

LEAH'S REPLY TO "UNKNOWN."

Editor Tribune.—The most impressive thing in the second communication of the "Unknown" is its very striking difference of spirit as compared with the first. Its arrogance, if not its confidence, seems to have left him, and he writes in a spirit more in harmony with the nature of the subject. I congratulate him upon the improvement. When a book which is sacred to tens of thousands of intelligent people, and which is accepted by them as a revelation from God, is so criticized, a decent regard for propriety requires that it should be discussed in a respectful manner, and all the more so if the critic regards those who accept the book as deceived, and would lead them from their delusion.

In this connection also I desire to say a word on an incidental matter on which the "Unknown" lays some stress, viz., that the "reading, thinking, truth-telling" of this country have come to the conclusion that the Book of Mormon is fiction. The "Unknown" has the idea that these "millions" have examined the Book of Mormon and intelligently judged it to be fiction—an impression most erroneous, for out of the ninety millions of the people of our country it is safe to say not more than two or three millions have ever read the Book of Mormon, this in the most superficial manner and in the most prejudiced manner of criticism on which the "Unknown" is based. The misrepresentations made concerning it, in fact, because of these misrepresentations, contempt has preceded examination, a circumstance which keeps them ignorant of the Book of Mormon. This much to remind the reader that there is no force in the appeal of the "Unknown" to the supposed condemnation of the Book of Mormon by the "reading, thinking, truth-telling" millions of this country.

OPPOSITION'S CRITICISM.
At this point the gentleman proceeds with a show of orderly argument to lay down what he considers two self-evident canons of criticism, the first of which is that the Book of Mormon is a book which has been written in ancient times and yet quotes from authors not born until centuries after. It is a "spurious" book. This canon of criticism, however, is not applicable to books in general, and in no sense be made to do service against the Book of Mormon. When he formulated his canon of criticism, as he has done, the gentleman fails to recognize the fact that, while the Book of Mormon is an ancient book, it is largely a prophetic book, and the strongest complaint that can be made against it is that some of its prophecies are here and there translated in phraseology somewhat similar to that of writers living subsequent to the period in which it was written. In explanation of this fact I have urged that the translator, Joseph Smith, being acquainted with the New Testament writings, and his dictation influenced by the phraseology of those writers, sometimes expressed the thoughts and predictions of the ancient writers in the Book of Mormon with the same words as the events, to them then future, found in the Book of Mormon, and is the theory reasonable that in translating their statements of these events Joseph Smith's dictation would be influenced by the phraseology of the New Testament? In dealing with the question of the New Testament phraseology in the Book of Mormon, it is Joseph Smith, and not the "Unknown," who is to be dealt with, not the original writer. A distinction which is persistently refused to recognize.

AS TO PROPHECY.
And now as to the point whether the writers of the Book of Mormon could be acquainted with the events, ideas and doctrines which Joseph Smith translated here and there in New Testament phraseology. The "Unknown" appears ignorant of the great truth that prophecy is but history reversed. He forgets that known unto God are all His works and words from the beginning to the end, and that He has at various times made known future events in the clearest manner to His prophets who, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, have recorded them. The Prophet Isaiah, for example, before the birth of Cyrus, foretold his name; declared that he should subdue kingdoms, including Babylon, set free the people of God held in bondage there and rebuild the House of the Lord at Jerusalem. And all this as clearly as the historians could write it after the events themselves took place. To Daniel he revealed the rise, fall and succession of the leading empires and nations of the world, even to the time of the establishment of God's kingdom in power to hold universal sway in the latter days, an event not yet fulfilled. To the prophets of Israel nearly every important event of the Jewish history was made known. They foretold that He would be born of a virgin, that His name would signify "God with us"; that He would be the place of His birth; that He would journey into Egypt with His parents, that He would reside in Nazareth, that a messenger would prepare the way before Him, that He should ride in triumph into Jerusalem upon a colt, the foal of an ass; that He would be afflicted and despised; that He would be made of sorrows and acquainted with grief; that He would be despised and rejected of men; that men would turn their faces from Him in His affliction; that He would be esteemed as stricken and smitten of God; that He would be wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; that the chastisement of men would be laid upon Him, and by His stripes would they be healed; that upon Him would God lay the iniquity of us all; that He would be oppressed and afflicted, yet give not his mouth; that as a lamb he would be silent before his shearer; that as a lamb he would be led to the slaughter; that He would be betrayed for silver; that men would divide his garment and cast lots for His vesture; that they would give Him vinegar to drink; that a bone of Him should be broken; that He should be taken from prison and from judgment; that He would be buried with the wicked and the rich in His death; but notwithstanding this He should not see corruption (i. e., His body should not decay); and that, the third day, He should rise from the dead, and that He should be glorified before the eyes of all men. This is prophetic history. In like manner, the "Unknown" is found in the Book of Mormon, and is found in greater plainness than in the New Testament, because the Nephties have not passed through the hands of an Arius, a Philo and a Clement, who by interpretation of the plain and precious parts of the Jewish Scriptures, and by the Lord revealing to the Jewish prophets these things, have been able to bring to light the events in the history of the Jewish people before the Messiah's birth, and to do so with a thought a strange way (especially by one who believes in the fact of revelation) if God imparted the same knowledge to the Nephties.

