



PUBLIC DISCUSSION

OF THE

ISSUES BETWEEN

THE REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS

AND

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST (DISCIPLES),

HELD IN KIRTLAND, OHIO,

Beginning February 12th, and Closing March 8th, 1884,

BETWEEN

E. L. KELLEY, of The R. C. of J. C. of Latter Day Saints,

AND

CLARK BRADEN, of The Church of Christ.

MODERATORS.

E. B. BOND, OF KIRTLAND, OHIO,	- - - - -	CHAIRMAN.
W. H. KELLEY, OF COLDWATER, MICH.,	- - - - -	FOR MR. KELLEY.
A. B. DEMING, OF KIRTLAND, OHIO,	- - - - -	FOR MR. BRADEN.

PROPOSITIONS:

I. Is the Book of Mormon of divine origin, and are its teachings entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people? MR. KELLEY, *Affirmed*.

II. Is the Church of which I, Clark Braden am a member, the Church of Christ, and identical in faith, organization, ordinances, worship and practice, with the Church of Christ as it was left perfected by the Apostles of Christ? MR. BRADEN, *Affirmed*.

III. Is the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, in fact, the Church of God, and accepted with Him? MR. KELLEY, *Affirmed*.

SPRING PRINTING CO.; STEREOTYPERS,
1110 Olive Street.

CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING CO., PRINTERS,
913 Pine Street.

CLARK BRADEN, Publisher,
913 Pine Street, St. Louis, Mo.

PREFACE.

It is not necessary to detail all that led to the debate in Kirtland, Ohio. Suffice it to say that it was held by mutual agreement between Mr. Kelly of the R. C. of J. C. of Latter Day Saints; and Mr. Braden of the Church of Christ, known as Disciples in the East and North, and as Christians in the West and South. The following were the Rules of Discussion between Clark Braden and E. L. Kelley.

1. The discussion shall be held at Kirtland, Lake County, Ohio, commencing February 12, 1884, and shall continue for the time of sixteen sessions of two hours each to be held each day as the parties shall determine.

2. Each session shall be occupied by two speeches each, by the disputants, of one half hour each. The affirmative shall open and the negative shall close the debate on each proposition, but in the closing speeches no new matter shall be introduced without mutual consent.

3. Each party shall choose a moderator, and they too shall choose a third if necessary, the duties of whom shall be the usual duties of moderators of such assemblies.

4. Eight sessions of two hours each shall be given to the first proposition, and four sessions of two hours each shall be given to each of the others.

5. Each session shall be opened and closed by prayer, by the parties alternately, or by selection.

6. The parties shall be governed by Hedge's Rules of Logic in this discussion as follows:

Rule 1st. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed, and the precise point at issue, should be so clearly defined that there can be no misunderstanding respecting them.

Rule 2d. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate, each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge and desire for truth, with himself and that it is possible therefore that he may be in the wrong and his adversary in the right.

Rule 3d. All expressions which are unmeaning, or without effect, in regard to the subject in debate, should be strictly avoided. All expressions may be considered as unmeaning which contributes nothing to the proof of the question, such as *desultory remarks*, and declamatory expressions, all technical ambiguities and equivocal expressions.

Rule 4th. Personal reflections on an adversary should in no instance be indulged in. Whatever his private character, his follies are not to be named, nor alluded to in controversy. Personal reflections are not only destitute of effect in respect to the question in discussion, but they are productive of real evil.

Rule 5th. No one has a right to accuse his adversary with indirect motives.

Rule 6th. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged on him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

Rule 7th. As truth and not victory is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be on either side should be examined with fairness and candor, and any attempt to ensnare an adversary by arts or sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules or honorable controversy.

The Following are the Propositions agreed upon by Disputants, and their Order

1. Is the Book of Mormon of divine origin, and are its teachings entitled to the respect and belief of all christian people?

KELLEY, AFF.

2. Is the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member, the church of Christ, and identical in faith, organization, teaching, ordinances, worship and practice with the church of Christ as it was left perfected by the Apostles?

BRADEN, AFF.

3. Is the Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in fact the Church of God, and accepted with him?

KELLEY, AFF.

In the discussion of the questions the Bible is to be the standard of evidence, but either party has the privilege of also using whatever proofs he may bring from Historical, Ethnological, Scientific or other works.

(Signed.)

CLARK BRADEN.

E. L. KELLEY.

By mutual consent the time to the first proposition was extended two evenings and hence the entire discussion was 18 instead of 16 sessions as provided by the foregoing rules.

Nearly all of the matter presented in debate was read from manuscript on both sides, hence the matter in the Book is almost *verbatim*, as it was presented in the debate.

With the hope and prayer that the book may aid in leading all readers to a knowledge of the truth, it is submitted to the reader by the authors.

CLARK BRADEN,
E. L. KELLEY.

THE BRADEN AND KELLEY DEBATE.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

Is the Book of Mormon of divine origin and its teachings entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people?

REPORT.

The parties met according to appointment on the 12th day of February, 1884, at seven o'clock p. m. in the Town Hall, Kirtland, Ohio.

MODERATORS.

Messrs. Ezra Bond, Wm. H. Kelley and A. B. Deming.

The meeting having been called to order, the chairman moderator, Mr. Bond, had read the rules of the debate as agreed upon by the parties, and the propositions agreed upon for discussion.

Mr. Kelley then opened the debate as follows:—

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is with some degree of pleasure that I appear before you this evening to enter upon an investigation of the question which has just been read in your hearing. And I say this, notwithstanding the fact of which I am already aware, that to undertake such a task requires on the part of any disputant a work of constant and continuous labor; and when one is called upon in such investigation to also contend with an experienced and persistent debater the undertaking will necessarily be with proportionate difficulties.

But I am happy in this step toward a critical examination of the proposition for the reason that I believe there is a merit, deep and lasting, attached to the subject-matter that few realize, and that should be attained by all mankind, and a fair and candid investigation will enable you to judge for yourselves of this, and decide as all thinking men and women should as to the merits or demerits, and let the decision be whichever way it may, it will to a certain extent not only affect you here but in a manner in all time that is to come. I say this, not for the purpose of stating to you anything that is calculated to terrify one in any respect with regard to the investigation of the question at issue, for I not only believe it is so with regard to the subject-matter in dispute here, but it is so also of any truth, any rule of action or fact that has emanated from the divine being, or that has been in this sphere elicited by mankind; it being better that the people should be brought in contact with and that they should accept that which is true, rather than that they should not come in contact

with it, or that they should reject it after having investigated.

This is not only true in religion but also in other matters. It is a fact as to the affairs of government; in science and the arts of man, and in fact through all the broad dominion of knowledge and experience. It is far better that the faith and impulses of the race be founded in truth than error, let that truth spring from whatever source it may; and believing also that mankind in the matter of religion may in the fullest sense become better while here in this life, and thus be better fitted to enjoy and inherit the life to be made manifest, by conforming to that which is true,—that system of religion which is in fact a revealed science from above, must contain truths, which if believed and followed, will affect the life and character here and so relate to us in the great hereafter, to a greater extent than can principles started or evolved by the wise of this little world of ours.

Taking up the subject-matter under discussion, I refer you directly to the question: The Book of Mormon!—Is it of divine origin? and are its teachings of such a character as to entitle them to the respect and belief of all Christian people? These are questions that you ought to be able to answer correctly and intelligently, as you are called upon to pass judgment upon them from time to time, and also to pass upon the society, so far as reflecting your views are concerned, which believes the work is of divine origin and that its teachings are calculated of their very nature to elevate the human family and to make men better here and thereby prepared for better promises the realization of which is to come. Do not overlook the gist of this proposition;—it not only contains teachings of value, but those of as high a nature as can be found in any work written in any age so far as furnished us in the history of the race. That we are bound as enlightened people to give to the claim by this work of being of "divine origin," a candid and careful consideration, will certainly follow if the work is brought under such circumstances and in that way as to present in its behalf a *prima facie* case touching its merits and its origin. And while it may be true Ladies and Gentlemen, that you are not required to examine everything that is thrown upon the world in order to fulfill the purposes and designs of creation, it is a fact which relates to the human family as absolutely as that, truth is more to be desired than error in its development, that whenever a fair and proper case is made

upon the very outset of a matter, claiming to be the truth, or a thing of divine source, it is incumbent upon all to hear and make a fair and candid examination of the same; and when persons go so far as to judge a matter before hearing it, or to pass a case fairly presented without the trouble even of giving it a hearing, they violate the prime law by which truth is made attainable in the world and progress possible, and thus far must forever stand condemned by Him who ordained the law for a wise purpose and gave to the creature thereunder intelligence and liberty of action.

The injunction to "Prove all things and holdfast that which is good," is certainly taken in the light of human reason a good one; and I go so far as to say, that neither you nor any other people should be called upon to accept as truth a matter or principle relating directly to them, except upon a due examination of the evidences favoring the same, or so much as may be necessary to support the principle; and in the progress of this discussion I shall only call upon you to accept as truth the work referred to in the proposition after you shall have had some of the evidences relating thereto.

The Book of Mormon comes to the people in such a shape as to fairly demand of them a candid and impartial examination. Whatever may be said as to the work otherwise, in the presentation of it at least there is made out a clear, concise, and *prima facie* case, containing every essential feature that would be requisite to a *bona fide* message or work absolutely emanating from the creator of the race and the dispenser of the system of religion as reflected in the Bible, the admitted standard of truth in this controversy.

This is made apparant from the following facts set forth on the face of the work:

1. It makes claim to have originated from the proper source. It does not claim to have originated with man. It does not claim to be the doctrines of any false god that has invaded this world; or of any god made with men's hands. It claims to have had its origin in the work of Him who delivered a like record to a people on the Eastern continent of the world. And since the claim of its origin is from the same source from which we claim to have received the Bible, the first position of the *prima facie* case is clear, and thus far makes the work entitled to the respect and careful consideration of all.

2. It claims to contain a proper message. A communication from Jehovah to any part of the race would contain a message evidently for the highest good of the people to whom it was made; and in this book there is what claims to be a record of the "Everlasting Gospel" as it was delivered to a people other than those of the tribe of Judah, together with a history of the works and worship of that same people. The second position to a proper case is made then in that, the message it claims to bear is a good and proper one.

3. The object in delivering the work to the world as borne out upon its face is a right and proper one. To show this object I will read from the book itself. I have in my hands a reprint of the third American edition. Would read from the original copy of the book which I also present to you, but this edition which I have used I am more accustomed to and hence use it for the sake of rapidity in my work. The two editions are emphatically the same however, except as to a few typographical and gramatical errors that evidently crept in, in the copying and printing of the work and from which I might say, no book is exempt. It is sometimes given out that there have been changes made in the work since its first publication. This I deny as to anything material whatever. The only thing claimed as a material change by any candid critic is in the inscription page, the first copy reading, "Joseph Smith, Author and Proprietor," whereas in subsequent editions he is simply the "translator." By examining the first page of the original, however, I find that he is set out there as the "translator," and in the preface to the original he is clearly and emphatically set forth as the translator only, so far as his work in the matter is concerned, and hence it was not possible to have misled any reader by the words "Author and Proprietor," as they there appeared. But it will be brought out more fully as we proceed as to how this came to be placed on the inscription and for the present I leave the matter. The object of the book. I read from the title page:—

"Wherefore it is an abridgment of the record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites; * * * An abridgment taken from the Book of Ether; also, which is a record of the people of Jared; who were scattered at the time the Lord founded the language of the people, when they were building a tower to heaven: Which is to show unto the remnant of the house of Israel what great things the Lord hath done for their fathers; and that they may know the covenants of the Lord, that they are not cast off forever; and also to the convincing of the Jew and Gentile that Jesus is the Christ, the Eternal God, manifesting himself unto all nations." "And now if there are faults, they are the mistakes of men; wherefore, condemn not the things of God, that ye may be found spotless at the judgment seat of Christ."

And also in the body of the work page 490, one of the writers states as follows:—

"And this is the commandment which I have received; and behold they shall come forth according to the commandment of the Lord, when he shall see fit, in his wisdom. And behold they shall go unto the unbelieving of the Jews; and for this intent shall they go; that they may be persuaded that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; that the Father may bring about, through his most beloved, his great and eternal purpose, in restoring the Jews, or all the house of Israel, to the land of their inheritance, which the Lord their God hath given them, unto the fulfilling of his covenant, and also that the seed of this people may more fully believe his gospel, which shall go forth unto them from the Gentiles; for this people shall be scattered, and shall become a dark, a filthy, and a loathsome people, beyond the description of that which ever hath been amongst us."

The object of the work then and the introduction of it is in the highest sense a proper one and thus the third fact entering to made up the *prima facie* case is complete.

4. In the array of its witnesses the work is shown to be fully entitled to a thorough and unprejudiced examination.

First, the testimony of a single witness; beginning with the statement of the boy when but fourteen years of age, and consistently maintained by him afterwards, until when in his thirty-ninth year he gave the highest assurance of its correctness by resolutely standing in the gate of death itself for the truth of it. His full statement I shall introduce in another part of the discussion.

Second, The testimony of three witnesses. And in presenting to you their statement I call your attention to the fact that the character of their lives were such subsequently as to fully attest the truth of the original testimony. They not only accepted this knowledge as a part of their lives religiously, but also taught it to their children, and to their children's children. Two of them having borne the same testimony till their voices were sealed in death, and the survivor, now under the lilies of nearly eighty winters, still points all enquirers to this his testimony as a circumstance in his life's work which was, and is, the happiest of all, and his has been a well spent life.

This testimony they left upon record not only to have its effect upon present things and associations, but also to extend to future generations, being the declared act and knowledge of the three with reference to this work under discussion, when uninfluenced by any conceivable sinister motive, or any inducement or hope of reward whatever, except the reward of well doing, which they expected only to receive when they should come into the presence of Him who is cognizant of all the secret motives that move men to action.

The following is their testimony:—

"Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, unto whom this work shall come, that we, through the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, have seen the plates which contain this record, which is a record of the people of Nephi, and also of the Lamanites, their brethren, and also of the people of Jared, who came from the tower of which hath been spoken; and we also know that they have been translated by the gift and power of God, for his voice hath declared it unto us; wherefore we know of a surety, that the work is true. And we also testify that we have seen the engravings which are upon the plates; and they have been shown unto us by the power of God, and not of man. And we declare with words of soberness, that an angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates, and the engravings thereon; and we know that it is by the grace of God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, that we beheld and bare record that these things are true; and it is marvelous in our eyes, nevertheless, the voice of the Lord commanded us that we should bear record of it; Wherefore, to be obedient unto the commandments of God, we bear testimony of these things. And we know that if we are faithful in Christ, we shall rid our garments of the blood of all men, and be found spotless before the judgment seat of Christ, and shall dwell with him eternally in the heavens. And the honor be to the Father, and Son, and the Holy Ghost, which is one God. Amen."

