon, whose ambition knew no bounds!

3. The revelations found in the Doctrine and Covenants enjoin faith in God and Christ; obedience to the gospel; a strict observance of that code of morals presented to us in the New Testament Scriptures. They also require us to honor and obey the laws of the government under which we live, while they prohibit in strong and definite terms all the crimes and wrongs found in the catalogue. In proof, we can safely cite the book as a whole, but for the convenience of the reader we furnish a few references: Section 41, paragraphs 1, 2; 42: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23; 38: 3, 4, 7; 50: 2; 58: 5; 59: 1, 2; 49: 3; 85: 5, 8.

Among the things condemned in the passages cited are killing, stealing, lying, hypocrisy, ignoring either the laws of God or of the government, polygamy, adultery, injustice, selfishness, improper observance of the "Lord's Day," etc.

4. If to insure success in this Satanic scheme, it was deemed necessary that Joseph Smith should be placed at the head, and as our opponents claim, the church should be made to believe that he was infalli-

ble, or a kind of second Messiah, why do some of these revelations severely condemn him (Smith) for having given way to human weakness and wrong?

Behold, you have been intrusted with these things, but how strict were your commandments; and remember, also, the promises which were made unto you, if you did not transgress them; and behold, how oft you have transgressed the commandments and the laws of God, and have gone on in the persuasions of men: for behold, you should not have feared man more than God, although men set at naught the counsels of God, and despise his words, yet you should have been faithful and he would have extended his arm, and supported you against all the fiery darts of the adversary; and he would have been with you in every time of trouble.

Behold, thou art Joseph, and thou wast chosen to do the work of the Lord, but because of transgression, if thou art not aware thou wilt fall, but remember God is merciful; therefore, repent of that which thou hast done, which is contrary to the commandment which I gave you, and thou art still chosen, and art again called to the work; except thou do this, thou shalt be delivered up and become as other men, and have no more gift.—D. C. 2: 3, 4.

And now I command you, my servant Joseph, to repent and walk more uprightly before me, and yield to the persuasions of men no more; and that you be firm in keeping the commandments wherewith I have commanded you, and if you do this, behold I grant unto you eternal life, even if you should be slain.—D. C. 4: 4.

There are those who have sought occasion against him without cause; nevertheless he has sinned, but verily I say unto you, I, the Lord, forgiveth sins unto those who confess their sins before me, and ask forgiveness, who have not sinned unto death.—D. C. 64: 2.

Not only was Joseph Smith at times placed in this humiliating condition before the church and the world, but even Rigdon himself was reproved and condemned:—

And now, behold, verily I say unto you, I, the Lord, am not pleased with my servant Sidney Rigdon, he exalted himself in his heart, and received not counsel, but grieved

the Spirit; wherefore his writing is not acceptable unto the Lord, and he shall make another, and if the Lord receive it not, behold he standeth no longer in the office which I have appointed him.—D. C. 63: 14.

Verily I say unto my servant Sidney Rigdon, that in some things he hath not kept the commandments, concerning his children; therefore, firstly set in order thy house.—D. C. 90: 7.

Now if Sidney Rigdon was the real author of these purported revelations of Jesus Christ, we have before us a peculiar spectacle, the equal of which the world's history has never before furnished. It is this: An ambitious, wicked man—the Devil's emissary—gives to the church and the world over one hundred communications, claiming to be revelations of God's will to his servants and people, and to the whole world. Allowing the Bible to be the standard of evidence, these revelations condemn all that God condemns, and they enjoin all that God commands; or, in other words, all that is Satanic in its origin is prohibited, while all that is pure, lovely, good, divine, is commanded! Even Joseph Smith and Rigdon themselves are reprov'd and condemned when they do wrong. Does the Devil fight against himself? When the Jews accused Jesus of casting out devils "by Beelzebub the prince of devils," he replied:—

Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?—Matt. 12: 25, 26.

Jesus made the following strong observations concerning the character and practices of the Devil:—

He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.—John 8: 44.

Question: Do the Devil's emissaries teach the

truth as it is with God? If it be said they do, in order to deceive the people, then we ask; first, Why did Jesus claim that the people ought to believe on him, because he taught the truth? And, second, Will a belief of the truth and obedience to its requirements jeopardize anyone's salvation?

Jesus said:—

And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not. Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words.—John 8: 45-47.

If scripture, good sense, and logic are allowable in this discussion, then we are fully justified in the statement that it requires more credulity to believe that these revelations originated with Rigdon, than it requires faith to believe that they came from God. But as the skeptic and infidel cannot account, in his way, for the origin and character of the Christian religion, without exercising extreme and indefensible credulity, so these critics cannot account for the origin and character of the faith and doctrine of the Latter Day Saints without placing themselves in the same unenviable position. Their claim that Rigdon gave all these revelations to the church is of a piece with the claim that he was the author of the doctrinal part of the Book of Mormon. These claims may satisfy a certain class of minds, but it is certain that they will not stand the light of investigation.

CHARGE OF CHANGING REVELATIONS EXAMINED.

A vigorous effort is made to show that the Book of Commandments, as published, was indorsed by the church, but after its publication some of the revelations were changed and in their changed form were published in the Doctrine and Covenants. Reference is made to Doctrine and Covenants section 70, paragraph 1, and it is affirmed that the persons there named constituted the publishing committee of the

Book of Commandments. This is a mistake. Joseph Smith, Martin Harris, Oliver Cowdery, John Whitmer, Sidney Rigdon, and W. W. Phelps were designated as general custodians of all the revelations given to the church. The language of the revelation is this:—

I, the Lord, have appointed them, and ordained them to be stewards over the revelations and commandments which I have given them, and which I shall hereafter give unto them; and an account of this stewardship will I require of them in the day of judgment.

This revelation was given November, 1831, while the last one found in the Book of Commandments (only part of which was published in the book) bears date of September, 1831. The publishing committee of the Book of Commandments was composed of W. W. Phelps, O. Cowdery, and John Whitmer. They were appointed May 1, 1832. (See *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 625.)

The references made to the Book of Commandments in Doctrine and Covenants 1: 2, and 67: 2, as cited by our opponents, refer to the revelations before they were ever printed at all. They were never properly printed, in book form, till the publication of the Doctrine and Covenants in 1835. They were referred to as the Book of Commandments in the same sense that the Apocalypse is referred to as a book even before it was written. (Rev. 1: 11; 22: 18.) Both of the revelations referred to above were given in November, 1831, while the Book of Commandments was not published till 1833.