prophets. In fact it is but reasonable to suppose that if God gave them revelations at all He would do so.

ONE QUESTION CONSIDERED.

There remains to be considered under this head only this question: Is it a fair objection to the Book of Mormon, because Joseph Smith, finding the prophetic history of the savior in the Jewish record, translated it in phraseology here and there found in the New Testament? Or in the language of accomplished fact, My contention is that it cannot be considered a fatal objection, or even a serious difficulty, especially when one considers upon what slight similarity the "Unknown" seizes to make good his objection. For example, when he tries to make it appear that I was in error when saying that the several passages he had already quoted practically exhausted the instances of New Testament phraseology in the writings of Nephi, he gives us such cases as these:

Nephi—Lehi prophesied that "these plates of brass should go forth unto all nations, kindreds, tongues and people who were of his seed."

Revelations—An angel should bring forth the gospel to be preached "to every nation and kindred and tongue and people."

Nephi—For he is the same yesterday, today and forever.

Hebrews—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday today and forever.

Nephi—I was caught away in the spirit of the Lord.

Acts—The spirit of the Lord caught Philip that the church saw him no more.

"In Nephi, xiv, 1," says the "Unknown," "the repeated expression mother of abominations and mother of harlots, are taken from Revelations, xvi, 9. I here quote Nephi, xiv, 1: 'And it shall come to pass that if the Gentiles shall hearken unto the Lamb of God in that day that he shall manifest himself unto them in word, and also in power, in very deed, unto the taking away of their stumbling blocks.' After reading it I refer to what the 'Unknown' says under the heading, 'A VITAL POINT.' I accounted for the imperfections of the language of the Book of Mormon on the ground that the translator obtained his ideas from the Nephties record, he was left to express that thought in such language as he was master of, as he was uneducated that language was here and there faulty; and I accounted for the existence of some passages of the Bible in the Book of Mormon by saying that where Joseph Smith found the words of the prophets in the Jewish Scriptures which the Nephties had with them or when the teachings of Messiah in their order followed, the language of our English Bible, the 'Unknown' considers is 'vital,' and he holds that the quotations would not be found in this translation of the Nephties record if the Book of Mormon is honest in its claim of being an ancient book. He argues that if Joseph Smith could thus incorporate these quoted passages, then there is nothing to hinder him putting into the Book of Mormon what he found in his quotations from other English books, from Shakespeare, from books of geography and history, and the peculiar views of Sidney Rigdon, with which the book is saturated, or his own views, and this he claims is just what he did. Well, of course, there is nothing that would prevent Joseph Smith from following a course of this kind if he was the uneducated imposter and scoundrel that the 'Unknown' tries to make him appear to be, but that is just what Joseph Smith was not, and hence his own honesty and integrity prevented his putting in quotations from the Bible or any other book except just what the facts and statements in the Nephties records justified him in adopting, and as for the views of Sidney Rigdon being incorporated in it, that is impossible since it is a well-established, incontrovertible fact that Sidney Rigdon never saw either Joseph Smith or the Book of Mormon until six months after the book had been published.

WHAT UNKNOWN THINKS.

The "Unknown" thinks I run counter to the statements of Martin Harris and David Whitmer as to the manner in which the Book of Mormon was translated, as he claims that in his opinion there is nothing said about Urim and Thummim, and nothing is said about "any great mental and spiritual effort on Joseph's part" in obtaining the translation. True, there is nothing in the statement of Whitmer and Harris quoted by the "Unknown" to that effect, but these statements are historical incidents connected with the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and the fact that the translation was not mechanical, and in the very book of David Whitmer, quoted by the "Unknown," it is stated that the prophet had to be in a very exalted mental and spiritual state of mind before he could exercise his gift of translation. But we have a better description of the manner of translation than that given by Whitmer or Harris. In the course of translation Oliver Cowdery became desirous to translate, and in a revelation the Lord promised him that power. "Yea, behold I will tell you, I, the Lord, in your mind, and in your heart, by the Holy Ghost which shall come upon you, and which shall dwell in your heart. Oliver made the attempt to translate and failed; whereupon the Lord in a subsequent revelation gave this as the reason of his failure: 'Behold you have not understood; you have supposed that I would give it (i. e., the translation) unto you, when you took no thought save it was to ask me; but behold, I say unto you, that you must study it out in your mind; then you must ask me if it be right, and if it is right I will cause that your bosom shall burn within you; therefore you shall feel that it is right; but if it be not right, you shall have no such feelings, but you shall have a stinging of the tongue, that shall cause you to forget the thing which I have said.' (Doctrine and Covenants, Section 9, verses 9-12.) The latter still kills it. It is the spirit that giveth life.

