

This objection is chiefly a misstatement of a fact. Anyone who is familiar with the historic data in the two venerable volumes, the Old Testament and the Book of Mormon, will admit that the outlines are *not* identical or even similar. In the Old Testament we trace the history of the covenant people from their progenitor Abraham, through their servitude in Egypt and wonderful deliverance; their entrance in Canaan, their wars, their apostacy and its consequences, the second captivity; their restoration in part and the following spiritual decline resulting in their rejection of Christ and dispersion among all nations. But the Book of Mormon has a far different history to tell. Here we find a brief sketch of the settling of America and the experiences of the different settlers who came to this continent. It tells of their growth, their wars, of the punishment for their sins and the rewards for their righteousness.

Of course, individuals are more or less alike all over the world and in all ages. So are nations. Any history of any nation must therefore necessarily touch upon points that are common to all. If we peruse the political history of any two countries we will find incidents of war and peace; commercial transactions, scientific discoveries and many other items treated on in both. The two sacred records now under consideration can form no exception to this rule. They necessarily touch upon the most notable events that happened among the people whose history they have perpetuated. When we, therefore, in both find recorded contentions and exterminating wars, miracles of various kinds, convulsions in nature such as earthquakes, darkness, etc., this is so far from throwing doubts upon the genuineness of either one of these two books, that, to a thoughtful student, it is a strong proof in favor of the authenticity of both.

To illustrate this: We know that every genuine history of nations with which we are acquainted records the building of cities, the cultivation of the soil, the formation of armies and navies, and so on. Now, suppose a man writes what purports to be a history of a nation that never built a house, never plowed a field, never had a war, never wrote a book, in short, in the history of which never occurred one incident common to incidents in the history of other nations of this earth. Would not common sense compel us to

stamp such a work as a mere fiction? Would it be possible to mistake Plato's sketch of an ideal state for a true history? We think not. That the Book of Mormon is no fiction, but an authentic record of real, not invented, incidents is supported by the very fact that it deals with matter which in some respects is similar to that with which the authors of the Old Testament deal.

It may be true to some extent that the Book of Mormon presupposes the Old Testament and that the former could hardly have been written had not the latter been in existence first. But this should not be made a ground of objection. The New Testament also has grown out of the old Scriptures. Without the existence of the Old Testament the New could never have been written, or understood. All God's works are of that nature. They depend on each other, supplement and explain each other and they must all be taken together in order to be seen in the fullness of perfection. The relation of the Book of Mormon to the other Scriptures is no exception to this well known rule. Had there been no Old Testament, there could have been neither Book of Mormon, nor New Testament, nor anything else which constitutes the dispensations of God.

The other objection is thus stated:

"Another startling thought must strike the student of the Book of Mormon, namely, that the book was remarkably familiar with terms never to be found in the Old Testament, and found for the first time in the New Testament. For instance, the Book of Mormon spoke of our Lord as 'Jesus Christ,' as 'the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth,' as 'the Good Shepherd,' as 'the Alpha and Omega,' as 'the Lamb of God,' as 'the life and light of the world,' applying these terms to Him in connection with a record or prophecy of a date centuries prior to the advent in Palestine. Two facts arrested the attention. The one was that, although the Old Testament Scriptures were admittedly the holy oracles of God, they contained no such reference to the Lord Jesus."

Two facts are clear from this objection: First, that Dr. Duncan overlooks what the Old Testament teaches about our Savior; second, that he forgets that the Book of Mormon as published in the English tongue does not profess to be the original document, but a recent translation given to a people familiar with all the above terms. This will readily be acceded when we have proven that every one of them is derived direct from the earliest writers of the Old Testament, those with which Lehi

was familiar before he left Jerusalem to settle on this continent.

The name Jesus or rather *Jesos* is nothing but the Greek form of the Hebrew Joshua or *Jeshua*. The meaning of the word is "Savior" as explained by the angel: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus (or *Jeshua*) for he shall save his people." The writers of the Book of Mormon must have been as familiar with this name and its meaning in the Hebrew as we are. For they had a portion of the old Scriptures. In speaking of a coming "Savior," they would naturally apply to him the name *Jeshua* and the translator would as naturally render this word with a well known English equivalent—Jesus.

The same remark applies to the title of Jesus Christ. This is the Greek (*Christos*) rendering of the Hebrew *Mashiach*, a word which has still been retained in the oriental translations of the New Testament. It is certain that the writers of the Book of Mormon were familiar with this term and they could use it prophetically just as Daniel does when he says (Dan. 9, 26): "After three score and two weeks shall Mashiach be cut off." Luther, and many translators after him, rendered this very passage: "After threescore and two weeks shall Christ be cut off," introducing a well known proper noun into their translations. Joseph Smith, we suppose, could do the same without being justly censured as a fraud.

But it is not impossible that some form of the word *Christos* really occurred on the plates of the Book of Mormon. If the word, as has been asserted, is derived from the Chaldean or Indian *Chris*, meaning the sun, it is very likely that Lehi knew it before he left Jerusalem, and it might have been handed down as a title to the Savior, the Sun of Righteousness.

"The only begotten of the Father" is an expression based directly on Old Testament passages. One instance is sufficient for illustration: Through David God says to his Son: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." (Ps. 2: 7.)

"The good Shepherd" is a prominent term of the Old Testament. Jacob, in pronouncing his patriarchal blessing upon the head of Joseph, alludes to the Savior as the "Shepherd of Israel" (Gen. 49: 24), and this expression must have been particularly familiar to the descendants of Joseph upon this continent. A few other passages may be quoted. "The Lord is my Shepherd"