But an effort is made to prove that the Book of Commandments as published was authoritative to the church, by the testimony of David Whitmer; and it is urged with more bluster than consistency that if we do not accept Whitmer's testimony concerning the Book of Commandments, away goes our leading witness for the Book of Mormon. Because David Whitmer's testimony concerning the Book of Com-

mandments is found to be contrary to the well-established facts of church history, does it follow that his testimony concerning the Book of Mormon, given fifty years before, is necessarily false? It should be borne in mind that Whitmer was expelled from the church in 1838, after which he manifested a disposition to greatly injure, or destroy, the reputation of Joseph Smith.

In proof of the unreliability of Whitmer's testimony on this point, we present the following extracts from an editorial of the *Saints' Herald* for June 4, 1887:—

SEVENTEENTH SECTION DOCTRINE AND COVENANTS.

Of the date of the reception of this section, Joseph Smith states:—

“In this manner did the Lord continue to give us instructions from time to time, concerning the duties which now devolved upon us, and among other things of the kind, we obtained of him the following by the Spirit of prophecy and revelation; which not only gave us much information, but also pointed out to us the precise day upon which, according to his will and commandment we should proceed to organize his church once again, here upon the earth.”—*Times and Seasons*, vol. 3, p. 928, 9.

This shows that between the date of the revelation of June, 1829, and April, 1830, the subject matter of this section, including the day on which the church should be organized, was given; notwithstanding the apparent discrepancy of dates.

In regard to this chapter 24, which is the 17th section in Doctrine and Covenants now used in the church, and section 2 in the edition of 1835, Elder Whitmer states on page 61 of his “Address,”—

“This revelation was received in June, 1830, and these two paragraphs [16 and 17.—Ed.] were added in June, 1832, in that paper.” [*Evening and Morning Star*.—Ed.] “W. W. Phelps is the one who printed this revelation in that paper with ‘items’ (paragraphs 16 and 17), added to it.—Address, pages 61 and 62.

We hope that Elder Whitmer will not charge us with misunderstanding what he has written on this point.

Elder Whitmer in his zeal to brand Joseph Smith as a falsifier of the commands of God, here makes a great mistake. The two paragraphs were not printed by W. W. Phelps, in the *Evening and Morning Star*, in June, 1832, in "The Articles and Covenants of the Church;" and we cannot help thinking that had Elder Whitmer not been so intent to destroy the character of Joseph Smith as a minister for Christ, he would not have made this mistake, for we printed the article in *Herald* of April 9 of this year, as it was in the *Evening and Morning Star* for June, 1832 and 1833; and as it is in the reprint of the same paper, published in Kirtland, January, 1835, and in the Book of Commandments of 1833. Had Elder Whitmer noticed the fact that the Reorganization had put this whole dispute before the people in the real facts, without comment, he would have been saved the present humiliation of discovering that in order to make an argument against Joseph Smith in support of the charge that he was false to his duty, he has stated what is not correct. The idea evidently entertained by Elder Whitmer when he made this statement was that the statement made by Oliver Cowdery, who was the Editor of the *Messenger and Advocate*, in January, 1835, when this disputed section was first printed with paragraphs 16 and 17 in it, to the effect that the document as published in 1832 was "different from the original," must be set aside; and to do it makes the chapter to appear in 1832.

David Whitmer was not one of the publishing committee of the Book of Commandments, nor was he one of the committee of "stewards over the revelations and commandments." How did it come that he knew so much more about this matter than those who had it directly in hand?

The first publication of the revelations in the *Evening and Morning Star* and Book of Commandments, was pronounced faulty by Oliver Cowdery, who was not only one of the publishing committee, but also one of the publishing committee of the Doctrine and Covenants, as published in 1835, and

one of the stewards referred to above. He says:—

We have again inserted the articles and covenants according to our promise in a previous number, for the benefit of our brethren abroad, who have not the first number of the first volume. As there were some errors which had gotten into them by transcribing, we have since obtained the original copy and made the necessary corrections.—*Evening and Morning Star* for June, 1833, p. 196.

Also in same paper for September, 1834, in “Prospectus for reprinting the first and second volumes of the *Evening and Morning Star*,” we have the following:—

There are many typographical errors in both volumes, and especially in the last, which we shall endeavor carefully to correct, as well as principle, if we discover any. It is also proper for us to say, that in the first 14 numbers, in the revelations, are many errors, typographical, and others, occasioned by transcribing manuscript; but as we shall have access to originals we shall endeavor to make proper corrections.

The printing of the Book of Commandments was never completed. Mob violence destroyed the printing press and put a stop to the work. The scattered forms, or a few of them, were gathered up and bound into books. The ending of the book is found in the midst of a revelation given in September, 1831. The book was never accepted by the publishing committee, nor by the church. But the committee which presented to the church, for its indorsement, the Book of Doctrine and Covenants, at Kirtland, on August 17, 1835, was duly appointed “by a General Assembly of September 24, 1834;” and on August 17, 1835, the work of this committee was indorsed by the different quorums of the church, by prominent individuals, and by the church in General Assembly. (See *Messenger and Advocate* for August, 1835, pp. 161, 162; also Kirtland edition of the Doctrine and Covenants pp. 255–257.)

Among the individuals who testified in favor of

the book as then presented, were John Whitmer, one of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, and W. W. Phelps. Oliver Cowdery was one of the leading witnesses of the truth of the Book of Mormon, and he was also one of the leading witnesses in favor of the Kirtland edition of the "Covenants and Commandments of the Lord." David Whitmer did not publish his testimony concerning the Book of Commandments till after Oliver Cowdery had been removed by death.

In further reply to this position, allow us to state that the truth of the Book of Mormon is no more dependent upon the testimony of David Whitmer than is the truth of the Christian religion dependent upon the testimony of Peter. However, that both should bear testimony to that which they knew to be of God, was eminently proper and needful in the building up of the work in the respective times in which they lived. Again; if when a man testifies falsely concerning any one point it thereby renders his testimony false on every other point, and at every other time, why do these critics present David Whitmer as one of their witnesses? According to their own rule if his testimony concerning the Book of Mormon is false, of what value is his testimony concerning the Book of Commandments?

BOOK OF ENOCH.

One critic says:—

Rigdon got many of these revelations from the Book of Enoch.

Where is the proof? Did he compare them with the Book of Enoch? No. Did he compare one single revelation or paragraph with any part of the Book of Enoch? He did not! If his assertion is true, and he wished to properly demonstrate just one point, why did he not make such comparison? Echo answers, "Why?"

THE VISIT TO INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, FALSELY REPRESENTED.

Next it is also affirmed:—

Smith got a lot of his dupes to follow him to Independence, Missouri. While there, Smith received three revelations, stating that it would be very unsafe for any except himself, Rigdon, and Cowdery to ride upon the waters. So these three men got the money and rode home, while the other dupes had to foot it.