"OLIVER COWDERY,"

"DAVID WHITMER,"

"MARTIN HARRIS."

Third, The testimony of eight witnesses.

Like the three before referred to, these were men who confessed their belief in the

authenticity of the work, by afterwards making it a part of their faith, and transmitting their testimony unimpaired to their posterity. It is as follows:

"Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people, unto whom this work shall come, that Joseph Smith, Jr., the translator of this work, has shown unto us the plates of which hath been spoken, which have the appearance of gold; and as many of the leaves as the said Smith has translated we did handle with our hands; and we also saw the engravings thereon, all of which has the appearance of ancient work, and of curious workmanship. And this we bear record with words of soberness, that the said Smith has shown unto us, for we have seen and hefted, and know of a surety, that the said Smith has got the plates of which we have spoken. And we give our names unto the world to witness unto the world that which we have seen; and we lie not, God bearing witness of it." Signed,

"Christian Whitmer,

"Jacob Whitmer,

"Peter Whitmer, Junior,

"John Whitmer.

"Hiram Page,

"Joseph Smith, Senior,

"Hyrum Smith,

"Samuel H. Smith,

To support the element relating to the manner in which the work comes to us I have now introduced the positive declarations of twelve witnesses, a sufficient number to maintain any cause to be contested before courts of justice; and in things relating to the divine being and religion it cannot be said truthfully that the rule would require more. In the introduction of the religion of Christ in the first century of what is termed the Christian era, a single witness first made known the proclamation; and the people to whom the witness was sent were required to properly consider and examine the message, although the witness himself by reason of different habits and a different life to that approved by many of the people, was considered possessed with an evil Spirit. Yet it is said of him in the first chapter of John: "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe." This was the only witness in fact of the great mission of Jesus until the time when God gave a revelation to Peter, and yet Jesus says of John's work: "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the council of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." Luke, 7: 30.

The twelve witnesses whose testimony I have now introduced in their work are similar to those raised up to bear testimony of the things declared and done in the first century; and so far as it is possible to compare testimonies it comes with equal weight of that which has supported any divine message in any time or age. The apostle Peter says with reference to the testimony to the work in his ministry: "And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly; Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." Acts, 10: 39, 41.

It is sometimes objected that the plates which are said to have been preserved by

the immediate power of God, kept that they might not be destroyed but yet fill a purpose in the world of instructing it in things pertaining to the divine life, were not shown to all people. The same objection has been made time and again with reference to the New Testaments foundation evidence. That Jesus did not show himself to the people after his resurrection in order to make them believe, but to a few "chosen witnesses."

The objection is a futile one in the mind of any person who understands anything of the essence and faith peculiar to the Christian religion, and the means adopted by Jesus himself of establishing it among the people.

But I am not left to the twelve witnesses; the thousands who have since attested the divine character of the work upon the independent knowledge they themselves have attained to, may be brought and marshalled as a living host testifying to the truthfulness of the claim.

All of these, however, I have referred to simply to substantiate my claim that in the presentation of the Book of Mormon to the world a *prima facie* case of its divine authenticity is in every respect complete. It claims to have come from the right source; the message it claims to bear is a proper one; the object of the message and the object of its introduction are proper; and now the array of witnesses to that message is found all that can reasonably be asked.

It is truly entitled to an investigation then, and with your attention, I at once proceed to unfold the evidences relating to its divine character, by which you and all thinking people must determine for yourselves.

There is an avenue of knowledge open to this work that is peculiar to it, and the doctrine taught by Christ in the New Testament Scriptures only. In the 7th chapter and 16th and 17th verses of John's gospel it is recorded: "Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself."

In this record which I hold in my hand (the Book of Mormon) occurs a sentiment very much the same as found in this instruction of Jesus; and, singular as it may seem, these are the only two works published to the world that have boldly claimed that the truth or falsity of their statements might be known by each person who would go to the Creator of all and do his will. I read from page 544:

"And when ye shall receive these things," (contained in the book under discussion), I would exhort "you that ye would ask God, the eternal Father, in the name of Christ, if these things are not true; and 'If ye shall ask with a sincere heart, with real intent, having faith in Christ, he will manifest the truth of it unto you, by the power of the Holy Ghost; and by the power of the Holy Ghost, ye may know the truth of all things. And whatsoever thing is good, is just and true; wherefore, nothing that is good denieth the Christ, but acknowledgeth that he is.'"

Remember, my friends, you are not asked

to first accept the book as true, nor to do those things commanded in the book—but the will of God; if you are in doubt, simply go aside and pray, with a sincere heart and honest purpose, and the statement is made fearlessly, and without regard to the fact that if it was a deception upon the people it might be at once detected by the first honest enquirer who should go before the Lord, for it says: "If ye shall ask 'with a sincere heart, with real intent, 'having faith in Christ, he will manifest 'the truth of it unto you, by the power of 'the Holy Ghost.'" The statement is not that of a cunning deceiver, but certainly of a person who has absolute confidence in the cause which he represented.

I am a believer in the Bible. I am ready at all times to come forward and stand in defense of the divine authenticity of its claim. But, while I am a believer in the Bible, I am at the same time equally a believer in the divine authenticity of the record that was given to the people who lived upon this continent. And I believe that its truth can be proven to the world, whether attacked by a professor of religion, theologian of whatever rank, or the most gifted skeptic.

Believing this, and that the evidences of such proof are susceptible of demonstration, I may truly say that I stand up in the effort to defend it to-night, as a work that has been committed to man by Jehovah himself, and that my reward for so doing will be the reward of all those who shall "have kept the word of God." Taking up the record as it has been presented to the world and examining it, I find that in holding forth its truths to the world, I make no attack, either directly or by implication, upon the Christian religion. I make no attack upon the Bible. I make no attack upon anything that people should believe in, and that they do believe in and accept, if they believe in and accept the sacred scriptures. But I hold forth a work confirmative of the truths revealed in the Bible, and containing a record also in its completeness of the gospel set forth in the Bible, and evidently prepared of the Lord as a means in his hand to stay the tide of infidelity which he must have foreknown would come rolling in like a flood to destroy his work. And this record not only being susceptible of clear proof from the Bible, but also from the scientific developments of the age and discoveries in archeology made since the publication of the book, it is, as I firmly believe, notwithstanding the warfare against it since the first communication of the light to the boy in 1823, destined to yet become one of the most important factors in the evangelization of the human race.

If the work is a good one its teachings and principles will be good;—

"For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of 'thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble bush, gather they grapes. A good man out of the good 'treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is 'good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his 'heart bringeth forth that which is evil; for of the 'abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh.'" Luke 6: 44 and 45.

So it must prove of this work whether written by men, or indicted by the Holy Spirit through them from time to time. To show you what its teachings are I will read a few specimen paragraphs, which I claim are in perfect keeping with all the teachings of the book; and if they are not I shall expect my opponent during the discussion to point out and read to you others of a contrary character. And if any of the audience think they can find something contrary to the teachings that I shall read, I want you to buy a book and make the examination for yourselves as a couple of gentlemen did to-day, who were not afraid to examine. Page 99.

"And, again, the Lord God hath commanded that men should not murder; that they should not lie; that they should not steal; that they should not take the name of the Lord their God in vain; that they should not envy; that they should not have malice; that they should not contend one with another; that they should not commit whoredoms; and that they should do none of these things; for whoso doeth them, shall perish; for none of these iniquities come of the Lord; for he doeth that which is good among the children of men; and he doeth nothing save it be plain unto the children of men; and he inviteth them all to come unto him and partake of his goodness; and he denieth none that come unto him, black and white, bond and free, male and female; and he remembereth the heathen, and all are alike unto God, both Jew and Gentile."

Page 242, of the same record.

"And now my brethren, I wish from the inmost part of my heart, yea, with great anxiety, even unto pain, that ye would hearken unto my words, and cast off your sins, and not procrastinate the day of your repentance; but that ye would humble yourselves before the Lord, and call on his holy name, and watch and pray continually, that ye may not be tempted above that which ye can bear, and thus be led by the Holy Spirit, becoming humble, meek, submissive, patient, full of love and all long suffering; having faith in the Lord; having a hope that ye shall receive eternal life; having the love of God always in your hearts, that ye may be lifted up at the last day, and enter into his rest; and may the Lord grant unto you repentance that ye may not bring down his wrath upon you, that ye may not be bound down by the chains of hell, that ye may not suffer the second death."

Also, paragraph 8, page 249.

"Now those priests who did go forth among the people, did preach against all lying, and deceivings, and envyings, and strifes, and malice and revilings, and stealing, robbing, plundering, murdering, committing adultery, and all manner of lasciviousness, crying that these things ought not so to be; holding forth things which must shortly come; yea holding

"forth the coming of the Son of God, his suffering and death, and also the resurrection of the dead."

Again from the instruction on page 224, paragraph 4.

"And now my beloved brethren, I have said these things unto you, that I might awaken you to a sense of your duty to God, that ye may walk blameless before him; that ye may walk after the holy order of God, after which ye have been received. And now I would that ye should be humble, and be submissive, and gentle; easy to be entreated; full of patience and long suffering; being temperate in all things; being diligent in keeping the commandments of God at all times; asking for whatsoever things ye stand in need, both spiritual and temporal; always returning thanks unto God for whatsoever things ye do receive, and see that ye have faith, hope and charity, and then ye will always abound in good works; and may the Lord bless you, and keep your garments spotless; that ye may at last be brought to sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the holy prophets who have been ever since the world began, having your garments spotless, even as their garments are spotless in the kingdom of heaven, to go no more out."

Such are the teachings of the book that claims to have been written by good men and prophets as directed of the Lord, to show unto future generations the dealings of our heavenly Father with peoples other than the tribe of Judah. And here I propound a question for my opponent and each one of you to answer. Why is it, that since the object of the work and the character of its teachings are in perfect accord with the object and teachings of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and that no person can be a believer in the Book of Mormon unless he also believes the Bible, that persons who claim to believe in the Bible and are called Christians, and many who are Christians too, have been found fighting against this same book? Why is it they fight against it since Jesus himself has said: "An evil tree can not bring forth good fruit?" I wish the negative of the proposition under discussion to answer these questions; and to candidly and carefully peruse the work and point out every evil thing, or any evil thing, or principle taught therein to this audience so that you may judge for yourselves of the fact, whether a man cannot accept the Book of Mormon as of divine origin, endorse its teachings, and at the same time be a christian man in the truest and highest sense of that term.

MR. BRADEN'S OPENING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—To render such a discussion as this necessary, there must be a difference of views between the parties. There is such difference between my opponent and myself. He and his people teach, I. That mankind needed new revelations, in addition to those in the Bible, when Joseph Smith pretended, in the book of Mormon and other pretended revelations, to give new revelations to the world. II. That in the book of Mormon and other pretended revelations, Joseph Smith did give to the world new revelations, in addition to those in the Bible. III. That Joseph Smith was a true prophet of God. I believe, I. That in the New Testament, God perfected and completed his work of revelation in a system of universal and eternal truths, a law of universally applicable principles in the Gospel of Christ. That man needs no additional revelations, and never will need any, for he cannot outgrow the universal and eternally applicable principles of the Gospel. II. That all of the pretended revelations of Joe Smith are base frauds and puerile fabrications. III. That Joe Smith was an infamous and villainous deceiver and scoundrel. To render discussion profitable and conclusive in determining what is the truth in regard to the issues, there must be a common standard of authority that is accepted as conclusive authority by both parties. There is such a standard in this discussion. The Israelite Sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament, and the Christian Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament.

The book of Mormon cannot be appealed to as authority in this discussion, for the issue is, "Is the book of Mormon worthy to be used as authority?" Even if it be found, in this discussion, that it is worthy to be used as authority, because it is of divine origin, that would not enable my opponent to use it in this discussion, in determining the issues in this debate. All appeal to the book of Mormon, as a standard in this debate, will be a begging of the question, or an impudent assumption of the very issue in debate. It is the work of each disputant in a discussion, to show that his position, clearly and honestly defined, harmonizes with a correct interpretation of this commonly accepted standard, and that the position of his opponent, clearly and honestly defined, does not harmonize with a correct interpretation and use of this standard. It is the work of my opponent in this discussion to clearly and honestly define his affirmative, concealing and evading nothing, using no equivocation or pettifogging, and then to show that his position thus defined, harmonizes with a fair inter-

pretation and use of the Scriptures. It is my work, if my opponent does not define his affirmative clearly and honestly—if he attempts to conceal or evade the real teaching of his system, by equivocation, or pettifogging, to expose such chicanery and to show what are the real teachings of his system, and then to show that the teachings of his system, fairly and clearly stated, do not harmonize with a correct interpretation of the Scriptures.

There are three questions to be settled. I. What are the teachings of my opponent's system, when clearly and honestly stated, without concealment or equivocation. II. What do the Scriptures, when correctly interpreted, teach in regard to the doctrine of his system. III. Do the Scriptures, when clearly and fairly interpreted, harmonize with a clear and honest statement of the doctrines of the system of my opponent. There is no sense in our spending time in talking about what we both accept. Nor in caviling over what is not in dispute. Let us then determine, as far as may be, in what do we agree; concerning what do we disagree; what conclusions should we draw from those things in which we agree, concerning those things in which we disagree. Whether the position of my opponent in regard to the things in which we agree is in harmony with his position in regard to those things in which we disagree. Let us make the issues as few, as brief and as clear as possible. I. My opponent and myself both believe that the Israelite Sacred Scriptures, of the Old Testament and the Christian Sacred Scriptures, of the New Testament, were given by inspiration of God, and that they are therefore of divine origin, and authority—a revelation from God to man. We differ concerning "The Book of Mormon." My opponent believes that it also was given by inspiration of God and that it is also of divine origin and authority a revelation from God to man, containing "the fullness of the Gospel," and that it stands related to the New Testament, as that does to the Old—and is as much superior to it. I believe that the Book of Mormon is a base, puerile fabrication, and a wicked fraud.