God to the few books contained in the Bible. The coming forth of the Book of Mormon contradicts that equally erroneous sectarian notion that God had ceased to give revelations to men and had spoken for the last time to His children. And yet, in the presence of this array of great facts and truths which the Book of Mormon makes known, and which are made known nowhere else (and the half has not been told here), men of the order of intellect of this "Unknown" critic stand chattering like parrots about their being nothing new or of value in the Book of Mormon, and seek to cast discredit upon it by their capricious criticisms upon the defects of the language in which it is translated, and because its translator has coached some of its glorious truths in the New Testament phraseology familiar to him. How puerile all such criticism seems, and how refreshing it is to hear God saying, "He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully, for what is the chaff of the wind, saith the Lord." (Jeremiah xxiii, 28.) The latter still kills it. It is the spirit that giveth life.

SPAUDLING THEORY.
In the background of the "Unknown's" discussion one may see the influence of what is called the Spaulding theory of the origin of the Book of Mormon, and in his second communication he indirectly refers to it by saying that "there are at least 12 persons, discover and reliable so far as I can discover, who testify that the substance of this Book of Mormon, with all its queer names of places and persons, its strange history, its battles and slaughters, its continual prosperity, times of disaster, periods of great righteousness, when prophets with their divine message influenced the people to keep the commandments of God, followed by a time of apostasy and spiritual depression, and ultimately succumbed to the fate which overtakes all nations that depart from truth and righteousness. The second civilization resulted from two colonies which came from Judea: one led by Lehi, landing in South America; the other by Shem, who came from the East, and who landed in North America. These colonies subsisted and flourished until a great nation was formed out of them. This nation, like others, followed the beaten track of the history of other nations. In periods of righteousness, periods of truth and righteousness, they had their prophets, philosophers, statesmen, patriots, traitors, and passed through all the experiences incident to national existence. Their history is the poet's moral of all human tales."

"This but the same rehearsal of the past: First freedom, and then glory—when that fails, then comes the fall. Wealth, Vice, corruption—barbarism at last. And history with all her volumes vast hath but one page!"

After he had completed his ministry in Judea, the resurrected Messiah appeared among the Nephties, this latter nation in fulfillment of his promise to his fathers, or his own view, and this he claims is just what he did. Well, of course, there is nothing that would prevent Joseph Smith from following a course of this kind if he was the uneducated imposter and scoundrel that the "Unknown" tries to make him appear to be, but that is just what Joseph Smith was not, and hence his own honesty and integrity prevented his putting in quotations from the Bible or any other book except just what the facts and statements in the Nephties records justified him in adopting, and as for the views of Sidney Rigdon being incorporated in it, that is impossible since it is a well-established, incontrovertible fact that Sidney Rigdon never saw either Joseph Smith or the Book of Mormon until six months after the book had been published.

SECOND CRITICISM.
Having disposed of the question relating to translation, I take up the "Unknown's" second criticism, which he states in these terms:

"Any book which professes to be a divine revelation to the people of the present time, and yet reveals nothing which it does not appropriate from some other book or source of knowledge already in the possession of the people, is a spurious book."

The Book of Mormon reveals the fact that there existed two great civilizations on the American continent. The first was established by a colony which left the valley of the Euphrates in very ancient times, established themselves in the North American continent, and in time grew to be a great nation far advanced in civilization. This race passed through all the vicissitudes incident to national existence, periods of prosperity, times of disaster, periods of great righteousness, when prophets with their divine message influenced the people to keep the commandments of God, followed by a time of apostasy and spiritual depression, and ultimately succumbed to the fate which overtakes all nations that depart from truth and righteousness. The second civilization resulted from two colonies which came from Judea: one led by Lehi, landing in South America; the other by Shem, who came from the East, and who landed in North America. These colonies subsisted and flourished until a great nation was formed out of them. This nation, like others, followed the beaten track of the history of other nations. In periods of righteousness, periods of truth and righteousness, they had their prophets, philosophers, statesmen, patriots, traitors, and passed through all the experiences incident to national existence. Their history is the poet's moral of all human tales."