All this will do very well for those who are willing to settle the whole question by what our opponents say. But what are the facts in the case? On June 19, 1831, Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, Martin Harris, Edward Partridge, W. W. Phelps, Joseph Coe, and A. S. Gilbert and wife, started from Kirtland, Ohio, to Independence, Missouri, arriving about the middle of July.

While at Independence, Joseph Smith received four revelations, not three, but there is not one word in any of them about dangers upon the waters! After starting back to Kirtland, in August, three or four days after leaving Independence, he received two more revelations, one of which speaks of dangers upon the waters; but they contain not one word even intimating, much less stating, that it would be more safe for Smith, Rigdon, and Cowdery than for others! (See *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 434.) After a brief account of their journey from Kirtland to St. Louis, we have the following:—

At St. Louis, myself [Joseph Smith], Brother Harris, Phelps, Partridge, and Coe, went on foot by land, to Independence, Jackson county, Missouri, where we arrived about the middle of July; and the residue of the company came by water a few days after.—*Times and Seasons* 5:434. (See also pages 448–452.)

Concerning Smith, Rigdon, and Cowdery getting the money, the facts are these: In the last revelation given at Independence, before their return, it was

made known that all should return to St. Louis, and from thence Sidney Rigdon, Joseph Smith, and Oliver Cowdery were to take their journey for Cincinnati, where they were to preach the gospel:—

And let the residue take their journey from St. Louis, two by two, and preach the word, not in haste, among the congregations of the wicked, until they return to the churches from whence they came. And all this for the good of the churches; for this intent have I sent them. And let my servant Edward Partridge impart of the money which I have given him, a portion unto mine elders, who are commanded to return; and he that is able, let him return it by the way of the agent, and he that is not, of him it is not required.

We now come to their return; the revelation which speaks of destructions upon the waters, etc. (*Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, pp. 464, 465.) On the third day after leaving Independence, or about August 12, 1831, Joseph Smith received a revelation which answers to section 61 in the Doctrine and Covenants. From this revelation we quote:—

Behold, there are many dangers upon the waters, and more especially hereafter, for I the Lord have decreed, in mine anger, many destructions upon the waters; yea, and especially upon these waters; nevertheless, all flesh is in mine hand, and he that is faithful among you, shall not perish by the waters.—Par. 1.

And now I give unto you a commandment, that what I say unto one I say unto all, that you shall forewarn your brethren concerning these waters, that they come not in journeying upon them, lest their faith fail, and they are caught in her snares; I, the Lord, have decreed, and the destroyer rideth upon the face thereof, and I revoke not the decree.—Par. 2.

And now, concerning my servants Sidney Rigdon, and Joseph Smith, Jr., and Oliver Cowdery, [the only ones, according to the above criticism, for whom it would be safe to ride on the waters,] let them come not again upon the waters, save it be upon the canal, while journeying unto their homes, or, in other words, they shall not come upon the waters to journey, save upon the canal.—Par. 4.

On the 13th another revelation was given, after which the history continues as follows:—

After this little meeting of the elders, myself, [Joseph Smith,] and Sidney Rigdon, and Oliver Cowdery, continued our journey by land to St. Louis, where we overtook Brothers Phelps and Gilbert. From this place we took stage, and they went by water to Kirtland, where we arrived safe and well on the 27.—*Times and Seasons*, 5: 465.

The above is sufficient to reveal the one who made the above criticism in a very unenviable light. And yet, this is a fair sample of the work of our critics in general, and serves to illustrate in a forcible manner the character of the grounds upon which we are asked to renounce our faith. Base misrepresentation has been resorted to in order to make out the case. This is certainly bad for the critic, and it is bad for his cause. But he is a man of education and learning, and if his case could be made out in a fair and honorable way, there are few, if any who would more quickly know it than he. There is nothing in the above citations from the Doctrine and Covenants, that is out of harmony with the character of God or the doctrine of the Bible. Instead of Smith, Rigdon, and Cowdery getting all the money and returning home by water, “while the other dupes had to foot it,” they only received part of the money, in connection with Phelps and Gilbert, and all who were able were to “return it by the way of the agent.” Instead of Smith, Rigdon, and Cowdery being the only ones who could travel with safety by water, they were the only ones specially commanded not to travel by water, and in obedience to the commandment they traveled home by land while their brethren went by water.

WAS HE A FALSE PROPHET?

Joseph Smith is declared to be a false prophet, because of a declaration found in a published letter,

dated September 1, 1842. (Doctrine and Covenants 109: 2).—

And I feel like Paul to glory in tribulation, for to this day has the God of my fathers delivered me out of them all, and will deliver me from henceforth; for behold, and lo, I shall triumph over all my enemies, for the Lord God hath spoken it.

The point is, as our opponents put it, "Joseph Smith's enemies triumphed over him, and killed him." We reply that Joseph Smith was chosen of God, as an instrument, to restore the gospel and church of Christ—"to lay the *foundation* of Zion." His enemies opposed him in this work. They tried in every conceivable way, with the prestige of learning, money, and popular sentiment on their side, to prevent and destroy the work; but in this they signally failed. The work introduced by him is still here, and it is here to stay. In this, the highest and grandest sense, he did triumph over all his enemies.

Joseph Smith could not have believed, in the light of what had already been given, that it would be impossible for his enemies to injure his person, at any time, and in this sense, overcome him. In Doctrine and Covenants 4:4, given in 1829, we have the following:—

And now I command you, my servant Joseph, to repent and walk more uprightly before me, and yield to the persuasions of men no more; and that you be firm in keeping the commandments wherewith I have commanded you, and if you do this, behold I grant unto you eternal life, *even if you should be slain.*

Surely, if Joseph Smith succeeded in accomplishing the work which God had for him to do, and for himself received eternal life, neither one of which our opponents can disprove, his triumph over his enemies was glorious and complete.

SOME DID NOT BELIEVE.

Doctrine and Covenants 67:2 is cited, and this statement is made:—

Some tried to get ahead of Joseph in giving revelations to the church.

Suppose they did, though it is not proved, would such opposition prove the revelations already given to be of human or Satanic origin? Is such opposition new? Moses was the Lord's chosen prophet, and yet,

Korah, . . . Dathan, and Abiram, . . . with two hundred and fifty princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown: and they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?—Numbers 16: 1-3.

Both in the case of Moses and that of Joseph Smith, the Lord, consistently, furnished his own tests; they were accepted and tried to the satisfaction of all who desired the right to prevail. (See Numbers chapter 16; *Times and Seasons*, vol. 5, p. 496.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRUE CHURCH.

Next, the book is condemned, and a strong bid made for popular feeling and sentiment, because it teaches that the church which Joseph Smith claimed to have been commanded of God to organize, "is the only true and living church" with which the Lord is well pleased. (D. C. 1: 5.)