II. We both believe that God has made revelations to man, through men inspired by the Holy Spirit—through angelic messengers—and through his Son Jesus the Christ. My opponent believes that he has spoken to men through Joseph Smith, and men who have accepted him as a prophet of God, and that God has through such persons, given revelations to men. I believe that Joseph Smith was a wicked, contemptible impostor, and that all who have pretended to speak by inspiration, in this age

are either hypocritical impostors or self-deluded visionaries. III. We both believe that, in the apostolic age, God spoke to men through the apostles of Christ, and through persons to whom the apostles imparted supernatural gifts, by the imposition of their hands. My opponent believes, that, in the apostolic age, others than those to whom the apostles imparted supernatural gifts by the imposition of their hands, enjoyed those gifts. He believes also that those gifts were an all important element of the religion of Christ, and that they were to continue, until the end of time, in the church. That those gifts can be enjoyed now. That they should be enjoyed now. That the condition of the church where those gifts are not enjoyed is that of apostasy—a dead church. He believes that those gifts can be imparted now by the imposition of hands, of persons now living. That they are so imparted and enjoyed in his organization. That all believers who do not enjoy those gifts are in an apostate condition.

I believe that those gifts were to exist only during the apostolic age. That it was the will of God that they should cease, when the word of God was completed in the New Testament, and that, as it was his will that they should cease then, they did cease. That in the apostolic age, those gifts were never enjoyed by any, except those to whom an apostle imparted them by the imposition of his hands. That no one but an apostle could, or ever did impart those gifts. That they never descended to a third person. That the power to impart those gifts was the "sign of apostleship." That when the last person, to whom an apostle imparted those gifts, died, they ceased from earth. That such was God's will and law. Also that the condition of the church, when the best of those gifts were enjoyed, was the formative, the child-like condition of the church. That the condition of the church, under the control of "the perfect law of liberty,"—"of that which is perfect," the completed word of God, is as much superior to the condition of the church, when the best of these gifts were enjoyed, as the condition of the world, when God ceased from creation—after creating man, is superior to the period, when by miracles of creation, he was preparing for man. Or as the condition of the full grown man is superior to that of the undeveloped child. Or as the condition of our country under our completed constitution, and government in accordance with it, is superior to the condition of our nation, while the constitutional convention was in session, framing the constitution.

I am careful to define and elaborate these differences, because this is the key note to the whole discussion. This is the crucial issue in this debate. My opponent bases his claim that Joseph Smith was a true prophet of God; that the Book of Mormon was given by inspiration of God, that it "contains the fulness of the Gospel"—that the Book of Mormon and other pre-

tended revelations stand related to the New Testament, as the New Testament stands related to the Old Testament, that his people possesses these miraculous powers and spiritual gifts, on a claim that the promises of Joel and other prophets, of John the Baptist, of Jesus, of Peter and the apostles, concerning spiritual gifts, were to be enjoyed by the church in all ages. If my position, that these promises refer only to the apostolic age, and were enjoyed only in the apostolic age, and that they were to remain only until the Word of God was completed in the New Testament,—that in the New Testament, God completed this miraculous work, and the exercise of spiritual gifts, in a perfect revelation of a complete system of universally applicable and eternal truths and principles be true, it utterly demolishes the claim of my opponent, by showing that revelations, in addition to those in the Bible, are needless, and contrary to the teachings of God's Word, and therefore his Book of Mormon and pretended revelations are base frauds, and Joe Smith a vile impostor.

We both believe that all followers of Christ, should be united and stand on the divine platform, laid down for such union, in Ephesians, IV. (A.) One God the Father. I shall, in the right place, prove that the teachings of the system of my opponent, in regard to the one God, are gross materialism and idolatry. (B.) One Lord; Jesus of Nazareth; the Christ, the only begotten Son of God—the only Divine Prophet, or source of all teaching in religion—the only Divine Priest, or sacrifice and atonement for the sins of all men—the only mediator between God and man—the only Divine King,—the only source of all law in religion, and the only one whose commands we are to obey, in religion. I shall, in the right place, expose the gross sensualism of my opponent's system in regard to the origin and character of the Son of God. My opponent claims that Joe Smith was a prophet of God, whose teachings are to be obeyed, accepted as "the fullness of the gospel," and as much superior to those of Jesus, as the teachings of Jesus, are superior to those of the prophets of the Old Testament; and whose commands are as much superior to the New Testament, as the New Testament is to the Old Testament. I believe that Joe Smith was a base impostor, a wicked deceiver, whose silly fabrications should be despised as contemptible frauds. (C.) One Holy Spirit, who inspired the men whose inspired acts and utterances are recorded in the Bible. My opponent believes that the Holy Spirit inspired Joe Smith, and others who have accepted him as a true prophet of God, and that he inspires men now. I believe that all inspiration and miraculous powers ceased in the apostolic age, having accomplished their purpose, in giving to mankind, a completed revelation of general and universally applicable truths; and that the Holy Spirit now influences men, in the only way in which one intelligence

can exert a moral influence over another, that is through the truth contained in his utterances recorded in the Scriptures, and through the teaching that is in accordance with the truths revealed by the Holy Spirit, in the Scriptures.

(D.) The one faith—the faith—the teaching—the Word of God,—the scriptures—"the faith once delivered to the Saints." My opponent would add to this "one faith" delivered to the Saints—to God's Word, the Book of Mormon, and other pretended revelations of Joe Smith, and of others who accept Joe Smith as a prophet of God. I reject all of these as base fabrications of impostors, or as silly vagaries of fanatical visionaries. (E.) One baptism—immersion into water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit—into the remission of sins. My opponent teaches these errors in regard to baptism. I. Baptism for the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit. II. That baptism in the Holy Spirit was universal in the church, in the apostolic age, and that it can be enjoyed now, and exists in his organization. III. The farce of baptizing the living as proxies for the dead. I believe that in the days of the apostles only those of the baptized received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, to whom an apostle imparted them by the imposition of his hands. I believe also that there were never but two occasions of baptism in the Holy Spirit, one on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem—the other at the house of Cornelius in Casarea—that both were miraculous—direct miracles from Heaven, and never were, and never will be repeated. The baptism for the dead I regard as a farce resulting from a blunder in regard to an obscure passage of Scripture.

(F.) One hope—remission of sins to the penitent believer, who is baptized into Christ—union with God and his Holy Spirit, so long as the Christian, in a holy life, makes his body a fit temple for such union and such a guest; and eternal life if men are faithful unto death. My opponent includes in this hope, miraculous spiritual gifts, in this life, and he debases the eternal hope into a materialistic sensual reigning of Mormons over Gentiles, in a materialistic sensual state, like the Paradise of the Mahomedan. (G.) One body—"The church of God" or "The church of Christ." Christ is the head of the body, and all believers are living stones, members in this body, this temple. In this church are Evangelists who proclaim the good news; Overseers who take care of the flock—Servants who minister unto the church; and members who are not called to such work. My opponent adds to this simple statement of the New Testament presidents, councillors, apostles, twelve apostles, three seventies of apostles, traveling bishops, presiding elders, quorums, patriarchs, seers, prophets, pastors, teachers, translators, revelators, until not even an inspired Mormon knows how many more, and about one-third of the men are officers of some sort. He asserts

that all of these should exercise miraculous powers, and divides them into the Melchisedec priesthood, and the Aaronic priesthood, and tells us that the Aaronic priest must be a *literal descendant of Aaron*." That caps the climax of absurdity.

(H.) One name—"Christian"—for all individuals who are followers of Christ; and "Church of God" or "Church of Christ" for the one body composed of these followers of Christ or Christians. My opponent calls his people "Latter Day Saints of Jesus Christ." Shades of the apostles what an Ashdodish lingo! He calls his organization "The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." Where in the World of God does he find such a rigmarole as that? He may find such a jargon in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, or Joe Smith's Book of Abraham, but not in the Scriptures. Such an Ashdodish Babel is not found in the pure speech of Canaan, in God's word. Such is a fair statement of the points concerning which we agree, and also those concerning which we disagree. My opponent summarizes his teachings in his proposition: "The Book of Mormon is of divine origin and entitled to the confidence of all Christian people."

My first and cardinal objection to my opponent's position is that the Bible teaches that the work of inspiration, miracles and revelation, was completed in the revelations of the Son of God, that he give in person, and through his apostles, in the New Testament, in which there is given to mankind, a system of eternal truths, universally applicable principles, which man can not outgrow, for which there can be no substitute, and to which there can be no additions. That as inspiration and miracle had accomplished their work in completing revelation, they ceased when the last person died to whom an apostle had imparted spiritual gifts, by the imposition of his hands. If this position be true, the Scriptures teach that such a claim as my opponent makes for his Book of Mormon, is absolutely impossible. It was not given, or translated by inspiration, for the Bible teaches that inspiration and miraculous power ceased nearly 1,800 years before it appeared. This is the crucial question, the vital issue of this discussion. If my position be Scripturally true, my opponent's affirmatives are utterly unscriptural and utterly untrue, according to what is the standard of truth in this debate. We intend to hold our opponent right to the work on this point. If he does not meet and overturn my position, his claim for the Book of Mormon is "as baseless as the fabric of a dream."

The first vital query then is "What do the Scriptures teach in regard to inspiration, miracles and revelations—in regard to when they first appeared—their purpose—their history and development—how long they were to continue? What was their purpose, and how long did that purpose make it necessary for them to continue? What

do the Scriptures teach in regard to the continuance of inspiration, miracle and revelation? And their completion and cessation? The Scriptures teach that the Father has spoken, in the hearing of man, only three times. At the baptism of Jesus, Mathew, III, 17. At the transfiguration, Mathew, XVII, 5. When Jesus prayed and the multitude heard the answer, John, XII, 28. On all other occasions, the Father has spoken through representatives,—the Word—the Christ—the Holy Spirit—angels inspired men. The Word spoke to men through angels, or through men inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Word was the God of the Old Testament, John, I. Colossians, I. Hebrew, I. The Word the God of the Old Testament spoke through angels, Acts, VII, "Ye received the word through the ministry of angels." Gal, III, "The law was ordained through angels, by the hand of a mediator" (Moses). While on earth Christ, spoke to men. Angels spoke to men as representatives of Jehovah, the Word, and of Christ, after his ascension. Rev. I. "The revelation of Jesus, the Christ, which God gave to him, to show to his servants, the things which must shortly come to pass, and he sent his angels to his servant John, and made them known unto John, and John bear witness of the word of God." In Exodus, III, we read interchangeably, "Jehovah said," and "the angels said," showing that Jehovah spoke through his angels that represented him. In several places Jehovah says, to Moses through his angel that represented him, "I send my angel before you. I have put my word in his mouth. Hear him," etc. Isaiah, LXI, we read that the Mosaic dispensation was given by "an angel of the face of Jehovah" or a messenger from his presence. We might illustrate this idea by many other passages, but these will suffice, for probably our only dispute will be over the work of the Holy Spirit.

Both parties agree that the Holy Spirit inspired all men who acted, spoke, or wrote under inspiration, from Adam to Malachi; that he inspired all who acted, spoke, or wrote under inspiration from Zachariah, the father of John the Baptist, until the last person died to whom an apostle imparted spiritual gifts, by the imposition of his hands. My opponent claims that the Scriptures teach that these spiritual gifts were to remain in the church until the end of time, that it is the law of God that they should now exist, that they do now exist in his organization, that as a result of such existence of these gifts Joseph Smith was inspired, was a true prophet of God, and therefore the "Book of Mormon," that he gave to the world, is a revelation from God. I claim that the Scriptures teach that these miraculous powers of the Holy Spirit were given for a specific purpose, the revelation of a plan of redemption—that they were to exist until that purpose was accomplished in completing the New Testament—that they ceased when they accomplished this purpose, in

completing this revelation, in the New Testament. I claim that the law of God ordains that they were to exist for a certain purpose, the revelation of the scheme of redemption, and they were to continue until that object was accomplished. The purpose for which God ordained their existence and continuance, has been accomplished, in completing the New Testament; and they have ceased, having accomplished their object, and being no longer necessary.

The issue is not one of power, but of fact and law. Not whether God can impart gifts now, but whether it is his law that they should exist now. Or is it his law that they should cease with the apostolic age, having accomplished their objects. As a question of fact, did Joseph Smith possess these powers? Do his followers now possess them? Proving that they can be exercised now, would not prove that Joseph Smith possessed them, nor that his followers do possess them. A man may be able to practice law, but that does not prove that he does so. The fact that God can impart such powers now, does not prove that he does so. God can have apples grow as tubers on the roots of trees, but that does not prove that he does. The question of fact remains, "How do apples grow?" The fact that God imparted these powers to persons in former ages, does not prove that he does so now. God once brought animals and plants into existence by miracle of direct creation. That does not prove that he does so now. As a matter of fact, we know that he does not, but that he brings them into existence through operation of natural law.

Let me here expose the vital error of my opponent's position, by an illustration. God exerted his miraculous power in creation, to prepare the way for natural law, the law of reproduction, and the world is in a higher and more perfect condition under the operation of natural law, than when God exerted miraculous power, in bringing animals and plants into being, by creation. Miraculous power, in creation, was only temporary, and provisional, and exerted only to prepare the way for the higher and more perfect, natural law. In like manner, God exerted his miraculous power in connection with revelation, only to prepare the way for the higher and permanent, a completed system of divine revealed truth, in the completed word of God, in the completed New Testament. Miraculous power in revelation, ceased when that purpose was accomplished; just as miraculous power, in creation ceased when it had prepared for, and introduced the higher and the permanent, the operation of natural law. Miraculous power in connection with revelation, was inferior to the work of the completed word of God, just as miraculous power, in creation, was inferior to the operation of natural law. God is in the operation of his completed word of truth, in a higher and more perfect manner, than he ever was in the highest exercise of miraculous power, just as he is

in the operation of natural law, in a higher and more perfect sense, than he ever was in the exercise of miraculous power in creation. In each case the method employed at first, was provisional and temporary, and was employed only to introduce the higher and permanent, for which it prepared the way. There is no evading the conclusion that the operation of natural law and the influence of the revealed truths of God's completed word, are superior to the highest exercise of miraculous power, either in creation or revelation.

