DESERET EVENING NEWS: SATURDAY DECEMBER 19, 1903.

"UNKNOWN'S" LAST ATTACK ON THE BOOK OF MORMON.

Editor Tribune:--In reply to my article in The Tribune of Nov. 22, pointing out, in response to his public challenge, some of the great difficulties in the way of accepting Nephi as an ancient prophet of God, and the Book of Mormon as an ancient revelation from God, Elder Roberts begins by finding fault with me for not writing over my full signature. But the reasons he intimates for my not doing so prove altogether too much, and hence, by a logical maxim, prove nothing. For they would prove that those great and high-minded statesmen, Alexander Hamil-ton, Chief Justice John Jay, and James Madison, acted an unworthy part, and were lacking in courage because, for wise reasons, they conducted those masterly discussions which made up

The Federalist, over an assumed name. Then the sarcasms about the rehash-ing, by more recent writers, of Alexander Campbell's arguments against the Rook of Mormon, are "wasted on the desert air," so far as I am concerned, for I have never seen any article or treaties by Campbell on the subject, It would be quite easy to retort and say that if it were not for the writings of Orson Pratt, the more recent defend-ers of the Book of Mormon would be without averaging for the state action without ammunition. But that style of arguing amounts to nothing. Elder Roberts' defense seems to raise

new difficulties without really settling any, although it is ingenious and skillful. On general principles, there is no reason why I should not accept the writings of Nephi and the Book of Mormon as readily as my opponent, if they were true. But the reason why I they were true. But the reason why I do not, is because of the extent and variety of the evidence against them, only a few points of which can be dis-cussed in a newspaper article. Since my main object is to establish truth, I wish to treat Elder Roberts and his arguments in a fair and candid way.

Let us come now to the main prop. osition, which is two-fold: Elder Rob-erts affirms that Nephi was a prophet of God living and writing about 600 B. C.; and that the Book of Mormon is a

divine revelation. The evidence compels me to deny both of these propositions and to de clare that neither of them is true. Now let us try to find some common ground on which we can stand. As such ground, I offer these two propositions in reference to books in general, which seem to me self-evident: First, any book which professes to have been written in ancient times, and yet quotes from authors not born until centuries

after, is a spurious book. Second, any book which professes to he a divine revelation to the people of the present time, and yet reveals noth-ing which it did not appropriate from ing which it during appropriate form some other book or source of knowledge already in the possession of the people, is a spurious book. I use the term "revelation" in its ordinary sense, as revelation in the truth. These are referring to divine truth. These are two propositions which I think people two propositions which I think people ik they contain nothing which is self-evident. The differences of think opinion will begin when we come to apply these two fundamental princi-Still, it is my opponent's privilege to dissent from these propositions, if he thinks they are not self-evident. But I think that careful, reasoning people generally, will accept them. Anyhow, I

As to the alleged prophet Nephi. If it can be clearly shown that he quoted passage after passage from the New Testament writers, who were not borh for centuries after he claims to have written, then the first fundament-

ially to three direct quotations by Ne-Taily to three direct quotations by Ne-phi, from the New Testament writers, taken from Acts iil., 21, John i., 26-27, and Romans xi., 17-24, and found in I. Nephi iii, 20, x, 8, and x 12-14. I also, under discussion of the third point, re-ferred to two other quotations from Ephesians v, 18, and Revelations xv, 3. It did not seem proceeding to the third point, re-It did not seem necessary to quote oth-er passages, for I deemed these suf-

ficient to establish the point. The words in Nephi x, 8, "For there standeth one among you whom ye know not: and he is mightier than I, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to un-loose" is a clear plagiarism from John 4, 26-27, which reads: "But there standthe off off of the stand of the

The first part of Nephi x, 8, is: "Yea, even he should go forth and cry in the wilderness. Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight." This is quoted from Matthew iii, 3. The reference of Elder Roberts to Isalah xl, 3, from which he thinks Nephi might have quoted, instead of from Matthew, is irrelevant, because, while the two passages are somewhat similar, the phraseology is different, and the care-less Nephi failed to help my opponent out of the difficulty, for he quotes from Matthew and not from Issiah, demonstrating what a smart fellow he was by juoting from an author that hadn't been born!