We have already shown that the Lord spoke of the church "collectively and not individually." It is simply stated that the church was the only one

which was in complete harmony with the word of God in doctrine and organization. Why do not these critics show if they can, that the church referred to is not in harmony with the word of God? Every minister who makes this criticism (and many do make it) is a representative of some church. Does he believe that his church is in harmony with the New Testament in doctrine and organization? If so, does he also believe that all other churches, which differ more or less from his, are in harmony with the New Testament? The New Testament when referring to the Church of God comprehensively, presents it as "one body," "the body of Christ," "the church," etc. (Eph. 4: 4; 1 Cor. 12: 27, 28; Eph. 5: 25, 26, 27.) So far as New Testament teaching is concerned, there are no more two churches, acknowledged of God with Christ at their head, than there are two Saviors, or two gospels. In Acts 2: 47, we read:—

The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.

Was that his church to which the Lord added such as should be saved? Was there any other in existence, at that time, with which the Lord was well pleased? Would he be pleased with the same kind of a church to-day?

For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ.—1 Cor. 12: 12.

There is nothing inconsistent in the Lord saying that his church is "the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth," with which he is well pleased; and if the church referred to was not, or is not the Lord's Church, because in opposition to the teachings of the New Testament, let our opponents show it.

BOOK OF MORMON EQUAL TO THE BIBLE.

Now we are told that according to the teachings of the Doctrine and Covenants the Book of Mormon is

made equal to the Bible. Yes, in this sense. If the Book of Mormon contains the word of God, then it is just as good as the word of God found in the Bible. Why not? If it contains a true history of the prehistoric people of America, and of the dealings of God with them, together with many prophecies, given by the Holy Ghost, then the things contained in this book are as sacred and important as similar things contained in the Bible. Here is our safeguard. No part of God's word can possibly oppose, or make void, any other part; but it will, when received, confirm and establish that which has already been given. It will bring us nearer to God by imparting more light, thus brightening our hopes and increasing our faith. No person ever became a sincere and intelligent believer in the Book of Mormon, who was not, because of this belief, made a stronger and more intelligent believer in the Bible. It is impossible that it should be otherwise.

WHO WILL BE DAMNED?

One of our critics cites Doctrine and Covenants 83:10-12, and says:—

All who are not baptized into this church will be damned.

Why did not this critic read and compare with the New Testament? The revelation cited was given in 1832, to Joseph Smith and six elders. They are commanded to take and send the gospel into all the world. All who believed their words and were baptized by water for the remission of sins, were to receive the Holy Ghost:—

And these signs shall follow them that believe.—Par. 10.

You see, Mr. Critic, this is the way in which the people were induced to accept the fraud (?).

Paragraph 12 teaches that those who would not believe on their words, and would not be baptized in

water, in the name of Christ should not receive the Holy Ghost, but should be damned:—

And this revelation unto you, and commandment, is in force from this very hour upon all the world, and the gospel is unto all who have not received it.

What is there in all the foregoing which is in conflict with the claims of a restored gospel, or the teachings of the New Testament? Will those who accept the gospel as preached by this minister be saved? Will those who reject it be damned?

DID JOHN TARRY?

How often we have been told this:—

John was to tarry on the earth. (D. C. Sec. 6.) Where is he? I would like to see him. Why was not this revelation in the New Translation?

If John tarried, and was made “as flaming fire and a ministering angel,” does it follow, as a necessity, that we should know where he is, and that he would have appeared unto every one who felt disposed to oppose the Doctrine and Covenants? What is claimed in this revelation is in harmony with John 21:20-24, but it contains additional information.

The evident reason why it was not made a part of the New Translation, was because it was not a part of John’s gospel, as contained in the New Testament, but was an additional account.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.

Now we have some more stupendous assertions; but where is the proof? This is becoming terribly monotonous:—

Twenty-seven different styles of officers provided for in the Doctrine and Covenants, seventeen of which are not found in the Bible! They have no evangelists or deacons!

No authority is given either from the Bible or Doctrine and Covenants! Reader, what do you think of this as a criticism, upon the strength of which, it

is thought, we ought to renounce our faith, and the people be fully prepared to reject it? Does this critic think we are all fools, or does he only count on the strength of religious bias?

All the officers named in the Doctrine and Covenants can be properly admitted under the terms of the New Testament, found in 1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11, and elsewhere. The same office is sometimes designated by different terms, or titles. The Doctrine and Covenants does provide for both evangelists and deacons, and both officers have been ordained in the church, the latter being very common. (See D. and C. 104:17; 17:11, 12, 15; 104:31.

But why does this minister cite the New Testament as a proper standard of evidence by which to try the claims and teachings of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants? He has already told us that the Bible knows nothing about this fraud, that it cannot be settled by the Bible! Does he propose to appeal to the Bible once in awhile, when he thinks it can be made to appear that it is on his side, and totally ignore it when it speaks against him?

NEW COVENANT.

Nearly every opposing minister cites Doctrine and Covenants 1:4; 26:2; 42:5, and then says, in substance, as follows:—

The Book of Mormon is the new covenant. The Bible contains the gospel, the Book of Mormon “the fulness of the gospel.”

The first citation speaks of the everlasting covenant, and “the fulness of my gospel,” but says nothing about the Book of Mormon. However, the revelation as a whole indorses the Bible, the words of the Lord, together with those of the prophets and apostles. The second simply says that the Book of Mormon contains the fulness of the gospel. The third says that the principles of the gospel, and the

fulness of the gospel, are contained in the Bible and Book of Mormon. Section 83:8, which was also cited, reads as follows:—

And this condemnation resteth upon the children of Zion, even all; and they shall remain under this condemnation until they repent and remember the new covenant, even the Book of Mormon and the former commandments which I have given them, not only to say, but to do according to that which I have written, etc.

Here we see that “the Book of Mormon and the former commandments,” are declared to be the new covenant. The former commandments indorse and command obedience to the things which are written in the Scriptures. (D. C. 17:24; 42:16.)

This new covenant is simply a renewal, or restoration of the gospel, as taught in the Scriptures. In Section 20 we read:—

Behold, I say unto you, that all old covenants have I caused to be done away in this thing and this is a new and everlasting covenant; *even that which was from the beginning.*

No superiority for the Book of Mormon over the Bible is claimed except in this: Some portions of the Bible, while in the hands of the “great and abominable church,” have been changed—added to and subtracted from, while the Book of Mormon is presented to the world as pure and full as when written by commandment of God.

THE CHARGE OF POKERY EXAMINED.

Our attention is called to Doctrine and Covenants 27:2; 119:2; 104:12, wherein it is taught that Joseph Smith only should receive revelations for the church till another should occupy his place. That he was to be like unto Moses, etc. The critic says:—

There’s your pope!