We do not remove God out of nature, or his word; but we show that, in each case, he acts in a higher and more perfect manner. We do not remove a single thing God created, nor a single truth of revelation. Miraculous power was not a part of the things created, but the means of creating them, and ceased when that was done, and gave way to the operation of a higher and more perfect means of accomplishing the same end. Miraculous power was not a part of the truths revealed, but the means of revealing divine truth, and ceased when that work was done, and gave way to a higher and more perfect work, and presence of God, in the moral influence of the divine truths revealed. The idea of my opponent, that the possession of miraculous power is the thing to be desired above everything else, and that the condition of the church, when it was exercised, was the highest condition of the church, and far superior to its condition now, when it does not exist, and the church exerts only moral power resident in perfect truth, is a contradiction of the Scriptures, of reason, and of fact. Such a state of the church was the childhood of the church. The exercise of such gifts was necessary, because it was in its childhood. They were aids to childhood, that ceased when the church "laid aside such childish things." The church is now in its manhood, and governed by "the perfect law of liberty" the completed Word of God. The moral power of divine truth, appealing to reason and conscience of men as rational beings, is far superior to miracles, appealing to the childish wonder of children.

A vital query is suggested here. How can one intelligence influence another? How can one spirit, the Holy Spirit, influence another spirit—the spirit of man? Man can influence his fellow man in two ways. I. By utterances or acts that convey ideas to the minds of the persons addressed. This is the only moral power or influence that one spirit can exert on another. II. An abnormal psychological influence, called mesmerism or psychology. This is not a moral influence for it leaves the mind influenced no wiser, no better. In like manner the Holy Spirit has exerted two influences over the spirit of men. I. A miraculous influence, psychologizing the spirits of men, so that they uttered the words he wanted them to utter; or performed the acts that he wanted them to perform. II. The ordinary influence, that he has exerted on the

minds of those who heard or read the utterances of those he psychologized, or saw or read the acts they performed. In the miraculous work of the Holy Spirit he has always exerted two influences. I. The miraculous psychological influence exerted on the hearts of those inspired by which he caused them to do or say what he wanted to reveal to others. II. The ordinary and moral influence that he exerted on the minds of those who heard or read their revelations.

We desire now to emphasize a thought that we do not want to be lost sight of for one moment, in the discussion of the issues before us. "The miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit never, in a single instance, exerted one particle of moral power, on the spirit of the person influenced by it; never in a single instance produced one particle of moral change, in the person influenced by it." The cases of Baalam, Saul King of Israel, Jonah and Caiaphas show that the person influenced, often uttered what was entirely opposed to his own wishes. That he did not know what he would say before he was influenced. Nor what he was saying when the influence was upon him. When the influence left him he knew no more about the meaning of what he had uttered than any other person, and had to study it the same as any other person. Peter says, "The Prophets, who prophesied of the good that should come unto you, sought and searched diligently, what manner of time, and what things, the Spirit of Christ, that was in them did signify, when he testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." The character of Baalam, Saul, Caiaphas and Jonah show that this influence of the spirit was imparted, sometimes, regardless of character to vile, rebellious persons. That it left vile men just as it found them. It did not change them morally, one particle. We wish our readers to remember these facts, while weighing the question, whether this influence was to remain in the church. As it was not a moral influence, it was not to be desired, on an account of its moral benefits to the person influenced. As it produced no moral influence, except through the truth it revealed, it ceased, when it had perfected that work. There can be no reason why it should exist in the church when revelation was completed. There is no work that the church does now, or is required, by the Word of God to perform, that can be accomplished by this miraculous influence, nor that it can aid one particle.

Let us now trace the miraculous influence of the spirit in the Gospel Dispensation. Joel and other prophets promised a miraculous outpouring of the spirit in the last days of the Mosaic dispensation. Peter declared, on the day of Pentecost, that the baptism in the Holy Spirit, received by him and his brethren was a partial fulfillment of Joel's promise. "This," the baptism in the Holy Spirit, that he and his brethren had received, "is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel." That it included the

miraculous powers that others enjoyed in the apostolic age. Peter's language has not the slightest reference to the ordinary influence of the spirit on the Christian, when he says: "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"—the Holy Spirit as a gift—"for the promise." What promise? Joel's promise of the miraculous influence of the spirit, "is to you and your children, and to those that are afar off."—It was, for Joel's promise was "to all flesh, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Call how? By the imposition of an apostle's hands as we shall show. John the Baptist and our Saviour promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit. It was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius. Our Saviour promised that his apostles should be inspired, when before persecuting magistrates. They were and the Bible records, no other instances. Our Saviour declares: "that out of those who believe on his name shall flow inspiration like rivers of water." This included the Baptism in the Holy Spirit, and the gifts of the Holy Spirit that existed in the apostolic church. These had not yet been given.

In his last lecture to his apostles, and to no others, as recorded in John, XIII to XVI, delivered just before crucifixion, our Saviour told his apostles that he would leave them—the apostles—that he would send to them—the apostles—the Comforter to take his place with them—the apostles—that the Comforter would reveal to their minds—the minds of the apostles—what he had said to them—the apostles—that the Comforter would guide them—the apostles—into all truth—show them—the apostles—things to come, and would take the things of the Father and show them to them—the apostles. These promises have not the slightest reference to the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit on the Christians, for his work was all miraculous. These promises apply to the apostles, and to no others. Our Saviour's address was a closing charge to his apostles, and has no application to any other persons. It was a promise that they—the apostles, should be qualified for the work that he committed to their care—committed to the apostles, and none others. After his resurrection he renewed this promise, when he promised that his apostles should be endowed with power from on high. That they should be baptized in the Holy Spirit.

Let us now dispose forever of the promise of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. It was a promise. Not a command. Was received. Not obeyed. Christ was the administrator. Not man. Was poured out from heaven. Not performed on earth by man, on another man. It was promised as a miraculous power. Not commanded as an ordinance. It was a miracle. Was always attended with miracles. It always conferred miraculous power. It was not in any name. It was not a memorial, a monument, a symbol, a type, a likeness, a form, an object lesson, setting forth any fact or truth. It was perhaps the most extraordinary and miraculous event in the Gospel Dispensation. Did not and could not become a permanent element in the church.

There is only one baptism in the church, Eph., IV, 4. It is a command. Men are to administer it to others. Men are to obey it. It is in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is in water. It is a monument of Christ's burial and resurrection—monument of the great facts of the Gospel, a memorial, a type, a likeness, a symbol, a form, an object lesson setting forth Christ's burial and resurrection—also the sinner's burial to his past sinful life, and his resurrection to a new life in Christ. It is for the remission of sins. It is a permanent ordinance in the church. The Scriptures designate but two occurrences as Baptism in the Holy Spirit. Peter declares, Acts, XI, "As I began to speak to the household Cornelius, the Holy Spirit fell on them as he did on us at the beginning, (on the day of Pentecost). Then remembered I the words of the Lord, how that he said: "John indeed baptized in water, but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit." God bestowed the same gift—the Holy Spirit as a gift—on them as on us." Peter declares that these two occasions—when the Holy Spirit fell on the apostles and brethren, on the day of Pentecost, at Jerusalem—and on the house of Cornelius in Caesarea—were baptisms in the Holy Spirit. The Bible knows no other. This disposes forever of all talk of Baptism in the Holy Spirit now, or on any other occasion, than the two mentioned by the Scriptures. Persons might as well claim the power to create a world, as to claim Baptism in the Holy Spirit. All such unscriptural visionary ideas that leave an open door for fanaticism and folly and have cursed the world with the most infamous delusions and crimes, should be abandoned.

SECOND SPEECH OF MR. KELLEY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I call the attention of the audience to the fact that instead of the negative following and trying to answer the affirmative, he has seen fit to try to prove some other thing true, in the hope that thereby he might prove that what I have stated is not true. It is customary in discussions for the negative to follow and answer the arguments of the affirmative, unless he is willing to admit that he cannot move them. If that is the position of the negative on this question, and he is willing to admit that he cannot move my position, but claims that there is something else true that he can prove outside of the line of the affirmative, and which may be termed an *alibi*, that will show that the position of the affirmative cannot be true because there is a contrary truth to such, then he has the right I suppose and the option to do so. But he cannot play upon both positions and keep within the law or rule of evidence or argument. If he has an *alibi* let him make the proper admission or plea, admitting my positions and setting up his claim, and then I can follow him in his lead, as he will thus place himself fairly in the affirmative and I can answer according to the rule, and the debate will go on orderly.

Will you do this? But I will first notice one or two of his positions, in order to show their fallacy to the audience, and then proceed with my affirmative arguments, as I shall not be drawn away from the main question under consideration to discuss side issues. I am here for the purpose of showing you the divine origin of this book, and shall show it before the eighth evening returns, I promise you that. It is said that the views and belief of the people who believe in this book are erroneous.

Now, suppose that I was discussing with an infidel friend at this time with regard to the divinity of the Holy Scriptures, and when I should take my position in order to show that the scriptures as delivered to the human family were of divine origin, my infidel opponent would arise and say, yes, your positions are all right; I cannot move those. But then your people have not been doing right. The people who believe in the Holy Scriptures are not in accordance with them in faith and doctrine. Would that interfere in the least or be applicable to the question of whether the Scriptures are true or not? And so it is with the question under discussion. The question is, as to the divine authenticity of this book, in regard to the teachings of this book; but he has sought to answer here and to throw into the minds of the audience the assertion that the people who believe in this book are not doing right, has called

in question the character of some of the persons who have believed in it, by his language and a few set phrases. In the first place, this is no argument nor can it have a particle of weight, so far as that is concerned, towards impeaching the divinity of the record that is before us. I might ask him if he believes in the Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, written and compiled by Solomon? Yet after Solomon had written these books he bowed down to wood and stone; gods made with men's hands. And yet I could hurl in his face that these books that were the compilation of the wise king ought not to be tolerated, because, forsooth, Solomon afterwards turned from the things therein and did evil in the sight of the Lord. He believes in the Psalms. Yet David had his hundreds of wives and concubines; and not only had many wives and concubines, but took a poor soldier's wife when he was in the front of war, battling for his country, and then afterwards had the soldier put in the front of the battle and murdered in order that he might carry out his designs. But because of this shall I say that the divinity of the Scriptures is at all called in question? Such fallacy of reasoning as this ought to be patent to any man that has come here for the purpose of investigating truth. I place the matter in the shape of a separate and distinct proposition. How shall we canvass this subject? How shall we go to work in order to canvass this book, and arrive at a correct conclusion as to its merits? There are many ways in which you may fail to do it. There were many ways in which the people in the first age of christianity undertook to canvass the claims with regard to whether Jesus was what he claimed to be or not. And there were true ways to canvass it then, and there were false ways to canvass it. And remember that the majority of the people undertook to canvass it upon the false issues and in the false ways. Why, I have only to open my Bible here and show you the conflict in this regard by turning to the 7th chapter of John. And it was a conflict not unlike the conflict that is presented here. In the 7th chapter of John and the 12th verse I read this: "And there was much murmuring among the people concerning him: for some said, He is a good man: others said, Nay; but he deceiveth the people. Howbeit no man spake openly of him for fear of the Jews." Now here was a question in regard to deciding upon the divine claim of that man, and there was a right way to proceed, and there was a wrong one. Some, instead of investigating the principles that he brought, and the truths that he presented, said standing behind the cloak of the persons that had

told the stories around about Jerusalem with regard to him, he is "a deceiver;" and not only a deceiver, but "a gluttonous man," "a wine bibber;" and he is palming upon the people something for truth that is not truth. Was there any argument in that? Is there any argument in the bare assertion that Joseph Smith was a false teacher, or that he was a deceiver? And I call my friend's attention to the fact that he has made him out a false prophet and a false teacher by his language before the audience, before he has offered even a scrap of evidence to you to prove him such. Is it proper, in the consideration of the question here, to call a man false before he is proven false? I wish to have him present the argument here, if he wishes to take up that line, and show that he is a deceiver, a false prophet, and a very wicked man. Then after he shall have done that, if I am not able to meet him and show to the contrary, it may possibly be proper for him to use the language with regard to him that he has used. I have not said anything in regard to the point of order raised by the chairman which was certainly proper, because if my opponent in this discussion wishes to make a poor use of his time and thus throw it away in regard to the question at issue, I propose to let him do that, so far as I am concerned. But I shall not be drawn from the main subject under consideration myself.

Then how shall we canvass this question? By an examination into the history and character, supposed faith and failings of the ones presenting it? Do you think that a fair examination could be made in such a way? This, as I said before, was the manner of those who sought or tried in a certain way to destroy the divine mission and character of Jesus. Why, you cannot palm that man off on us for the Messiah! "For is he not the carpenter's son? Is not his mother Mary, and are not Josias and James and Simon and Judas his brothers?" Such a rule of investigation adopted as that, was calculated to deceive the people, and to keep all those deceived who engaged in it, rather than to bring light to them. Afterwards when the apostles went out to preach to the world, there was a rule laid down whereby men might come to a correct conclusion with regard to the things that were presented by the apostles. And certain individuals saw fit, instead of following the true rule, to make war upon the character of the apostles. But was that a true way to examine into their faith? I ask my opponent in this discussion to answer a question with regard to that—Does he approve the course of the Jews in testing the truth and divinity of the message presented by John and Jesus in searching for stories as to their characters? Tracing out their father and mother, and their brethren, etc.; instead of investigating from the standpoint of the message that was brought, and that was shown forth in the claim itself? After he has answered these, then I ask him to state to this audience whether he

approves the act of the wicked Jews in investigating the claims and the teachings of the apostles themselves as they went forth to the world to carry that message, by inquiring into the character of Paul and of Peter, and by listening to the stories that were being told all around about them in Jerusalem and elsewhere instead of coming up like fair men and weighing and canvassing the words that they presented and comparing them with the Scriptures that they claimed to believe in? It seems to me that if we are to canvass the question under consideration, there is some proper way by which we must do it. How shall it be done? Is there any rule laid down? I believe that the Bible is the standard in controversy, as stated by my opponent. He stated many things to you that were true, and many things with regard to my belief that were untrue, and so many of them are not true, that the only answer that I will make to them at this time, is the answer that General Rosecrans telegraphed back to Washington on the occasion of the re-union of the soldiers at Cincinnati last Fall in reference to a statement made in the newspapers at Washington of a purported interview. He said, "there is so much falsehood mixed in with the little truth in the publication, that I send back a telegram that the whole is false." Now, I do not use the term falsehood in a deliberate sense in regard to my opponent, but certainly he has misconceived the positions that I take and that my people take with reference to our belief in the scriptures and in the revelations. And on many other things that he stated before you he is as ignorant, if he has stated what he really believes, as the majority, no doubt, of this audience. But it is my place to enlighten him, and I will try to do so before this discussion closes. When Jesus had been examined under a wrong rule by the wicked Jews in his time, he gave the apostles a correct rule by which they might try men, and that correct rule is stated in direct language when he refers them to the teaching of Moses and the prophets. He says to them, "If ye believed in Moses and the prophets, ye would believe in me, for Moses wrote of me." And again, as you will find recorded in the 8th chapter and 46th verse of John: "Which of you convinceth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me?" Now, the Jews were standing there, some saying that he was the son of Joseph, some saying that he was the son of Mary and that these men around here were his brethren, and that he was a deceiver and a wine bibber and a gluttonous man. But Jesus says to them, "If I say the truth, why do you not believe me?" That was the proper ground upon which to decide whether he was an impostor or not, or whether his message came from heaven or not. Afterwards he lays down a distinct and positive rule for his disciples to go by. My friend claims to be a Disciple. Will he go by it, and will he answer to this audience whether it is a true rule or not? He says,

"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: Ye therefore hear them not because ye are not of God."—John 8: 46, 47.