So Elder Roberts' reference to the fact that the olive iree is used figura-tively by some of the Old Testament prophets, is irrelevant, because Nephi quotes Paul's exact phrases, and does not quote from the prophets. Now, in not quote from the prophets. New, in reference to these quotations by Nephi from the New Testament writers, El-der Roberts says: "The gentleman very much overstates the difficulty he presents, by making it appear that the alleged quotations are very numerous, when the fact is that the two or three cases be cites vitually exhaust the alcases he cites virtually exhaust the al-leged quoted passages so far as the New Testament is concerned."

I am not a little surprised at such a statement, as Elder Roberts rather Roberts rather prides himself on his knowledge of the Book of Mormon, and in his article, near the close of his discussion of the fifth point, laments that he is obliged If the point, faments that he is obliged to carry on this discussion with an op-ponent who does not seem to be much acquainted with the subject. Well, my friend, I don't boast about my knowl-edge or superfority to other men; I don't assume "to know it all." But I think I know enough about the Book of Morrison to prevent me from making Mormon to prevent me from making any such careless and utterly inaccurate statements as the above, "that the two or three cases he cites virtually exhaust the alleged quoted passages." Verily, I begin to wonder whether my friend has ever read the books of Nephi through! If he will now follow me for a little, perhaps he may learn something new about them. Let us see whether "two or three passages ex-haust the quotations." In my former article I referred to five quotations from the New Testament writers. Let

Lamb," is taken from the only place in the world where it originated, Revelaion xxi, 14.

13. it is the love of God which sheddeth itself abroad in the hearts of the chiliren of men," are taken from Romans 14. In Nephi xii, 11, "And the angel said unto me, These are made white in the blood of the Lamb," is from Reve-

lations vii, 14, 15. In Nephi xiv, 1, the repeated ex. ressions,"mother of abominations" and mother of harlots," are taken from

Revelations xvii, i These 15 quotations have been taken from the first 14 chapters of I Nephi, leaving eight chapters more in this book and 33 chapters in II Nephi for other quotations. I have jotted down on the fly-leaf of my copy of the Book of Mor-mon 44 different quotations from the New Testament writers by this alleged prophet. These quotations are largely in the Sidney Rigdon-Nephi style of Inaccuracy. Nephi is just about as in-accurate in quoting Scripture as in quoting Shakespeare. Then a large per cent of the language in the books of cent of the language in the books of Nephi is a mere paraphrase, and often a parody, of the language of the New Testament. I have quoted nothing from III Nephi, whose 30 chapters and 68 pages are largely in the direct language of the New Testament, three whole chapters being quoted, although the New Testament was not written for 50 years afterward. I have not quoted from this book, for I understood Elder Roberts to be referring to the first two toberts to be referring to the first two

books The explanation of Elder Roberts The explanation of Ender Roberts that Nephi had a vision of Christ some 50 years before, which made Christ real to him, is no explanation of the fact that there are eight quotations from three New Testament writers in Nephi II, thirty-first chapter.

AS TO SHAKESPEARE.

2. Concerning Nephl's quotation from Shakespeare. Elder Roberts thinks he has found a way of escape for Roberts Nephi from this fatal blunder. He cites a passage from Job from which he thinks Nephi might have quoted, for he says "the Nephites had the Jewish Scriptures with them, including the book of Job." But now observe that book of Job. But how observe that this suggested escape for this ancient prophet is out of the Nephile frying-pan into the Lamanite fire. For Shakes-peare died in 1616, and the King James English version of the Bible was pub-lished in 1611. Now, so far as the argu-ment against the ancient Nephi is conment against the ancient Nephi is con-cerned, what difference does it make whether he quoted from Shakespeare or our English version of Job, which is the one Elder Roberts alludes to, and which is the only one containing any resem-blance either to the passage in Nephi or in Shakespeare. The only way, there-fore, to lift Nephi out of this fatal situ-ation is for Elder Roberts to show that he had, in addition to the Jewish Scrip-tures, a copy of our English Bible with tures, a copy of our English Bible with him back there in the wilderness 600 B, C., or else a copy of Shakespeare. Or else let Mr. Roberts agree with me, according to the evidence, that Mr. No.