He also tries to make it appear that the church was commanded to receive and give heed unto the words of Joseph Smith as though they came from

the mouth of God. This seems to be the position of all our opponents.

With reference to the charge of popery, this critic says:—

The cardinals appoint the Pope, but Joseph Smith appoints his own successor.

Yes, Joseph Smith was to appoint his own successor, as indicated by the Lord, but the church was to have the power to receive or reject him. Is the Pope thus presented to the church for acceptance or rejection?

Every president of the high priesthood (or presiding elder), bishop, high counselor and high priest, is to be ordained by the direction of a high council, or general conference.—D. C. 17:17.

Of necessity, there are presidents, or presiding officers, growing out of, or appointed of, or from among those who are ordained to the several offices in these two priesthoods. Of the Melchisedek priesthood, three presiding high priests, *chosen by the body*, appointed and ordained to that office, and upheld by the confidence, faith and prayer of the church, form a quorum of the presidency of the church.—D. C. 104:11.

The president of the church, who is also the president of the council, is appointed by revelation, and acknowledged, in his administration, *by the voice of the church*, etc.—D. C. 99:6.

Concerning the charge that we are bound to receive the word of Joseph Smith as from God, the charge is a plain perversion of the teachings of section 19:2:—

Wherefore, meaning the church, thou shalt give heed unto all his words, and commandments, which he shall give unto you, as he receiveth them, walking in all holiness before me.—Par. 2.

For behold, I will bless all those who labor in my vineyard, with a mighty blessing, and they shall believe on his words, which are given him through me, by the Comforter, etc.—Par. 3.

We are simply and only under obligations to

receive the word of God given to the church through Joseph Smith, as though it came directly from the mouth of God, which is in harmony with the teachings of Christ found in the New Testament. (Matt. 10:40, 41; John 13:20.)

The rights of the church are fully protected by the law of common consent, which obtains and governs in the church:—

And all things shall be done by common consent in the church, by much prayer and faith.—D. C. 25:1.

Neither shall anything be appointed unto any of this church contrary to the church covenants, for all things must be done in order and by common consent in the church, by the prayer of faith.—D. C. 27:4.

Much more might be adduced but the foregoing is sufficient to show that the charge of popery is utterly foundationless.

WHAT KIND OF EVIDENCE IS THIS?

Doctrine and Covenants 113:3 is cited, followed by the statement that, Joseph Smith has done more (save Jesus only) for the salvation of men in this world, than any other man that ever lived in it.

True, the statement is there, but it does not come from any purported revelation, but from an obituary notice of the “martyrdom of Joseph Smith and his Brother Hyrum.” It is simply the opinion of the writer, and no more affects the claim for divine origin, made for the purported revelations, in the book, than the expressions, “Most High and Mighty Prince,” “Most Dread Sovereign,” “Your Majesty,” etc., found in the address of the translators of the Bible, to King James, and printed in the first part of many of our Bibles, affect the divine origin of the word of God contained in the Bible.

JOSEPH AND HIS POSTERITY.

Now we have a quotation from section 107:18. The claim made that, according to this paragraph,

Joseph Smith is next to Christ; his posterity equal to Christ. . . . Joe is going to bring the Messiah into the world!

The objectionable statements are these:—

For this anointing have I put upon his head, that his blessing shall also be put upon the head of his posterity after him; and as I said unto Abraham, concerning the kindreds of the earth, even so I say unto my servant Joseph, in thee, and in thy seed, shall the kindred of the earth be blessed.

If the above puts Joseph Smith next to Christ, then the language of the Bible places Abraham next to Christ. (Genesis 12:3; Galatians 3:8.) It does not make Joseph Smith's posterity equal to Christ, but simply says that the "head of his posterity" shall be made equal to himself:—

His blessing [the blessings which belonged to the calling and office of Joseph Smith] shall be put upon the head of his posterity after him.

The passage does not imply that the head of Joseph Smith's posterity would be a Messiah, but that as the families or all nations of the earth were to be blessed in Abraham, so the kindred of the earth were to be blessed through Joseph and his seed. If when two things are compared for the purpose of showing similarity, it necessarily follows that they are in every respect alike, and fully equal to each other, then it follows that Moses was in every respect equal to Christ. (Deut. 18:18, 19; Acts 3:22, 23.)

Through the posterity of Abraham, the nations of the earth were to be blessed in Christ, by the gospel; so the kindred of the earth were to be blessed in Christ, by the gospel, Joseph Smith and his posterity being leading administrators of the divine law.

CHAPTER V.

FALSE NOTIONS.

In order to show that the revelations of the Doctrine and Covenants are of human origin, our critics sometimes marshal a number of passages under the heading of "false notions;" but instead of a careful comparison of these supposed false notions with the word of God in the Bible, they are frequently disposed of by a strong expression of the opinion of the critic, or denounced because they are not in harmony with his theology. Hence each critic selects his own list of "false notions," being able to find them because of his knowledge of his creed; and they agree, of course, so far as their creeds agree, and feel that they can safely denounce all those things which are not taught in any of the creeds of the reformed churches. Adventists denounce the book, because it teaches the conscious existence of the spirit after death; Pedobaptists, because it teaches baptism for the remission of sins; Christians, or Disciples, because it teaches the necessity of the baptism of the Holy Spirit in our age, etc. And they all denounce it, because it teaches present revelation, the administration of angels, and the gifts and powers of the Spirit, as all belonging to the people of God in our own age. A list from one of the shrewdest of these critics will be sufficient.

BAPTISM OF FIRE AND THE HOLY GHOST.

Doctrine and Covenants 17:8 is cited, where it is stated that one part of an apostle's duty is to lay on hands for the baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost." This critic says:—

They received the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and the fire part of it will be when the wicked are burned with fire.

No proof is furnished.

John promised the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and of fire; and to whom did he promise it? "To all who would bring forth "fruits meet for repentance," and who were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins:—

I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, . . . he [Christ] . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.—Matt. 3:11.

This baptism began to be realized by the disciples, on the day of Pentecost, a history of which we have in Acts 2:3, 4, which reads as follows:—

And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.

ADAM-GOD THEORY.

Next, we have one of those oft repeated efforts to make the Doctrine and Covenants responsible for all the heresies taught by Brigham Young and Co. So it is claimed that the "Adam-God theory" which was once taught by Brigham Young is also taught in the Doctrine and Covenants. A statement found in section 26:2 is selected as proof, while all that is written elsewhere in the book, on the same point, is ignored. The statement reads as follows:—

And also with Michael, or Adam, the father of all, the prince of all, the ancient of days.

How can any critic consistently affirm that this revelation teaches that Adam is God, when the opening part of the first paragraph reads as follows?

Listen to the voice of Jesus Christ, your Lord, your God, and your Redeemer.