Again, a further exposition of this rule by one of his apostles afterwards. You will find it recorded by John in his second epistle, 9th verse, wherein he states that "whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." That is the way to try men. I have presented you my case this evening, and told you that I believed in the doctrine of Christ, and that so far as the revelation on the other continent was concerned, I was in agreement with it. I take up the revelation made on the other continent, and it says, "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." And what am I answered with? "Oh, they are deceivers! They are fanatics! He is a false prophet."

There was one position that was taken by the negative in his argument that I will examine in due time, but I will not leave the subject at this time to do so. That with reference to the cessation of miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, or inspiration, or the confining of them to the first century. If I cannot show that they were not confined to the first century, why, certainly I ought to be able to, if this is true in this book, in one sense. But then this book might be true in a certain sense, too, and still they be confined, so far as the people on the eastern continent are concerned, to the first century.

However, I will examine that when the time comes, and will make it explicit and clear to the audience. We have the rule as stated by the Apostle John, in accordance with the rule laid down by the Master himself:—"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." Now, will you investigate my character in order to know whether I am teaching the right kind of doctrine or not this evening? Or would such a course be pertinent to the question? So with any other character. If that was the test, I could overthrow, by taking the testimony of enemies and the testimony of friends, every writer that is contained in the Bible, and sink them so low that no man could ever resurrect them. But, I repeat, it is no test.

In the next verse to the rule already quoted the apostle says:—"If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." But, instead of examining the question in regard to the presentation of the book under investigation, in that line, he sees fit to go back and ask in regard to the character of the people, what their enemies said about them preferring the stories of their enemies, to the truth. But I leave the matter thus far with you, and proceed with my main affirmative argument.

Having generally introduced the subject

under discussion, I shall proceed at once to marshal the testimony found in the Bible that is fairly applicable to my positions.

It may be properly arranged under the following general divisions:—

1. That of a general nature, showing that it is in harmony with the general law relating to the race of man, that God makes known his will to him wherever and whenever man will put himself in condition to receive instruction, regardless of caste or nationality, and making it possible and probable, that nations other than the Jews of Palestine, have received instruction from Him.

2. Such testimony as is contained in the Scriptures which specifically refers to the fact of a people settling the American continent from the orient; definitely setting forth who they were; the reason and object of their coming; the results of the migration, and the character and nature of the revelations God from time to time made to them.

3. The prophetic writings contained in the Bible which refer to the decadence of the people who came here, the bringing to light of their history and Record, and the important part that Record is to fill in the purposes of the Almighty as an ensign to the people, and a means of leading men and women to the knowledge of the true God.

Under the first of these divisions the statement of the Apostle Paul is directly in support. Acts 17: 26 and 27: "And [God] hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation: That they should seek the Lord, if happily they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us."

Whatever may be our views and preconceived notions with regard to the dealings of the divine hand with the human family, it was made clear to the gifted mind of the apostle, that God did have something to do in fixing the bounds of the human habitation, and that He did it for the purpose that they might seek Him;—not only this, but that they might also "find him," which finding is to be brought into such relationship with him as to actually know him, to have a knowledge of their acceptance from him of their work and hence a communication of his will. The testimony of the apostle Peter is in perfect agreement with the thought, acts 10: 34 and 35, when he declares:—

"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." It had been with the Jews up to Peter's time as with the great mass of the people denominated Christians to-day, an idea that God would have nothing to do with any people except the few who congregated about Jerusalem so far as communicating his will or acceptance to them was concerned, and that all had been said by him to the world through them that was necessary, or that he had to

communicate: But when the light of truth was sent from on high and dawned upon Peter's mind, he woke up to the grand fact that with our common Father and Creator there was no partiality, that his will and desire extended everywhere to aid and bless the creature, the same that was subjected in hope. His acceptance on this occasion was the same as made all along through the history. That same comforter which was shed forth at the acceptance of Jesus, when He said, "This is my beloved Son," and of which Jesus had said, "If I go away I will send him," was shed forth; and falling upon those of the uncircumcision, "They heard them speak with tongues and magnify God." And the apostle and those who were with him from the manifestation of God to the people recognized that there was an acceptance.

Jesus is the next witness I offer upon the point of the existence of another people, than the Jews, who had been in communication with the Father at the date he personally presented the gospel to the people: John 10, 14 and 16:—"I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, (people), and am known of mine. As the Father knoweth me even so know I the Father: and I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep, (people), I have, which are not of this fold: (the fold of Jerusalem), them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

To have been sheep, the people referred to by Jesus in this scripture, must have at some time had the will of God made known to them and also believed the same, or else have been of Israel, made so by reason of the promises. Otherwise, they could not have been sheep; for says Jesus: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them and they follow me." They like Abraham of old had heard and recognized the inspired voice as had also the Jews when he led them along through the difficulties of life and who had hearkened in a manner to his precepts; and although at that time far separated from the fold from whence they had been led, (Jerusalem), yet, they, as the Jews to whom the address was then made, were to hear the voice of that same shepherd. These citations establish the fact certainly of the first proposition, that there were at the time Jesus was ministering upon the earth, another people than those at the fold of Jerusalem who were, or had been acceptable in their worship with God. But this is but one fact established; the second, pointing out the people referred to, must be shown, ere we can apply with understanding to the particular people, the Master's declaration. Turning to Math. 10, 5, 6, we find a descriptive statement of the kind or class of people who were termed by Jesus, sheep:—"These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Here then is another

mark of distinction by which the sheep of whom he spoke may be known.

In addition to being a people who have hearkened to his teachings, they were of the house of Israel;—of the tribes of which Judah was but one, that had under the promises sprung from Jacob, (Israel), and hence of the house of Israel. The prophet Ezekiel in speaking of those in the 34th chapter of that book gives us instruction as to where we might expect to look for this house of Israel: "My sheep wandered through all the mountains, and upon every high hill; yea, my flock was scattered upon all the face of the earth, and none did search or seek after them." And again, verse 11. "For thus saith the Lord God: Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep and seek them out."

It is clear then that in our search to find the people denominated sheep of whom Jesus spoke, and that he was to search after, we are not necessarily bound to confine ourselves to any particular part of God's heritage; for, "they were scattered upon all the face of the earth;" and although men who have termed themselves the wise and learned of the world, may have thought that the little country of Palestine is the only one wherein Jesus' voice had been heard, inspiration unmistakably points to the contrary, and no person should be surprised to find that in the faithful examination of these things the inspired writings shall have been found correct. Taking up the Record forming the basis of this discussion, I read on page 451, of a claim made that the language of Jesus made at Jerusalem was with the understanding that he knew of these on this continent, as also others in a different part of the earth;

"And behold, (says Jesus to these), 'this is the land of your inheritance; and the Father hath given it unto you. And not at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell it to your brethren at Jerusalem; neither at any time hath the Father given me commandment that I should tell it unto them concerning the other tribes of the house of Israel, whom the Father hath led away out of the land. This much did the Father command me, that I should tell unto them, that, other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd. And now because of stiffness and unbelief, they understood not my word; therefore I was commanded to say no more of the Father concerning this unto them. But, verily, I say unto you, that the Father hath commanded me. And I tell it unto you, that ye were separated from among them because of their iniquity: therefore it is because of their iniquity that they know not of you. And verily, I say unto you again, that the other tribes hath the Father separated from them; and it is because of their iniquity, that they know not of them. And verily, I say unto you, that ye are they of whom I said, other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.'"

But, says the objector, what evidence is that, that these were the people referred to? Only this; in the singularity of the statement which the record makes, and the new fact brought to light, if it shall upon investigation be found to be a fact, at a time in the world's history when it was supposed by scribes everywhere that Jesus referred to another thing, and which view is

found to have been erroneous when examined closely from a Bible standpoint in the light that is newly thrown upon the world by this record. And further it bears evidence in this, being a circumstance in the chain of evidence which unites to form a complete connection with this people and that at Jerusalem. And it is of value providing the other links in the chain accord therewith, and harmonize, and thus indeed form a chain, the which, no other reasonable view is adverse.

Do not understand me, or misrepresent me as jumping at the conclusion that because of the expression of Jesus on the other continent, found in John's gospel, therefore the book of Mormon is true; nor because the language is contained in the book from which I have read, therefore, it is true. I think I understand and comprehend the rules of logic as well as those of evidence too well to make any such blundering, or startling leap, at conclusions as that; and wish you to take only things for evidence after they shall have fairly been shown to be such.

Whether I believed in the words read from the Record I have before me or not, there would hang to mind the singularity of the statement of Jesus at Jerusalem, taken in connection with the other fact that it seemed to have been so wholly ignored and misunderstood by those to whom it was addressed. No one even to ask, Lord to whom do you refer? Indeed it is singular knowing as we do, that the Gentiles are not and never were reckoned as sheep. The same stolid indifference still manifest by that people and that seems to have hung by them so long before and after, that to them nothing was of worth or interest outside of Judah and the little country on the east of the great sea.

Returning to the line of evidence, I take up the testimony of the scriptures which relate to the establishment of a people in the land as claimed in this record:—

Genesis, 49, 22, Jacob, (Israel), the head of the tribes in his last blessing upon the twelve sons whose children should figure so wonderfully in the history of the world, says, in his blessing of Joseph:—

"Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough
"by a well; whose branches run over the wall:"

"The archers have sorely grieved him and shot at
"him, and hated him: But his bow abode in strength
"and the arms of his hands were made strong by the
"hands of the mighty God of Jacob; (from thence is the
"shepherd the savior of Israel):

"Even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee
"and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with bless-
"ings of heaven above, blessings of the deep that
"lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of the

"womb: the blessings of thy father have prevailed
"above the blessings of my progenitors unto the ut-
"most bound of the everlasting hills: they shall be on
"the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of
"him that was separate from his brethren."

Whatever may, or may not have been the former entertained or expressed views of the meaning and application of this prophetic blessing, one thing must be admitted by all the intelligent, and that is, that the prediction clearly shows a change of place of residence and habitation at some period of time, of the posterity of Joseph. Also their settlement and inheritance of a country far greater in extent, and more wonderful for richness and desirableness than the country of Palestine, or that adjacent.

The prophecy reveals what is to be the history of the descendants:—"Whose branches run over the wall." "The blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of my progenitors unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills." The blessing of Jacob's progenitors, Isaac and Abraham, consisted in the promise of the country east and south of the great sea (Mediterranean), from the River of Egypt to the Euphrates, including the whole of Canaan. This is clearly established by the following references: Gen. 12:7; 7:8; 15:7 & 18; 26:3 & 4; 28:4, and 48:4.

But in the prophetic blessing of Joseph the statement is emphatic that the branches (daughters, children, posterity), of Joseph were to extend above this, beyond Canaan and the country of the Mediterranean, even "unto the utmost bound of the everlasting hills." Far from the country of Palestine, to a land teaming with the first things of earth, honored with the choicest of blessings and one to be desired above that of Canaan.

I invite you to candidly and fairly enter upon the search for this "promised" land, and to be only as confident in the same as the history and prophetic writings shall fully and fairly warrant. Turning to Deut. 33:13 to 18, we find a further account and description of this same country, and also a prediction with reference to this same branch of the human family. It is the language of Moses, the great civil and ecclesiastical lawgiver of ancient times, and "the prophet," to whom even reference is made in pointing out a likeness of the great character of Jesus.

Upon these words we may rely if we are to place implicit confidence in any statements of the divine record.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We return now to the rest of Joel's promise, and what was also included in the Saviour's promises. Joel's promise was to all flesh, without exception. It included every human being. Our Saviour in his last great commission to his apostles limited Joel's promise to "as many as should believe" on him through the preaching of the apostles. His language includes all believers, without exception. But as our Saviour limits the promise of the Holy Spirit in Joel, so the Holy Spirit in Peter on the day of Pentecost, limits our Saviour's promise to "as many as the Lord our God shall call." There is no conflict, but merely a gradual development, by the Holy Spirit, in successive revelations, of the law of spiritual gifts. Joel's promise was limited by our Saviour to believers; and the Holy Spirit, in Peter, limits the promise of Joel and Jesus to those among believers "whom the Lord our God should call." Only those whom the Lord our God should call were to receive the Holy Spirit as a gift, or were to receive miraculous power through the Holy Spirit. When God ceased calling persons to the exercise of these gifts, they were to cease. The all-important question then is: "How did God call men to the enjoyment of the gift of the Holy Spirit, to the exercise of these miraculous powers, conferred by the Holy Spirit, called spiritual gifts? How long did he continue to call men to the exercise of these gifts? When did he cease to call men to the exercise of these miraculous powers?"

I claim that he called them to the exercise of spiritual gifts, in every instance, except the Baptism of the Holy Spirit—by the imposition of an apostle's hands—in that way alone. None but an apostle could call men to the exercise of these gifts. This power to bestow these gifts was "the sign of apostleship." When the apostles ceased to call men, God ceased to call men, to the exercise of these gifts, for his appointed and only means of calling men to these spiritual gifts ceased. Then as many, out of all flesh, out of believers, as God called—by his only appointed means, the imposition of an apostle's hands—to the exercise of these spiritual gifts, and no others received them. Outside of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit no one ever enjoyed these gifts, except those on whom an apostle laid his hands, to impart them. Acts, VIII. Philip, who exercised wonderful spiritual powers, could not impart spiritual gifts. "Now when the apostles, who were at Jerusalem, heard that the Samaritans had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who when they were come down prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit, for as yet he had not fallen

on any of them, only they had been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." My opponent's claim that baptism is for the receiving of the Holy Spirit, is at fault here. These persons had been baptized, and had not, and could not receive the Holy Spirit until an apostle had laid hands on them, for the account proceeds: "Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit. Simon saw that the Holy Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostle's hands." Here it is declared, as clearly as human speech can make it, that the Holy Spirit was received through the laying on of an apostle's hands. That he was imparted in that way alone, for the apostles had to come down from Jerusalem, and lay their hands on them, before they could receive him, although they had been baptized, and Philip the mighty wonder-worker, who was full of the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, was with them. If Philip could not bestow the Holy Spirit, no one outside of an apostle could.