"This but the same rehearsal of the past: First freedom, and then glory—when that fails, then comes the fall. Wealth, Vice, corruption—barbarism at last. And history with all her volumes vast hath but one page!"

After he had completed his ministry in Judea, the resurrected Messiah appeared among the Nephties, this latter nation in fulfillment of his promise to his fathers, or his own view, and this he claims is just what he did. Well, of course, there is nothing that would prevent Joseph Smith from following a course of this kind if he was the uneducated imposter and scoundrel that the "Unknown" tries to make him appear to be, but that is just what Joseph Smith was not, and hence his own honesty and integrity prevented his putting in quotations from the Bible or any other book except just what the facts and statements in the Nephties records justified him in adopting, and as for the views of Sidney Rigdon being incorporated in it, that is impossible since it is a well-established, incontrovertible fact that Sidney Rigdon never saw either Joseph Smith or the Book of Mormon until six months after the book had been published.

WHAT UNKNOWN THINKS.

The "Unknown" thinks I run counter to the statements of Martin Harris and David Whitmer as to the manner in which the Book of Mormon was translated, as he claims that in his opinion there is nothing said about Urim and Thummim, and nothing is said about "any great mental and spiritual effort on Joseph's part" in obtaining the translation. True, there is nothing in the statement of Whitmer and Harris quoted by the "Unknown" to that effect, but these statements are historical incidents connected with the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and the fact that the translation was not mechanical, and in the very book of David Whitmer, quoted by the "Unknown," it is stated that the prophet had to be in a very exalted mental and spiritual state of mind before he could exercise his gift of translation. But we have a better description of the manner of translation than that given by Whitmer or Harris. In the course of translation Oliver Cowdery became desirous to translate, and in a revelation the Lord promised him that power. "Yea, behold I will tell you, I, the Lord, in your mind, and in your heart, by the Holy Ghost which shall come upon you, and which shall dwell in your heart. Oliver made the attempt to translate and failed; whereupon the Lord in a subsequent revelation gave this as the reason of his failure: 'Behold you have not understood; you have supposed that I would give it (i. e., the translation) unto you, when you took no thought save it was to ask me; but behold, I say unto you, that you must study it out in your mind; then you must ask me if it be right, and if it is right I will cause that your bosom shall burn within you; therefore you shall feel that it is right; but if it be not right, you shall have no such feelings, but you shall have a stinging of the tongue, that shall cause you to forget the thing which I have said.' (Doctrine and Covenants, Section 9, verses 9-12.) The latter still kills it. It is the spirit that giveth life.

the two in general or in detail. These seem to be no name or incident common to the two. . . . Some other explanation of the origin of the Book of Mormon must be found. The truth of President Fairchild's statement can be verified by any one who will compare the two.

NEPHI AND SHAKESPEARE.

The "Unknown" has certainly plunged into the for respecting his alleged connection between Nephi and Shakespeare, and by some sort of mental contortion, utterly inexplicable, has arrived at the conclusion that we must suppose that Nephi had a copy of the English Bible, as well as the Jewish Scriptures, and also a copy of Shakespeare, in order to account for the passage in the Book of Mormon which he alleges is a quotation from the English poet. I must come to the rescue of the "Unknown" in this matter. I begin to feel some degree of commiseration for him in this very stupid matter. Attend, then, Lehi lived in Judea in the sixth and sixth century, B. C. He was acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and the book of Job, and when he departed from Jerusalem for the western world his colony took with them these same Scriptures. Through them he became familiar in the Hebrew with Job's—"Let me alone, that I may take comfort a little before I go whence I shall not return." Also Job's—"When a few years are come, then I shall go away whence I shall not return." When Lehi's own hour of departure hence had come, impressed with this solemn thought of Job's, he gave expression to it in Hebrew. The saying was recorded by his son Nephi in the Egyptian characters employed by him in making his record. Observe that we have traced these ideas of the "Unknown" to their source, and we find that when I shall not return" into the Nephties records without the aid of the English Bible or Shakespeare. When Joseph Smith came to this thought in Nephi, the thought, mark you, he translated it into the English, and he translated it into the English of Job in English, his translation followed somewhat the phraseology of Job in our English version. Shakespeare nowhere appears in all this, and if he did, it would have been in the old Hebrew and Nephties thought in Shakespeare's exact phraseology instead of that of our English version of Job, it would have been no valid objection to the Book of Mormon, for Shakespeare obtained his thought, and even paraphrased the very language of Job in his English Bible. Ah, but the "Unknown" points out that Shakespeare died in 1616, and the English version of the Bible was only published in 1611, only five years before the poet's death! Are we to infer from this that "My" thinks Shakespeare had no English Bible from which to paraphrase this passage? If so—and I can see nothing in the "Unknown" to these dates—then I would inform the gentleman that as there were brave men before Agamemnon, so were there English Bibles before Shakespeare. We have the English Bible, 1530-1534; Tyndale's English translation, 1530; Miles Coverdale's English translation, 1535, dedicated to Henry VIII. for the time issued under the royal sanction. From any of these versions Shakespeare could have paraphrased Job's words.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