In Doctrine and Covenants 77:3 it is plainly shown that Adam received all his power, knowledge, and authority from the "Holy One,"—

Who hath appointed Michael [Adam], your prince,

and established his feet, and set him upon high; and given unto him the keys of salvation under the counsel and direction of the Holy One, who is without beginning of days or end of life.

Doctrine and Covenants 104: 28 shows in what sense Adam was made "the father of all, the prince of all":—

And the Lord appeared unto them, and they rose up and blessed Adam, and called him Michael, the Prince, the Archangel. And the Lord administered comfort unto Adam, and said unto him, I have set thee to be at the head: a multitude of nations shall come of thee; and thou art a prince over them forever.

So another infidel effort to convict is exposed, and the Doctrine and Covenants is vindicated by simply allowing it to speak for itself. And we need not be at a loss to know what estimate to place upon the assertions of these would-be iconoclasts, when it is known that Brigham Young taught that Adam is God, and the only God with whom we have to do; and they say, almost with one voice,—

There never was a pupil who followed so literally the teachings of his master, as did Brigham Young follow the teachings of Joseph Smith!

And yet Brigham Young taught that Adam is our father and our God, and the only God with whom we have to do; Joseph Smith taught that Adam was a man, standing at the head of the race, and that all his official honor and power came from the "Holy One," whom alone we are to worship, and "who is without beginning of days or end of life."

IS THE DEVIL LUCIFER?

Next, we are told that the idea that Lucifer was once an angel of light, but because of rebellion was thrust down, and became Satan, or the Devil, is another false notion:—

He is not the Devil, but simply the king of Babylon.

This is said by one critic, who cites Isaiah fourteenth chapter as proof.

When this critic finds himself able to produce a passage or passages, from the Doctrine and Covenants which conflict with Isaiah fourteenth chapter, or with the teachings of the Bible concerning Satan, let him do so. We are prepared to show that the teachings of the Doctrine and Covenants are in harmony with the Bible on this point. Let him show, or at least attempt to show, that the one contradicts the other. He has given us no citation to the Doctrine and Covenants on this point, hence we leave his presumptuous assumptions without any further notice.

INFANT BAPTISM CHARGED.

Without doubt the Latter Day Saints who have read the Doctrine and Covenants for more than fifty years, will be astonished to learn that it teaches infant baptism! But if it does, then, of course, it is more harmonious with some of the leading creeds. But this critic does not believe in infant baptism, you see, so he must make the Doctrine and Covenants to teach it, if possible. Wonder if our Pedobaptist friends ever discovered that the Book taught infant baptism? Guess not. To us, this objection is a novel one, and if it possesses any degree of merit over the old ones, the reader ought to have the full benefit of its force. Here is the proof.

In Doctrine and Covenants 53:4, we read that John the Baptist "was baptized while he was yet in his childhood." Thus by ignoring the plain distinction between childhood and infancy, the critic seeks to establish his point. An infant is,

A child in the first period of life, beginning at its birth. A young babe. In common usage a child ceases to be called an infant within the first or second year, but there is no definite period.

The children who are proper subjects for bap-

tism, according to the teachings of the Doctrine and Covenants, are those who are eight years old, and who have been taught to believe in Christ, the Son of the living God; and,

To understand the doctrine of repentance; and of baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands.

And they shall also teach their children to pray, and to walk uprightly before the Lord.

When children who have been thus instructed, desire to obey the gospel, they are admitted into the church by baptism. Why not? Where is the conflict?

SECTION 22: 7, EXAMINED.

Our critic quotes D. C. 22: 7:—

And the first man, of all men, have I called Adam, which is many.

He then adds,

I deny it. Adam does not mean many, but “of the ground, firm.”

Adam was the name given by the Almighty to the first created man. Is it not affirming too much to say that it cannot possibly have any other meaning than “of the ground, firm?” But it is by no means certain that the language objected to states that Adam means many. It is susceptible of a different construction without doing any violence to the paragraph, or the revelation as a whole. Let us transpose the sentence:—

And the first man, of all men, which is many, have I called Adam.

This construction is in harmony with the context found in the same paragraph.

And worlds without number have I created; and I also created them for mine own purpose; and by the Son I created them, which is mine Only Begotten. And the first man, of all men, have I called Adam, which is many. But only an account of this earth, and the inhabitants

thereof, give I unto you. For behold there are many worlds which have passed away by the words of my power. And there are many which now stand, and innumerable are they unto man, but all things are numbered unto me, for they are mine, and I know them.

SECTION 110 IS NOT A REVELATION.

Reference is had to Doctrine and Covenants 110:11, where Joseph Smith, in a letter, not a revelation, makes a wrong use of the Latin phrase *summum bonum*, (the chief good,) putting it "sum and bonum." Does this mark of illiteracy prove that the purported revelations of the Doctrine and Covenants are of human origin? It simply and only proves that Joseph Smith was not a learned man, and this has been admitted by the Latter Day Saints from the beginning. Joseph Smith probably used this phrase as he had heard it used among the people of his boyhood days, without ever taking the trouble to look it up. But how can such an innocent blunder as this, found in a letter written by Joseph Smith, affect the claims of the revelations, all of which, says our critic, "Sidney Rigdon gave to the church"?

BLESSING OF CHILDREN.

Another false notion, it is supposed, is in making the blessing of children an ordinance of the church. (D. C. 17:19.) He challenges the proof from the New Testament. Is the New Testament a proper standard of appeal in this controversy? If so, what becomes of the position that the Bible knows nothing about this fraud, and that teaching in harmony with the Bible is no evidence of divinity? Is the Bible the proper standard once in awhile, and the balance of the time entirely worthless for this purpose?

We are only under obligations to show that the teachings of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants are in harmony with the teachings of the Bible; not that

it does not contain additional light and information. From Matthew 18: 13-15; Mark 10: 13-16, we learn that Jesus took little children in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them. Matthew calls them little children; Mark, young children. The Doctrine and Covenants teaches that "little children," "young children," are to be blessed by the laying on of hands; older, or larger children, to be taught the principles of the gospel, and when they believe, they are to be received into the church by baptism. Right here we are willing to leave it.

TITHES AND OFFERINGS.

Doctrine and Covenants 106:1, 2, is cited, and the following statements made:—

All their surplus property called for. They are after money. The first revelation received by the present prophet is a call for money. Moses only wanted a tenth—they want all the surplus. It is in conflict with Corinthians where it is stated that every man is to pay according as God has prospered him.

If our critic would stop long enough to try, at least, to prove one point, it would certainly be a pleasant relief from a painful monotony. Moses taught the people to pay one tenth, which was a standing law unto them, but they were also required to give,

Burnt offerings . . . heave offerings, . . . and your vows, and your freewill offerings, and the firstlings of your herds and of your flocks.—Deut. 12:5-19. (See also Deut. 14: 22-29; 26: 12, 13.)