Acts, IX. Saul's case is supposed to be an exception. He was in Damascus, hundreds of miles from any apostle. As prophets, who were not Levites, sometimes offered sacrifices as prophets, when no Levite was present to officiate, so here, God called and miraculously commissioned and appointed Ananias to act as special apostle, in this case, to confer on Saul the Holy Spirit. He declares: "The Lord Jesus sent me to you, that you may receive the Holy Spirit." This case no more sets to one side our law than the act of Elijah in offering sacrifices as prophet, when there was no priest to officiate, sets to one side God's positive law that no one but a Levite could offer sacrifices. Acts, XIX. Paul baptized the twelve disciples of John, at Ephesus. "Then he laid hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit, and spoke with tongues and prophesied. Tim. 1-6." "Stir up the gift of God that is in you, through the laying on of my hands." These are all of the instances of the impartation of spiritual gifts, in the Scriptures, outside of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was imparted, in every instance, by the imposition of an apostle's hands. These Scriptures prove beyond cavil that no one but an apostle could confer these gifts, and that they were conferred in that way alone. None but an apostle could call to the exercise of these gifts. These gifts never descended to a third person. I challenge an instance where they descended to a third person. That any one ever exercised spiritual gifts but one called by the imposition of an apostle's hand. When the last person to whom an apostle had imparted these gifts, by the imposition of his hands, died these gifts

ceased from earth. God ceased calling men to the exercise of these gifts when his only appointed means of calling them ceased. Thus we utterly demolish every claim of inspiration for Joe Smith or any of his followers; every shadow of claim of inspiration for the Book of Mormon; all claim that it is of divine origin.

The Scriptures clearly teach that these miraculous powers were exercised to give to man a completed revelation of a scheme of salvation from sin, and that when that object was accomplished, they ceased. We have already used the illustration of creation. God brought animals and plants into existence by miracle of direct creation. But when that was done he ceased miracles of creation, and now operates in a higher and more perfect manner, by natural law. So he gave revelation by means of inspiration until he had completed a perfect system of revelation universally applicable, and eternal truths. Then he ceased revelation and miracle, and operates now through a higher and more perfect law, the moral power of these divine truths, thus revealed and completed. The Bible speaks of the unfolding of the scheme of redemption as being similar to the growth of each person, from infancy to manhood. As the child lays to one side the discipline of the school and the parent, and enters on the duties of life, in which he uses what parents and teachers have taught him, so the Bible teaches that mankind have laid to one side the instrumentalities employed in childhood and youth, and now, as men, use the truths God has imparted and perfected.

There was a time when the settlers of America had no government. Then they obtained from home government colonial governments. This was followed by the revolutionary government. Then came government under the Articles of Confederation. Under these a constitutional convention was held, and a constitution offered to the people. They adopted it and established a complete government under it. All constitutional convention work then ceased. The Antediluvian Dispensation, from Adam to the flood, might be compared to the settlers before they had a regular government. The Patriarchal Dispensation, from the flood to the law of Sinai, might be regarded as the period of colonies and governments under the parent government. The Mosaic Dispensation might be compared to our revolutionary government. The preparatory work of John and our Saviour to government under the articles of confederation, when the constitutional convention was established and did its work. The apostles and the work under them might be compared to the work of the constitutional convention, and the organization of our government in accordance with the constitution. The apostles were appointed by our Saviour to give to the church its constitution the New Testament, just as the people chose delegates to the constitutional convention, through their representatives, and empowered them to

frame the constitution. Now mankind adopt the New Testament, form churches under it, and live in accordance with its principles, just as our people accept our constitution, form states under it, and live in accordance with the general laws and principles of the constitution. Just as the constitutional convention ceased its work, when it had framed the constitution, so the apostles and revelation ceased their work, when the New Testament was completed. To go back under direct revelations would be as absurd as to go back under a constitutional convention. Direct revelations were as much inferior to the operation of the completed word of God, as the constitutional convention was to government under the constitution. In all of the former dispensations, when miraculous powers were exercised, the condition of mankind was as inferior to our condition now, under a completed revelation, as all former conditions of our people were inferior to our present condition. Not only so but revelation in all dispensations speaks of the dispensations, when miraculous powers existed, as imperfect provisional, and preparatory to something higher and better. They speak of the work of Christ and his apostles as that which is perfect and complete. They never speak of anything that is to succeed it, of anything that is to be better than the Gospel. John speaks of the work of Jesus as perfect. The apostle speaks of this work as the perfection of the work of revelation, as that which is perfect. That which is to have no successor. They speak of what the Gospel will do, but not what something higher and better, that is to replace it, will do. The Scriptures teach clearly and positively, not that these miraculous gifts were to remain as a constituent and perpetual element in the Gospel, the church and their workings, but that they were the means of revealing the Gospel, the New Testament, and when that was done they were to cease. These miraculous powers were no more a part of the Gospel than the exercise of miraculous powers exercised in creation was a part of things created. Just as miraculous power in creation was only the means, and ceased when it had accomplished its work, so miraculous power in revelation, was the means of revealing the word of God, and not a part of that word and ceased when revelation was completed, and did not remain a part of what it had introduced and completed. Constitution making is only a means of making the constitution, and not a part of it. It ceased when it had done its work in giving the constitution. It does not remain as part of what it has made. My opponents position is as absurd as it would be to claim that God must now bring animals and plants into being by miracle of creation or that a constitutional convention must set forever, and be forever making constitutions.

The teachings of the New Testament harmonize exactly with our position and illustrations. Eph., IV: "Christ gave

miraculous gifts to men. He gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, some to be shepherds and some to be teachers." These apostles and prophets, were extraordinary powers in the church. Their work was necessarily one accomplished by inspiration, miraculous power from the Holy Spirit. The evangelists, shepherds and teachers were endowed with miraculous powers then, for such power was essential to their work, in the condition in which the church then was. All these had miraculous powers, spiritual gifts. How long were they to continue? For what purpose were these miraculous powers given? Paul answers: "For the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of the ministry, for the building (the work of the ministry in building) of the body of Christ" or completing the organization of the church—"until we all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God"—or until "the faith"—the word of God—the New Testament is completed. This passage of Scripture explains, definitely and clearly, for what purpose these gifts were given, and how long they were to continue. They were given to furnish the saints for the work of the ministry in building up the organization of the church, and were to remain until that work was done, or until all attained to the unity of the faith, and the faith is perfected. Then they ceased, having accomplished their purpose. There can be but one answer to this. My opponent must show that the "until" refers to something else than the completion of the organization of the church, and the completion of the word of God—the New Testament, and show that the work of these gifts was not accomplished in these works, and that it is needed now.

My position is still more fully taught in I. Cor. XII, XII, XIV. The apostle in XII, 8, 9, 10, and 28, 29, 30, enumerates the gifts that the Holy Spirit bestowed on persons in the church: I. Word of wisdom. II. Word of knowledge. III. The faith—the word of God. IV. Gifts of healing. V. Working of powers. VI. Prophecy. VII. Discerning of spirits. VIII. Speaking in different tongues. IX. Power to interpret different tongues. These miraculous gifts made persons: I. Apostles. II. Prophets. III. Teachers. IV. Miraculous powers. V. Gifts of healing. VI. Helps. VII. Wise counsellors. VIII. Speaking in different tongues. IX. Interpretation of different tongues. He then says: "Desire earnestly the best of these spiritual gifts"—while it is the order in the church to exercise these gifts—"but nevertheless I show unto you a more excellent way"—than the exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts. Observe carefully that Paul, after exhorting his brethren to desire the best of these spiritual gifts while it is the order of the church to exercise spiritual gifts, declares positively that there is a more excellent way than the exercise of the very best of these spiritual gifts. In this he flatly contradicts the central idea of Mormonism, which teaches

that the highest condition of the church is the exercise of these spiritual gifts, and that the state of the church, when they are not exercised is, not as Paul declares "the more excellent way," but an apostate condition.

Paul proceeds to unfold this more excellent way in what is the XIII. chapter in our English Bible—this way that is more excellent than the exercise of the very best of these spiritual gifts, which my opponent makes the all in all in Christianity. He declares that Christian love, Christian character and spirit, are the great purpose of the religion of Christ. All things—the highest and best spiritual gifts, are worthless unless they aid in producing Christian love, Christian spirit and character; and are valuable only as they aid in producing such results. He then unfolds a way of producing Christian love, Christian spirit and character, that is better than the exercise of the highest and best of these spiritual gifts, that my opponent regards as the alpha and omega of Christianity. He declares that Christian love, Christian character and spirit, shall remain forever, for they are the great object of the religion of Christ. "But prophesying" all utterances by inspiration, "shall cease"—"speaking in different tongues, shall cease"—that is all miraculous powers that are mere signs, of the presence of superhuman power shall cease. "Knowledge"—all knowledge by inspiration "shall cease," or in other words, when that more excellent way than the exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts obtains, all miraculous powers shall cease.

Paul then gives the reason why they shall cease, and tells when they shall cease—We come now to a passage of scripture that is more frequently perverted and worse perverted than almost any other in the word of God. Paul is discussing the condition of the church, and if the ordinary interpretation be true, he leaves the church entirely, and goes up into heaven, in his discussion, and contrasts, not two different states of the church, as common sense demands, but the church and heaven. Outside of the Bible, such an idea would be regarded as preposterous nonsense. But men seem to lay one side all sense, when studying the Bible. It is not to be understood as any other book; but is to be made as unnatural and fantastic as possible. No conceit is too farfetched, too unnatural to be injected into Biblical interpretation. Insist that Paul is contrasting two conditions of the church. One when spiritual gifts are exercised, the other when they are not exercised. Both states are states of the church, and of course here on earth and before Christ gives up his Messiahship, and the church ceases to exist as an institution, on earth, for the salvation of man from sin. The passages following have not the slightest reference to heaven, or to anything but a condition of the church on earth.

The apostle declares: "For now"—that is during the exercise of these spiritual gifts, the present state of the church—"we know

in part"—that is the knowledge imparted by these spiritual gifts is but partial—but a fragment of revelation each time they are exercised—"and prophesy in part"—that is speaking by inspiration, gives but a fragment of revelation each time it is exercised—"but when that which is perfect is come"—when the "perfect law of liberty" of James—when that which makes perfect the man of God, the scriptures, are completed in the New Testament—"then that which is in part"—the exercise of these spiritual gifts—these partial revelations through them "shall be done away." The apostle then returns to the figure used in the XII chapter, where he compared the church to the human body, and personifies the church by his own body, and its development by his own growth. He declares that just as he "perceived as a child, felt as a child, spoke as a child, when he was a child," so the church, during the exercise of these spiritual gifts, "perceives as a child, speaks as a child," for for all revelations under such circumstances must be fragmentary and broken. But as he "put away childish things when he became a man" so the church will put away these childish things, the exercise of these spiritual gifts when it passes out into the condition of manhood, when it is under "the perfect law of liberty" the completed Testament a law of universal truths, suited to the liberty of manhood.

This agrees exactly with the apostle's teaching in Eph. IV. as we have already seen. The apostle continues: "Now" that is during the exercise of these spiritual gifts—"we"—that is all believers—"see as in a mirror dimly"—these partial revelations, through the exercise of these spiritual gifts, give imperfect knowledge—"but then"—that is when the word of God is completed in the New Testament—"we shall see face to face." As James declares: "the perfect law of liberty," the New Testament is a mirror, and if a man looks into it and is a doer of what it requires he is blessed. "Now," continues the apostle—that is during the exercise of these spiritual gifts—"I know in part"—that is the fragmentary revelations, given through the exercise of spiritual gifts, imparts but partial knowledge—"I prophesy in part"—that is inspired speaking through these spiritual gifts is partial and fragmentary—"but then"—that is when the word of God is completed in the New Testament—"I shall know even as I am known"—that is the church shall know what it ought to be, just as the Holy Spirit knows what it ought to be, for the Holy Spirit will then have made a perfect revelation of the matter. The apostle closes by declaring that "faith," the faith, God's perfected word—"hope"—God's perfected promises—"love"—christian spirit and character, that are the object of revelation, "shall remain forever, but the greater of these is love, christian spirit and character" the great aim and purpose of all religion. I have been careful to unfold this important revelation, because it cuts up by the roots, all claim of inspiration for Joe

Smith, and all claim that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin. I might rest my case here.

We will clinch the matter however by putting Mormonism to the test it challenges. Has Mormonism revealed a single new idea, not contained in the Bible? Has it given a better expression to a single idea revealed in the Bible, than is given by the Bible? Man is constitutionally a religious being. Without any revelation his religious nature would have, and ever has had its expression in religious ideas and system of religion. Into these systems of religion man has wrought certain catholic religious ideas of his religious nature. Religions differ in the number of these ideas that they contain, and in their expression of them. All human systems of religion are faulty in these particulars. I. They do not contain all of the catholic ideas of man's nature. II. They do not express these ideas perfectly. III. They do not expand them into universally applicable principles. All human religions are national or race religions. They are not religions for all mankind. IV. They do not unite these ideas into a harmonious system. V. They do not expand the system into a universal and absolute religion. VI. They corrupt these ideas with error and evil. VII. They incorporate error and evil into the system as cardinal ideas. We claim for Christianity I. It contains every catholic religious idea of man's religious nature. II. It expresses each and every idea perfectly. III. It expands each and every idea into an eternal truth, a universally applicable principle. IV. It unites all of these ideas into a harmonious system. V. It strips these ideas and the system of all error and imperfection, with which human systems has polluted them. VI. It expands the system into an absolute religion, a religion for humanity.