Now we come to the second proposi-Now we come to the second proposi-tion which is, that the Book of Mormon is a divine revelation to the people of the present time. A large part of what has been said in proof of the spurious character of the books of Nephi applies to the Book of Mormon as a whole. to the Book of Mormon as a whole. But there are overwhelming special dif-ficulties in the way of accepting it as a

No one upon this continent ever saw these plates prepared by Mormon ex-cept himself and his son, Moroni. They

were prepared specially for the people of our time, in this country. After be-ing hidden about 1,400 years Joseph Smith claims that the angel Moroni came and disclosed them to him. And the worderful In Nephi xi, 22, the words, "Yea, wonderful revelation contained in plates, about "the restoration to earth of the everlasting gospel,"

Elder Roberts says Joseph Smith trans-lated "by means of the inspiration of God and the ald of Urim and Thum-mim." And, behold, when we come to read this wonderful new revelation and this new everiasting gospel which it discloses, we find that it is simply a feeble and diluted imitation of the Bible revelation and the gospel which had al-ready been in the possession of the Christian people of this country for over 200 years, and in the possession of their ancestors for over 1,200 years.

If this duplicate, pretended revela-tion had been brought out among the benighted people of China or India, or some other heathen country who were without these Bible teachings, it would not have been such a complete "give away." But, with a great flourish of trumpets, to give to the Christian peo-ple of this country a weak and poor copy of the revelation and the gospel whose bright and radiant original had been in their possession for hundreds of years, seems to me so absurd, and so transparent as a deceiving scheme, do not wonder that the overwhelming majority of intelligent people utterly reject it. And just because this book. while so loftly pretending to be a new and divine revelation, reveals absolute-ly nothing which the people did not have before in much better form, how can we avoid concluding that it is a counterfeit book? I will attend presently to the specimens of new truth which Elder Roberts finds in it.

2. There are at least 12 persons, worthy and reliable so far as I can dis-cover, 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 slaugh-ters, its continual imitation of Bible phraseology, they had heard read sev-eral years prior to the publication of this book, from a religious romance. It was in this romance that the Ne-phites and Lamanites originated, and also the pretended ancient books of Nephi, Alma Mostah, Mormon and the rest. I can find no proof whatever that the above peoples and books ever exist-ed except in the imagination of the writer of the religious romance. And I have never been able to see why the testimony of the above 12 witnesses, who had nothing to gain by their tes-timony, should be arbitrarily brushed timony, should be arbitrarily brushed aside and the testimony of the 11 in-terested witnesses, who declare that they saw and "hefted" the plates, should be gulped down at one swallow. Even if they did see the plates, that proves absolutely nothing essential to the case. They were all ignorant menand knew nothing about what Was

3. The Book of Mormon, though selu-ed up and hidden away about 400 A. D., is filled up from beginning to end, with the phraseology of our English Bible. Not only that, it contains hundred upon hundreds of the exact phrases and sentences, and about 29 whole chapters from our English Bible which chapters from our English Bible which was not published for about 1,200 years after the book was hidden away. In my former article, I intended to state that there are in the Book of Mormon about 300 quotations from the New Testament, and I am obliged to Elder Roberts for interpreting my meaning that way, for I did not intend to say that the two books of Nephi contain so many quotations.

A VITAL POINT.

Now we come to a vital point. asked Elder Roberts to explain how the above quotations could possibly have been made if the Book of Mormon is honest in its claim of being an ancient book. And here is his explanation: book. And here is his explanation: "Because Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon by means of the in-spiration of God and the aid of Urim and Thummim, it is generally supposed that this translation occasioned the prophet no mental or spiritual effort, that it was purely mechanical; in fact, that the instrument did all and the prophet nothing, than which a greater mistake could not be made. * * * Now when the prophet perceived from book. Now when the prophet perceived from the Nephite records that Isaiah was the reprite records that Islam was being quoted, or when the Savior was represented as giving instructions in doctrine and moral precepts of the same general character as those given in Judea, Joseph Smith undoubtedly turned to those parts of the Bible where he found a translation, substantially he found a translation, substantially correct, of those things which were referred to in the Nephite records, and adopted so much of that translation as

expressed the truths common to both records. Now, it seems to me that the above

Now, it seems to me that the above defense and explanation of Eider Rob-erts are fatal to his position, and that of the defenders of the book generally, that it is a thoroughly accurate trans-lation of the Nephite plates, "by means of the inspiration of God and the aid of Urim and Thummin." And it seems fatal for two reasons:

fatal for two reasons: First-This defense places Mr. Roberts in opposition to his own witnesses, For two of the famous "three wit-nesses," wholly differ from Mr. Roberts as to the method of translating the plates, and point out that Joseph Smith had nothing whatever to do except simply to read the English sentend they appeared in translation. Martin Harris says: "By aid of the seer stone, sentences

would appear and were read by the prophet and written by Martin, and, when finished, he would say 'written,' and if correctly written, that sentence would disappear and another appear in its place; but if not correctly written it remained until corrected, so that

my strength is made perfect in the translation was just as it was en

14

graven on the plates." Here is the testimony also of David Whitmer, another of the three witness-Fifth-"The Lord doth grant unto all nations, of their own nation and tongue, to teach his word." I do not quote the rest of this verse, for I think his first statement is not true. Many nations are in the darkness of heathenes. After stating that Joseph put the seer stone into a hat, he says: "A seer stone into a hat, he says: "A piece of something resembling parch-ment would appear, and on that ap-peared the writing. One character at a time would appear, and under it was the translation in English. Brother Jo-seph would read off the Frederic Parcel. dom and do not teach the word of God. Sixth-"Adam fell that men might be; and men are that they might have joy." I think both statements in that sentence are wholly untrue. Adam fell seph would read off the English to O. Cowdery, who was his principal scribe, joy." I think both statements in that sentence are wholly untrue. Adam fell because he disobeyed God and became a sinner. Two-thirds of the human race are in heathenish darkness. suffer-ers from crueity, want, oppression and idolatry and without joy. In conclusion, I am sorry to spoil my opponent's concluding paragraph, for I admit that it is well written. But it seems to me filogical, for in ex-pressing his regret that I could not have lived in the days of Paul, so that those opposed to Paul and the Chris-tians might have availed themselves of my suggestions, he has to class me with the anti-Christians. In this he is illogical, for I do not belong to that class. Suppose that I should express regret that he did not live in the eigh-teenth century, so as to help the infi-dels of that day in their context. and when it was written down and re-peated to Brother Joseph to see if it were correct, then it would disappear and another character with the interpretation would appear.

Nothing is said by these witnesses about any Urim and Thummin. That was evidently an after thought. Noth-ing is said about any great mental and spiritual effort on Joseph's part. Second—The above defe

me fatal to Elder Roberts' position, because if Joseph Smith turned aside to quote from our English Bible, as Elder Roberts admits that he did, then what was to prevent him from putting into the Book of Mormon, when it suited him, quotations from other Eng-lish books, from Shakespeare, from books on geography and history? What prevented him from putting into the Book of Mormon the peculiar and wellknown views of Sidney Rigdon, with which the book is saturated? What prevented him from putting in his own views? Undoubtedly, that is just what views? Undoubtedly, that is just what he did, for the books give abundant evidence of being a modern compila-tion, and the evidence that it is an ancient book utterly falls. The state-ment and admission of Elder Roberts give us all the light we need as to its modern origin and spurious character. Just a few words now as to the speci-

mens of new truth from the Book of Mormon, of which Elder Roberts presented six First-"Fools mock, but they shall nourn." I see nothing new about that. Everybody mourns sconer or later, and fools with the rest. In Proverbs, xiv.,

we read: "Fools make a mock at sin. Second-"Wickedness never was happiness." I think the prophet Isalah ex-presses this idea far better when he says in lvil. 21: "There is no peace, with my God to the wickad."

saith my God, to the wicked." Third-"The Lord giveth no mandments unto the children of men, save he shall prepare a way for that they may accomplish the thing which he commandeth." Certainly that is not new truth. The very fact that God gives us commandments, implies that the way will be open for us to keep them. Per by 1 Cor., x, 13. Perhaps it was suggested

Fourth—"I give unto men weakness-es that they may be humble, and my grace is sufficient for all men that humble themselves before me." This idea seems to have been appropriated from II Cor., xii, 9: "And he said unto may be grace sufficient for these for LYON & CO., 143 Main St My grace is sufficient for thee; for



teenth century, so as to help the infl-dels of that day in their contest with

dels of that day in their contest with Bishop Butler and the other great Christian scholars of that time. My supposition would be illegical, for my opponent does not belong to the infidel class. Now, I have tried to treat my opponent and his arguments with fair-ness and in a kindly way. I certainly have nothing but good will toward him ord to all who are sincer in their order.

and to all who are sincere in their opin-lons. Unless some new phase of the

subject should come up I see no reason why I should continue the discussion

any further.