These tithes and offerings were for the priesthood of God, and for,

The stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled.

The revelation objected to says the surplus is to be used,

For the building of mine house, and for the laying the foundation of Zion, and for the priesthood, and for the debts of the presidency of my church.

(The debts referred to are such as were incurred in legitimate church work, that is, "laying the foundation of Zion.") Elsewhere, the Doctrine and Covenants teaches that tithing, not a giving of all their surplus, is a permanent law for the support of "the poor and needy." (D. C. 42: 8, 11; 64: 5.)

The revelation received by the "present prophet" charges the Twelve and Bishop to take measures "to execute the law of tithing." The reasons given for the commandment are; first, the "promulgation of the gospel," and, second, "as a means of fulfilling the law." It also says:—

And let them before God see to it, that the temporal means so obtained is truly used for the purposes of the church, and not as a weapon of power in the hands of one man for the oppression of others, or for the purposes of self-aggrandizement by anyone, be he whomsoever he may be.

This revelation is in complete harmony with what is written in 1 Corinthians 16: 1, 2; 2 Corinthians 9: 6, 7. Each one is to give "as God hath prospered him," and "according as he purposeth in his heart."

"Those who are not tithed will be burned," says a persistent critic, referring to Doctrine and Covenants 64: 5. Yes, the works which are in harmony with God's word will abide; those which are not, will be burned, and the doers of them will suffer loss. (1 Cor. 3: 12-15.)

CHAPTER VI.

DOES THE BOOK TEACH STEALING?

When our critics, as a number of them do, affirm that "the Doctrine and Covenants teaches stealing," and quote 64: 6, as proof, they clearly reveal the purpose of their attack, and the badness of their case. It reads as follows:—

Behold, it is said in my laws, or forbidden, to get in debt to thine enemies; but behold, it is not said at any time, that the Lord should not take when he please, and pay as seemeth him good; wherefore, as ye are agents, and ye are on the Lord's errand; and whatever ye do according to the will of the Lord, is the Lord's business, and he hath sent you to provide for his saints in these last days, that they may obtain an inheritance in the land of Zion, etc.

From the above, our opponents draw an inference, and then affirm that the Doctrine and Covenants authorizes stealing! In the preceding paragraph, Whitney and Gilbert are forbidden to sell their store in Kirtland. Two months before this, at Independence, Missouri, the following instructions were given to Gilbert and Partridge, whose business it was to locate the Saints in the land of Missouri:—

Let my servant Sidney Gilbert, stand in the office which I have appointed him, to receive moneys, to be an agent unto my church, to buy land in all the regions round about, inasmuch as can be in righteousness, and as wisdom shall direct.

Let my servant Edward Partridge, stand in the office which I have appointed him, to divide the saints their inheritance, even as I have commanded; and also those whom he has appointed to assist him.

And again, verily I say unto you, let my servant Sidney Gilbert plant himself in this place, and establish a store, that he may sell goods without fraud, that he may obtain money to buy lands for the good of the saints, and

that he may obtain whatsoever things the disciples may need to plant them in their inheritance.—D. C. 57: 2-4.

In carrying out the above instructions these men found themselves sorely pressed for money, and they hesitated to go into debt. The Lord tells them that they are his agents, and whatsoever they do according to his will is the Lord's business." Hence they were to take as agents of the Lord, "and pay as seemeth him good." Is this stealing?

The Lord simply and only states that he will approve of that which is done according to his will. Viewed from the standpoint of the teachings of this book, is it the Lord's will that his people should steal? Let us see. In section 42 we have the law given to govern the church till the second advent of Christ. On this point we read:—

Thou shalt not steal; and he that stealeth and will not repent, shall be cast out.—Par. 7.

And if a man or woman shall rob, he or she shall be delivered up unto the law of the land. And if he or she shall steal, he or she shall be delivered up unto the law of the land.—Par. 22.

In a revelation given at Independence, Missouri, August, 1831, only one month before the one to which our opponents object, among other injunctions and prohibitions, we have the following:—

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Thou shalt not steal; neither commit adultery, nor kill nor do anything like unto it.—D. C. 59: 2.

And all this was given to be observed that they might be prosperous in the land of Zion.

In section 101:13, given in 1834, we have the following statement:—

And again, verily I say unto you, concerning your debts, behold it is my will that you should pay all your debts, etc.

The oft repeated statement that the book au-

thorizes the Latter Day Saints to steal, is as unkind as it is untrue; and it indicates more of a malicious intent to destroy and break down, *at all hazards*, than a loving disposition and purpose to save from error. The statement of Paul in 1 Corinthians 10: 24 furnishes as good grounds for affirming, as some infidels do, that the Bible teaches stealing. It reads as follows:—

Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth.

DID THE PREDICTIONS FAIL?

Next, we are told that certain predictions made by Joseph Smith and published in the Doctrine and Covenants, have failed. Section 98: 4 is cited:—

Zion shall not be moved out of her place.

Why do not these ministers who complain so loudly at the unfairness and dishonesty of infidels, quote the balance of the passage, instead of stopping at a comma in the midst of a sentence? Here it is:—

Notwithstanding her children are scattered, they that remain and are pure in heart shall return and come to their inheritances; they and their children, with songs of everlasting joy; to build up the waste places of Zion.

Thus we see that Zion here refers to the place, —location,—instead of to the Saints. Do our critics purposely mislead in this way, or are they ignorant of the reading of the other part of the sentence?

Now section 98:10 is cited, but not quoted, and the statement is made that,

Zion is to be built up no more to be thrown down.

A reading of the passage is a sufficient refutation of the claim that it has failed:—

There is even now already in store a sufficient, yea, even abundance to redeem Zion, and establish her waste places, no more to be thrown down, were the churches, who call themselves after my name, willing to hearken to my voice.

It must be shown that the stated condition upon which Zion might be built up no more to be thrown down, has been fully complied with before a failure can be properly claimed.

Next our attention is directed to section 94:5, with the statement,

Zion was to rejoice and the wicked to mourn.

This, it is claimed, is false.

Let us look at the statement itself. We have little cause for fear so long as an intelligent reading of the book will dispel the objections urged:—

Therefore verily thus saith the Lord, let Zion rejoice, for this is Zion, **THE PURE IN HEART**; therefore let Zion rejoice, while all the wicked shall mourn.