If this position be true, then a man can not outgrow Christianity. It is the work of all study to reach universally applicable principles, such as the law of gravitation, or the Copernican law of the universe. When research has attained to such principles, it has reached the ultimate in that direction. It can never outgrow such a principle. It will never need anything in its stead. It can only learn more of the scope and grasp, the ramifications of these universal truths, throughout the infinite universe, but it can never outgrow them. It will never need anything in their stead. In Christianity, we have a system composed of such eternal truths, such universally applicable principles. Man can never outgrow them not even a "Re-organized Mormon." He will never need new truths, new revelations in addition to them, nor in their stead. If man progresses throughout eternity, he may be able to understand the scope and grasp of these eternal truths, these universally applicable principles better, but he will never outgrow them, nor will he need something in their stead, no more than he will outgrow the law of gravitation, and need something in its stead. This forever

silences and renders absurd the claim of Mormon revelations.

The catholic ideas of man's religious nature are these, I. The self-existent, independent, self-sustaining, eternal and absolute Being, the origin of all derived existences, and the cause of all phenomena, is Absolute Spirit, or God. Has Mormonism any idea to take the place of this? Does it give a better revelation of it than is given in the Bible? II. This Absolute Spirit created, controls and sustains all things in the boundless universe. Has Mormonism a revelation to take the place of this truth? Does it give a better revelation of this truth than is given in the Bible? III. Spirit existence. God who is absolute spirit; Christ who is a divine spirit; the Holy spirit, a divine spirit; angels; spirit in man. Has Mormonism any ideas to take the place of the teachings of the Bible on this subject? Does it give a better revelation of them than we find in the Bible? IV. The immortality of man's spirit and all spirits. Has Mormonism given us any new ideas on this topic? Does it reveal any truth not in the Bible, or better than it is expressed in the Bible? V. Freedom of volition in all acts of the spirit. Has Mormonism any new revelations on this topic, not in the Bible? Or does it express the truth better than the Bible? VI. The division of all things into good or evil; all ideas into true or false; all acts into right or wrong; all characters into righteous or wicked. What new revelations has Mormonism given us on these matters, that better express this truth? VII. Clear, simple, infallible standard for deciding what is right and wrong, true and false. Has Mormonism given us a single new idea in regard to this matter? VIII. Responsibility to God? Has Mormonism added a single thought in regard to this? IX. Accountability to God? What light have we from Mormonism, on this topic, not in the Bible? X. Retribution here and hereafter. Has Mormonism given us a single new idea on this important topic? XI. God's providence, as our Father in heaven. Has Mormonism added a ghost of an idea to our knowledge on that subject? XII. Prayer and answer to prayer. What new revelations has Mormonism given us on that question? XIII. Revelations from God, of truth man unaided could not attain. What new idea in regard to revelation does Mormonism give to man? XIV. Inspiration of chosen men as mediums of revelation. What new light have we from Mormonism on this topic? XV. Miracles as proof of inspiration and revelation. What new truth has Mormonism in regard to miracles? XVI. Prophecy. What new ideas in regard to prophecy has Mormonism given to the world? XVII. Sacrifice for sin. What light have the pretended Mormon revelations thrown on this topic? XVIII. The expiation or atonement that Christ made for mankind. Have Mormon pretended revelations given us one new thought on this central idea of Christianity? XIX. The mediatorship of Christ. Has Mormonism given to the world one particle

of light on that topic, not in the Bible? XX. A leader in religion and redemption. What light from Mormon revelations here? XXI. A perfect embodiment of teaching, and example in life. Has Mormonism given us a ray of additional light on the subject? XXII. An object of faith devotion and love? What light does Mormonism add to the teachings of the Bible? XXIII. Incarnation of Jesus as divine sacrifice, mediator, and object of love and devotion. Does Mormonism add a single thought on this topic? XXIV. Sin as a fact in man's life and experience. Its nature, its results. Has Mormonism thrown one particle of additional light over this dark theme? XXV. Regeneration of life, spirit and character. Have we any additional light on this glorious idea of Christianity, from the jack-o-lantern of Mormonism? XXVI. Forgiveness of sin on repentance and reformation. What new revelations on this cheering truth, have we from Mormonism? XXVII. A life of righteousness moulded and directed by religion. Does Mormonism give us new revelations here? XXVIII. The life of each individual, the family, society in all relations, nations, mankind, are to be regenerated by the pure religion of Christ. Do we owe anything to Mormon revelations on this subject? XXIX. The regulation of all thought, action, and life, in every relation of life, and sphere of action, by this religion. What new ideas does Mormonism give us here? XXX. Each person elevates himself in love and righteousness, by giving himself in loving self-sacrifice for others. Does Mormonism give a new revelation on this thought? XXXI. Man is to be a co-worker with God in the great work of redemption. What new revelation have we from Mormonism on this topic? XXXII. Man in the mental and moral likeness of God. What new revelations here? Weak Mormonism. XXXIII. Endless growth, development and progress of all intelligences, towards the absolute perfection of their Creator. What new revelations have we here? We ask the Mormon. XXXIV. The resurrection and glorification of man's nature. What new revelations on this theme have we from Mormonism? XXXV. The universal Fatherhood of God. What new light does Mormonism give us in regard to this topic? XXXVI. The universal brotherhood of man. What new revelations on this theme has Mormonism given us? XXXVII. A system of truth to be believed, of worship to be performed, of rules of life to be lived. Has Mormonism in its pretended revelations added the ghost of an idea to what is in the Bible? XXXVIII. The church of Christ as a perfect organization, for the maintenance of this religion, and man's culture in it. What new truth has Mormonism given us here? Will our opponent answer these questions?

He dare not contradict common sense and Gods word, in claiming that all of the pretended revelations of Mormonism, have suggested a ghost of a new truth, in regard to one of these great ideas revealed in the

Bible. There is left for him one refuge. He may say that he does not claim that revelations are needed to add to the truths revealed in the Bible, or to express them better, but the spiritual gifts are needed to enable man to do the work that the religion of Christ and the revelations of the Bible demand of him. That inspiration and new revelations are needed to aid man in such work, and to enable him to do it. That human wisdom is not always sufficient to the task of developing and applying the universally applicable truths of revelation. Nor to the task of deciding what should be done in applying them. That revelations, inspiration, spiritual gifts, are needed to supply this want of human weakness. Also to authenticate and establish the divine origin of Christianity. That as spiritual gifts were needed as helps and a sign of the divinity of the religion of Christ anciently, so they

are needed now. This is the only refuge left him. Should he attempt refuge there, we will soon drive him out of that last hiding place.

Now will our opponent meet these two positions. I. The Scriptures teach that inspiration revelation and miraculous power existed for a definite purpose, the revelation of a perfect system of truth. That system of truth was completed in the New Testament. Inspiration revelation and miracle ceased having accomplished their purpose. Therefore all claims of later revelations is absurd and unscriptural. II. Christianity contains all religious ideas and expresses them perfectly. Further revelation is needless. Will he grapple with these positions like a man and cease his jingling interpretation of prophecies that have not more reference to Mormonism than the frauds of a gang of counterfeiters.

THIRD SPEECH OF MR. KELLEY.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: When my time was called upon last evening I was citing proofs from the scriptures, relative to the establishment and occupancy of a people upon the American continent.

I turn and read again from Deuteronomy 33:13-18:

"And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the Lord be his land, for the precious things of heaven, for the dew, and for the deep that coucheth beneath, and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the earth and fullness thereof, and for the good will of Him that dwelt in the bush: let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns are like the horns of unicorns: with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth; and they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and they are the thousands of Manasseh."

Here we have such a full and definite description of Joseph's land—where the branches—posterity of Joseph—were to pass to, and inherit, that it is hardly possible to make a mistake in applying it to the country, unless we shall while trying to do so be determined in our minds at all risks to preserve to our souls some cherished and petted theory or selfish institution, rather than to approach fairly and openly the light. It is a land of broad fields and extended territory. Of great diversities of soil, climate and temperature. It must extend through and occupy in the different zones. Here are the products of the earth set out in their fullness. Celebrated for its fruits and luxuriant vegetation, "put forth by the sun and moon." A land of the chief minerals, "chief things of the ancient mountains;" for the wealth and products of its lakes and rivers, "the deep that coucheth beneath;" and for the blessings of heaven, the revelations of God—verse 16, "For the good will of him that dwelt in the bush;" and then it was far away from Canaan, "to the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills."

Associate this description now, with the promised blessing upon the children of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, Gen. 48:15-20, where the land is located in the midst of the earth; which, when we remember that the patriarch stood in the country lying on the Mediterranean and near to Canaan, could not with any sense of justice or fitness to the statement be made to apply to that land, and it will be possible to intelligently point it out.

The children also were to "grow into a multitude." Wherever the land is, a multitude of people will doubtless be found who are the descendants of Joseph of Egypt. "And he blessed them that day, saying, 'In thee shall Israel bless, saying,

God make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh.'" This accords with the description of the blessing of Joseph's land by Moses. It is one greatly to be desired; choice above every other land, as was the blessing of the lads: so much so that it would be the highest thing to bless others as was the blessing of these children. The other sons of Jacob had their blessing and inheritance in Canaan, and how could it ever be truly said, "God bless thee as Ephraim and Manasseh," if theirs was thus confined to Canaan also?

Pursuing the examination however, in search of this promised land and the line of Joseph, I next refer you to the prediction with reference to the departure from Jerusalem of the people who evidently were led to the land spoken of by these inspired men and the manner and time of their coming. Jeremiah 48:32, "O vine of Sibmah, I will weep for thee with the weeping of Jazer: *'Thy plants are gone over the sea, they reach even to the sea of Jazer: the spoiler is fallen upon thy summer fruits, and upon thy vintage.'*" Here is introduced under the figure of a choice vine the dispersion of the line of Israel's beloved, and an introduction of the fact that they should pass from the then inheritance to the sea, and over the sea; as is also more specifically set forth by the prophet Isaiah 16:8, where it is evident the same event is referred to of which Jeremiah has given evidence. He says: "For the fields of Heshbon languish, and the vine of Sibmah: the lords of the heathen have broken down the principal plants thereof, they are come even unto Jazer, they wandered through the wilderness: her branches are stretched out, they are gone over the sea."

Now pass in your mind over the sea, from the old country of Jazer on the east of the Mediterranean, in either direction (so as to pass over the sea), and tell me what land you shall find and the only one you can find that answers the description of Joseph's land as foretold by Israel and Moses?

The phrase, "vine of Sibmah," may be understood by comparing it with the saying of the Lord in the second chapter, 20th and 21st verses, of Jeremiah: "For of old time I have broken thy yoke, and burst thy bands; and thou saidst, thou wilt not transgress; when upon every high hill and every green tree thou wanderest playing the harlot. Yet I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: How then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me?" Sibmah refers to that to be desired, pleasant, choice. And the "vine of Sibmah," is properly interpreted, "a noble vine," "a right seed," which was true of Ephraim and Manasseh.

Turning again to the evidences upon the main thread of our search, I refer you to the 49th of Jeremiah, 30th to 33rd verses inclusive; where he gives the excited and hurried warning which God had commanded him to deliver, just a short time before the king of Babylon brings desolation upon the country of Jerusalem. The language of the prophet fully discloses the troublous scenes which suddenly followed: "Flee, get you far off, dwell deep," (that is go unobserved, secret),

"O ye inhabitants of Hazer, saith the Lord: for Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon hath taken counsel against you, and hath conceived a purpose against you. Arise, get you up unto the wealthy nation that dwelleth without care, saith the Lord, which have neither gates nor bars, which dwell alone. And their camels shall be a booty, and the multitude of their cattle a spoil: and I will scatter into all winds them that are in the utmost corners: and I will bring their calamity from all sides thereof, saith the Lord. And Hazer shall be a dwelling for dragons, and a desolation forever: there shall no man abide there, nor any son of man dwell in it."

The warning to these people was to get out of the reach of the King of Babylon who at that time held complete sway in the countries of the east, and they were promised that if they would obey the voice and hearken unto the Lord, they should be led to a wealthy nation, a land descriptive of Joseph's land, and which, had been aforetime inhabited and whose inhabitants dwelt without bars;—with nothing to prevent persons who should go there of taking possession,—showing that the cattle and camels would be a prey to be had for the taking.

Such a country as this existed at some place upon the earth at the time of the delivering of the warning prophecy and of the captivity referred to, unless the prophecy is false. Where was it? The Book of Mormon comes in with the new light reflected in 1829, and shows that at the time, such a country existed upon the American continent.

It had to that date been inhabited by a people who were led here from the plains of Shinar at the time of the confounding of the languages; and who had been greatly blessed and enriched and had builded cities and towns and earthworks, and had been rich in cattle and camels and all kinds of animals, and in mines and mining. But had been at this time hurriedly gathered together by their leaders from every part of the land, leaving their cities unkept, the ores in process of removal in the mines, their herds and their flocks free to wander, while they engaged in mortal combat, stirred to the most desperate frenzy by animosity and revenge, until the country had become desolate of inhabitants.

Ah! but says my opponent, this comes from the Book of Mormon, it is not evidence. But I shall not leave the testimony here. I refer to it to show you that so early as 1829, when the book went into the hands of the publisher, this work cast the new light upon the nation and peoples of the world, when all were in ignorance and darkness; not only with regard to the former habita-

tion of the continent, but also the interpretation of these prophecies. For my proofs, I shall bring before you the corroborative testimonies which have come to light through the explorations and archeological discoveries of the continent, as set forth and published in the first scientific and historical works of the times, and which could not have been known to the author of the Book of Mormon if it is claimed to be the work of man only.

Upon last evening it was repeatedly challenged, to point to a new thing which reflected light to the people from the work. I had nevertheless just referred him to the new light thrown upon the prophecy of the Master at Jerusalem. Here is another that stands out boldly and sublime as though flashed by the inspired shaft from the heavenly realms; and were it material to the maintenance of the authenticity of the work, I could gather from its brilliant pages ten thousand reflections of its rays, which are for the elevation of man, the encouragement, consolation and spiritual growth of the Christian as he wrestles with the evils of life, and which are not attained by the reading of any other work. But suppose I could not show a single new truth. How could it affect the argument as to whether God revealed himself to the people upon this continent, and that the result of such revelation were not teachings, "entitled to the respect and belief" of all the people who believe in the partial record that is left to us of the will of heaven as given to the people on the other continent? Will he answer the question for you? His ringing of changes on the word Mormon and "Mormonism," will hardly answer him as argument even with half thinking people. If this record is what it purports to be, all of it except about 75 pages, was in existence as a matter of history, *prior* to the time the revelator was at Patmos, and the greater part, long prior to the dawning of the Christian era. The people by whom much of it was written were also to a degree in customs, manners, and education, comparable with those who wrote much of the Bible. Should it be thought wonderful then that we can find often in its pages a similarity of thought and style?