The "Unknown" seems somewhat distressed in his efforts to account for the few original and moral religious truths I quoted him from the Book of Mormon. Especially "Fools mock, but they shall mourn." He says nothing new in that, since in Proverbs it is said "Fools make a mock of sin." True, but it appears from the context where the Book of Mormon passage occurs that the particular "fools" the writer had in mind were those who mocked at righteousness and truth, and hence he predicts that they shall come to grief, and the consequences are not stated, at least not in that passage. I trust, however, the "Unknown" will not worry over much. The star of hope may yet appear above life's horizon for him. The jargon-like sentences, "Fools mock, but they shall mourn," is immediately followed by "My grace is sufficient for the meek," and it appears to me if this discussion continues through a few more papers, and there should continue to be manifested as much difference between each succeeding communication of "Me" as there is between the paragraphs of his first letter and the humility of his second, in time I am sure he would be prepared to enter a contest even with Moses for the distinction of being the meekest of men.

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

that it can be marshaled to sustain the truth of the Book of Mormon has not yet been presented. The manner in which the discussion began made this impossible. Those who before this review as evidence on the positive side concerning the Book of Mormon when the discussion began, and the power of the "Unknown" was on the negative side of the question. A proper discussion of the Book of Mormon would require that we who affirm its divine origin should have the opportunity of presenting the affirmative evidence, followed by an argument against that evidence, with answer and rejoinder to follow. All of which, of course, the necessary indication of necessary compromise makes impossible. These remarks, of course, are in no way a complaint as to the present opportunity presented to the writer by "The Tribune," as to him has been extended equal opportunity and courtesy with his opponent, for which I desire to express my appreciation. I am satisfied with this discussion, but merely desire to call attention to the enforced limits of its scope. Respectfully yours,

Not a Sick Day Since.
"I was taken severely sick with kidney trouble. I tried all sorts of medicine, none of which relieved me. One day I saw an ad. of your Electric Bitters and determined to try that. After taking a few doses I felt relieved, and soon there after was entirely cured. I have not had a sick day since. Neighbors of mine have been cured of Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Liver and Kidney troubles and General Debility. This is what E. F. Bess, of Fremont, N. C., writes. Only 50c. at Z. C. M. I. Drug Store."

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

As to the rest of the "Unknown's" matters, the limits of this writing preclude further comment. Neither is it necessary, for it is all as shallow, not to say as stupid, as the "Unknown" in the passage here criticized.

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence

that it can be marshaled to sustain the truth of the Book of Mormon has not yet been presented. The manner in which the discussion began made this impossible. Those who before this review as evidence on the positive side concerning the Book of Mormon when the discussion began, and the power of the "Unknown" was on the negative side of the question. A proper discussion of the Book of Mormon would require that we who affirm its divine origin should have the opportunity of presenting the affirmative evidence, followed by an argument against that evidence, with answer and rejoinder to follow. All of which, of course, the necessary indication of necessary compromise makes impossible. These remarks, of course, are in no way a complaint as to the present opportunity presented to the writer by "The Tribune," as to him has been extended equal opportunity and courtesy with his opponent, for which I desire to express my appreciation. I am satisfied with this discussion, but merely desire to call attention to the enforced limits of its scope. Respectfully yours,

Not a Sick Day Since.
"I was taken severely sick with kidney trouble. I tried all sorts of medicine, none of which relieved me. One day I saw an ad. of your Electric Bitters and determined to try that. After taking a few doses I felt relieved, and soon there after was entirely cured. I have not had a sick day since. Neighbors of mine have been cured of Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Liver and Kidney troubles and General Debility. This is what E. F. Bess, of Fremont, N. C., writes. Only 50c. at Z. C. M. I. Drug Store."

A WORD IN CONCLUSION.
Just a word in conclusion, not to the "Unknown," but to the readers of these papers. I would have them remember that in this discussion the evidence