The word "Zion," when applied to the Saints, refers to the pure in heart. If the pure in heart may not properly rejoice, "while all the wicked mourn," what becomes of the teachings of the Bible? Do these men have any faith in God, and in the principles of truth and right taught in the Bible? The statement, "Let Zion rejoice," is an injunction, not a prophecy. The only prophetic statement is, "while all the wicked shall mourn." Do our opponents believe that this has failed in the past, and will continue to fail in the future? They must answer for themselves; but if they do so believe, it will throw light upon the strange methods and policies pursued in their efforts to destroy this work.

Another false prediction, it is claimed, is found in section 100:5. It is stated that,

Baurak Ale (Joseph Smith), with his young men and warriors, were to go up to the land of Zion and conquer their enemies. He did not do it, but was himself conquered.

As usual, the above is a clear misrepresentation of the paragraph referred to, when taken as a whole. Here it is:—

Therefore, let my servant Baurak Ale say unto the strength of my house, my young men and the middle aged, gather yourselves together unto the land of Zion, upon the land which I have bought with moneys that have been consecrated unto me; and let all the churches send up wise men, with their moneys, and purchase lands even as I have commanded them; and inasmuch as mine enemies come against you to drive you from my goodly land, which I have consecrated to be the land of Zion; even from your own lands after these testimonies, which ye have brought before me, against them, ye shall curse them; and whomsoever ye curse, I will curse; and ye shall avenge me of mine enemies; and my presence shall be with you, even in avenging me of mine enemies, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.

The lands were to be bought with moneys consecrated to the Lord's use. The Saints were to protect their homes against the attacks of those who should come to drive them away simply because their religious belief was different from theirs! The cursing and avenging were of God, not man, done through the instrumentality of his people, as his presence should be with them. A few months later the Lord says to these same "young men and warriors,"—

And it is expedient in me, that they should be brought thus far, for a trial of their faith.—D. C. 102: 5.

In this revelation, and the one preceding it, the Saints are taught to exhaust every means provided in the laws of the land before resorting to force in protecting their homes.

God said to Abraham:—

And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee.—Gen. 12: 3.

Isaac said to Jacob:—

Cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee.—Gen. 27: 29.

NAUVOO HOUSE TO BE AN ABIDING PLACE.

The next objection raised is:—

Joseph Smith's posterity was to have an inheritance and abiding place in the Nauvoo house, forever. (D. C. 107: 18.)

The language of the paragraph is simply expressive of the Lord's will, to be realized under certain conditions, plainly expressed in other parts of the same revelation. (See paragraphs 10, 13, 14.) The last named reads as follows:—

And it shall come to pass, that if you build an house unto my name, and do not do the things that I say, I will not perform the oath which I make unto you, neither fulfill the promises which you expect at my hands, saith the Lord; for instead of blessings, ye, by your own works, bring cursings, wrath, indignation and judgments, upon your own heads, by your follies, and by all your abominations, which ye practice before me, saith the Lord.

The only failure was upon the part of those who professed to be Saints; and I presume neither God, nor his word, are justly responsible for that failure.

It surely seems that when our opponents refer to Doctrine and Covenants 83: 2, and state that "the revelation so far has been a failure," their stock in trade has nearly run out. The idea of denouncing prophecy as a failure for the simple and only reason that it is yet unfulfilled, is rather a novel one. Why do not these critics pronounce the statement false because they do not believe it will ever be fulfilled!

This generation shall not all pass away until an house be built unto the Lord, etc.

Why not wait till the failure occurs.

ZION TO INCREASE IN BEAUTY.

Doctrine and Covenants 81:4 is now cited, and the following statements made:—

Zion was to increase in beauty and holiness while the wicked mourn. Joseph was mistaken.

The paragraph referred to says nothing about the wicked mourning; but it does say that,

Zion must increase in beauty, and in holiness; her borders must be enlarged; her stakes must be strengthened; yea, verily I say unto you, Zion must arise and put on her beautiful garments.

The passage is simply a statement of the will of God concerning his work, and that that work will eventually succeed. It is similar to the statement of Jesus found in Matthew 16: 18:—

And upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

That is, though the apostasy of the church, as a body, and disaster upon disaster intervene, yet she will prevail over every opposition, and win a glorious victory at the last. God's work cannot fail. That disaster and trial awaited Zion before this final triumph, is clear from many statements of the Doctrine and Covenants:—

And, now I give unto you a word concerning Zion. Zion shall be redeemed, although she is chastened for a little season.—D. C. 97: 4.

Zion shall not be moved out of her place, notwithstanding her children are scattered, they that remain and are pure in heart shall return and come to their inheritances; they and their children, with songs of everlasting joy; to build up the waste places of Zion.—D. C. 98: 4.

FAILURE OF THE CRITICS.

If some other man can be found, who is able to do what our critics have signally failed to accomplish so far; viz., furnish such reasons against our faith as should cause all people of common intelligence, who profess to be Latter Day Saints, to renounce their

faith, it is clearly his privilege and duty to do so; but until this is done, such efforts as those which we have reviewed in the foregoing pages, can only affect the uninformed, and those who are determined to believe in a certain way without regard to evidence for or against. All such efforts so far as efficacy is concerned, may properly be compared to a furious attempt to beat down a stone wall with a bunch of feathers!

If space would permit, we would gladly present a number of reasons for believing the Doctrine and Covenants to be true, and its revelations divine; but, as it is, with a few brief statements we close this review.

THE TEACHINGS OF THE BOOK PURE AND DIVINE.

Right in the beginning of the work, God was careful to enjoin and make emphatic those great leading principles of righteousness which have moved the world for good, and which have transformed the human character into the Christlike, and without which no man can see God. (D. C. 1:5; 2:1-4; 3:1, 2; 5:8; 42:8.) In these passages are taught, loyalty to God—an entire submission to his will as taught in the Scriptures and revealed by the Spirit; an entire forsaking of all sin; faith, hope, charity, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, brotherly kindness, godliness, humility, and diligence.

The book itself invites and enjoins us to test its claims in such a way as to discover and expose that which is human, and establish in our hearts that which is divine. For this reason men and devils cannot overcome the work, and God will not fight against his own.

That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, to whose righteous rule we must all submit, is a leading claim of the book all the way through. In

connection with this, the principles of the gospel as we find them in the New Testament are enjoined.

The great rules by which we are to know the children of God from the children of the world, as taught by Jesus and his apostles, are made prominent and plain, being given to us in our own language:—

And again, I will give unto you a pattern in all things, that ye may not be deceived; for Satan is abroad in the land, and he goeth forth deceiving the nations; wherefore he that prayeth whose spirit is contrite, the same is accepted of me, if he obey mine ordinances. He that speaketh, whose spirit is contrite, whose language is meek, and edifieth, the same is of God, if he obey mine ordinances.—D. C. 52: 4.

We believe that such rules and principles will commend themselves to the earnest and intelligent seeker after truth. *Read, think, pray;* “HAVE FAITH IN GOD.”