I know the position has been assumed by my opponent, that he has a right to set up and affirm what he thinks the principles of my faith are, or of the body I represent in this discussion, and then to make a grand lunge at these supposed views as though he were battling down my arguments.

But he will find out before the close of the sixteen sessions that I lead in my own affirmatives, and have a different source from which to gather and elucidate my faith, than the brazen works of falsehood of Howe, Hyde, Tucker, Beadle, Stenhouse, Bennett, Ford, et al, by the score, who by garbling, falsifying, innuendo and deceit, have sought to make the faith of the Saints, (which is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, as was the kingdom of God with the apostles), to be a coarse and "sensual

system." And by way of a reminder I will tell him here and now, that it will avail nothing for his side to set up imaginary men of chaff and straw at which to make a show of fight. I claim to be founded upon the rock, the which, neither fog, bluster, dust nor ashes will startle or move, and against which slanderous stories, calumny, abuse and vilifying can make no impression. Returning, however, to my affirmative argument, I invite your consideration to a thought that may arise in the minds of some as to whether or not at the time of these last prophecies, there lived at, or in the country of Jerusalem, any of the posterity of Joseph of Egypt. It was not as may have been imagined by some that these tribes had their respective boundaries and there was no intermingling in their living and their marriages. It was common for persons of different tribes to inhabit in the territory of other tribes. In 1 Chron. 9:3 it is stated: "And in Jerusalem dwelt of the children of Judah, and of the children of Benjamin, and of the children of Ephraim and Manasseh."

For further evidence on this point I cite you to 1 Chron. 7:28; 2 Chron. 15:8,9; 17:2; and 30:18. It will not do then to take the position that the prophet's warning was to be heeded by some of the tribe of Judah only, and that it was thus fulfilled in passing out of the land, and that none of the others of Israel improved the opportunity.

The other prophecies relating to subsequent events are in conflict with such an idea or interpretation. There were in the city and country of Jerusalem at this time, those of other tribes, and particularly Ephraim and Manasseh.

Here, I call to your mind a summary of the proofs I have made so far in this line, not one of which the negative has even noticed to this time. He has been waxing strong elsewhere, trying to draw comfort from the use of a few choice phrases applied in a derisive manner to the church and people I represent, and to prove to you that God could not reveal himself to the people of this continent, because by the action of a few persons who lived a few hundred years after the death of the apostles, and who got together, collected as many copies of the manuscript of the apostles as they could find, and after asserting them according to their judgment, made a book and called it the Book, or "The Bible;" and thus forever shut Deity out. Don't fail to gather the idea! they shut off the means of communication before they had heard whether Deity accepted their work as containing all the word of God. And now my opponent occupies the ridiculous position of stating that this compilation and collation contains all that God ever did, or ever will give for the instruction of men. It is a terribly false and superstitious belief, and has been the means of making more infidels than any other one thing. But I shall particularly notice this hereafter, and pass now to the proposed summary.

I have so far shown:

1. That it is according to the expressed will of heaven to make known to man in every nation His will, and that all should seek after and find Him.

2. That other nations than the Jews have sought after and found Him, and we have not their record in the Bible.

3. That in the days of the Patriarchs, and of Moses, and of the Prophets, there were express predictions to the effect that a line or remnant of the seed of Joseph should change their inheritance from Palestine, to a country that far exceeded it in all that is calculated to make a land desirable; and that the new country was far from Canaan.

4. That such a people did leave the country of Palestine in the time of the reign of Zedekiah, King of Judah, and started for a land of this description, passing covertly to and over the sea, to a land beyond the borders of Africa.

I shall now enter upon another line of proofs and show that the people did not only thus leave Palestine, but also show more particularly where they went to, and what was said they should do after they arrived upon the (to them), "promised land." Referring to the prophecy of Ezekiel, 37:15-28, we find a clear and explicit statement made with regard to an event to take place in the earth, and one particular thing which was to precede this notable event:

"The word of the Lord came again unto me saying, 'moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it for Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions; then take another stick, and write upon it for Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: And join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thy hand. And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these? say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thine hand before their eyes. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land.'"

If in this prophecy it shall be concluded that the *particular sticks*, can have no interest or signification, certainly the *writing upon them* must. The writing upon one of these sticks was for Judah, to represent the line, evidently, through which it came, and may be fairly and truly interpreted to mean the scriptures which came through that line. The writing upon the other was for Joseph, and complimentary by reason of the blessing upon his sons long prior, called the stick of Ephraim; and may fairly be interpreted to refer to some like writing which should come through the line of Joseph. Verse 19 shows, that the Lord should at some time in the divine economy use these together for the accomplishment of his purposes; and verses 22 and 23, show what these purposes are, and at what time the sticks or writings were to be joined together, i. e., at the time de-

clared by the prophet when, "the envy of Ephraim shall depart and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off." "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." Isaiah 11:13; and more particularly with regard to the time and event see the instruction in verse 12: "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."

Turning to the 18th of Isaiah, the parallel text with this, we find the place of the setting up of the ensign and a further confirmation of the time when it was to take place. See the entire chapter. The prophet calls attention to the land shadowing with wings as the place, which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia—far west of Jerusalem. Verse 3, calls especial attention to the ensign to be lifted up and the sound that shall go forth as of a trumpet; the thought in this is that a call is to be made upon the people by the God of heaven. Verse 5, fixes the time as being just afore the harvest of the world; the same time in which the event is placed by Jesus as set forth in Matthew 13:39, and in the same time referred to by John the revelator, 14:6, where he says: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to Him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of the waters."

This again, brings the gospel by an angel to the earth after the apostle's time and just at the time before the harvest, when the judgments should go forth, and with a call to the people like to the blowing of a trumpet, "Hear ye!" and, "worship Him who made the heaven and the earth;" and this call is, and since 1830 has been made, whether my opponent would confine all angels, and gospel that came in power and the Holy Ghost, to the apostles' age or not.

Turning now to the 29th chapter of Isaiah, I find clearly and definitely set out the nature and character of the ensign that was to be lifted up. The gifted prophet beholds it in the form of a book containing the "everlasting gospel;" the same which Jesus preached; a gospel of power and salvation from sin; the same as the revelator saw. This chapter is clearly definitive also of what is termed "The stick of Joseph," referred to in the 37th of Ezekiel's prophecy. I will proceed and examine it particularly.

The first six verses of the chapter in Isaiah portray the degradation, distress and punishment of Jerusalem, and the ruin of their city; after which, "all nations," that have occasioned this distress and ruin, are represented in the condition of one in a dream; verses 7-11.

These nations are under the influence of the spirit of deep sleep; they are slumber-

ing as to hearing the voice of God, with eyes closed, without prophets or seers. Then verse 11, "The vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed." (A book descriptive of a people that had wandered from God, so that they had wrought evil and felt not after him aright, and for their iniquities had been overthrown.) "Which (words) men deliver to one that is learned, saying, read this I pray thee: and he saith I cannot; for it is sealed." "And the book (not the words only), is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this I pray thee: And he saith, I am not learned."

Then the Lord says, that he will proceed to do his own work, "Even a marvelous work and a wonder," (Not by the wisdom of the world; for no learned man after the wisdom of the world was to be able to do his work; "for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." Then the book, the work referred to elsewhere as the "ensign," is to be translated and read by the means God has prepared. He will do His own work.

This work is to be wrought among the people at the time He sets His hand to redeem Jacob and establish Israel. To bring peace to those trodden down and scattered upon every mountain. It was not the work of Jesus in his time; for then was the beginning of the scattering, so far as Judah was concerned, or rather the beginning of the completion of the scattering of Israel.

Lebanon, the country of Jerusalem, then began to dry up and become barren, but this work is to be done at the time Lebanon was to be redeemed from the barrenness, and to become "a fruitful field, and the fruitful field esteemed as a forest." All of the things referred to here, every essential feature, of people, of time, of place, of the day in which the book should come forth, of the words which the book should contain, of the power of God to be manifested in the reading of the book, and the bringing to nought the wisdom of the wise (after the world and not after God), is fulfilled in the coming forth and publishing to the world of the Book of Mormon. Don't forget that I take a positive and confident stand with regard to the fulfillment of the prophecy. And yet, my wise opponent stands, darkening counsel with words without knowledge, never even attempting to give you an adverse explanation and application of the prophecy, such that he is willing to stand by, saying, "Where does it say that the Book of Mormon is meant?"

Where does it say in Genesis that the Shiloh is Christ? Yet we can see the relation of the prophecy. Again:

"He was led as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep dumb before his shearers, so he opened not his mouth." How did Philip find out this was Christ? Is the name mentioned? Does it say "Jesus of Nazareth" is he who is mentioned? Not at all.

What are the rules of evidence which should govern in this controversy? I call attention to the fact that the same rule which has governed in the reception or rejection of divine messages in every age or time of trying things or men, claiming a divine origin, or call from heaven, must be the governing rule in this case of the trial of the Book of Mormon being of Divine origin.

This rule I have sought to abide, saying; if you believe in Moses and the prophets, you will believe in this also; for they wrote of this. And again, "To believe for the very work's sake." What works? The gospel that is preached, and the everlasting gospel that it contains.

From that sure rule of examination, "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John, 9th verse. The reason is evident and all sufficient; by Jesus' words, not miracles, not what is said about character, not the stories told on people, are we to be judged at the last day; and if we have stood by the word we will be right there and then; and whether it come from the high or low, rich or poor, from the mean city of Nazareth or the city of the kings; whether he who brings it is abstemious neither eating nor drinking, or whether he shall both eat bread and drink wine, it matters not; the lesson is taught us that we must not expect perfection in men, because God speaks to them; but perfection in the work so far as it comes from the hand of the Creator. God to my mind selects the best fitted persons he can find to do his work here, and no doubt he would,—save in the instance of Jesus only,—have preferred a more appropriate man than he found for the conduct of his work in every age in the past: but he works by unchangeable laws. Rules of discipline and development. He fits and prepares men by such laws, only in proportion as they will conform to the same, and hence in his selections, makes choice from the material he has, and thus through the established means been able to prepare. And it is not for me to say he is not true, and that the law ordained for this preparation is not the best possible order. It was by this just rule that the compilers of the New Testament did their work. They had a mass of books claiming to be of divine origin. Some were acknowledged to be such. They tried the others by these. The correspondence in teaching, character of works, &c.,—receiving some and throwing out others. Do you deny it sir? So far as tracing the writings back to the original, or first writers, they could not do it in any instance positively. The rule followed by them, however, was a good one, and the same is true now, and I am willing to abide it.

But to return to the direct line of argument! I have now further located the land to which the descendants of Joseph were to come, as lying over the sea from Canaan, west of that country beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, far away to the utmost bounds of

the everlasting hills; to a "land shadowing with," (lying widely stretched out in the form of) "wings;" located as these prophecies claim, with a record containing the "everlasting gospel;" revealed as predicted, by an angel from the courts of heaven, and "just afore the harvest," in the hour of the judgment.

This land is the continent upon which you and I live. Do not these proofs make my claim from the Bible stand point complete? Which link has he succeeded in breaking? One thing, however, I shall show in this connection, that is, the fact of a race of people of Israelitish origin or extraction, having come to this continent in ages past, and who well occupied and inhabited here, from the certain proofs obtained through archaeological research and discovery brought to light since the publication of the Book of Mormon to the world.

Not only this, but prior to their habitation, there had been upon and inhabited the continent another people and race which was not of the Jewish extraction, but highly civilized, and whose work of art in the ruins of the continent is readily distinguishable, from that of the people who succeeded them. These answer to, and are in fact the complete prototype and primeval race whose history is set out in the Book of Mormon as the Jaredites, who came here as they were led from the plain of Shinar. But just now I will take up and examine some objections, pretended or real, made by the negative.

1. He says, That in the New Testament God perfected and completed his work of revelation in a system of universal truths, &c.

To the unthinking listener there may appear a degree of force in this proposition. But is there in fact? In the first place the statement is at fault in that, it assumes the truth of a thing he is trying to prove, to wit:—That in the New Testament is contained all that God has ever revealed to the world. For neither of us will deny that whatever he has revealed is perfect.

In what way is it perfected and completed? As my opponent would have you believe, so that God could not, and would not, outside of this, reveal HIMSELF to any part of mankind? Certainly not. No one can maintain the proposition that in the New Testament is contained all that our Heavenly Father has revealed for the instruction of man, or that he desires that they should know concerning him. The New Testament is but a compilation of many of the things revealed for the good of the human family, and not all. St. Luke in the first four verses of his record, sets forth the true idea of the record of the gospel. Then he proceeds to give his account of the things said and done by Jesus. The account is true, and in a sense complete in itself, and the truths are universally applicable to the race; but would that justify me in asserting that this book of Luke's writing, or this in connection with the Acts of the Apostles, which he wrote, contains all the re-

vealed will of God, and all necessary truth? Such a conclusion would be most ridiculous and absurd. But not more so than the conclusion arrived at by my opponent, that the New Testament compilers, who were not inspired men, succeeded a few centuries after the evangelist Luke wrote, in bundling up all truth, which God had or would reveal in order to guide his children.

While man is not expected to outgrow the universal and eternal principles of the gospel that were delivered by Jesus himself, yet in the dissemination and acceptance of these principles in their true sense there is as necessarily instruction to be given by revelation in this age of the world, as there was after the personal ministry of Jesus had ceased and his instructions given, and when Peter, Paul and John did their work.

While we are quite ready to allow that truths which God has given for the good of universal man are universally applicable, and these in a sense perfect and complete,

it does not follow from this that man should be limited to the simple reading of these, neither that it is not absolutely necessary that the act of revelation itself be continued in order that these very universal truths may be properly carried out in one's life.

This continuance of revelation is in fact a part of the revealment, and essential to growth in that already given; hence the apostle declares: "Wherefore I also after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus" "after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation" (that already revealed), "Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, that the Father of glory may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him." My position is, that the negative, in his method of jumping at such a conclusion of no more revelation, assails that which he professes at the same time to accept.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: A man who was engaged in an altercation with a trifling character that was annoying him was asked why he did not kick him. "I will," replied he, "if some one will fold him up into about a dozen thicknesses so that there will be something to kick." I have waited till now, before answering my opponent, so that I could double his talk up into at least a dozen thicknesses so as to have something to review. My opponent can prove that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin in two ways: I. He can prove its divine origin, as we establish the divine origin of the Bible. We appeal to the fact that the best living intellects accept the Bible as of divine origin; that the best intellects of former generations accepted the Bible, as of divine origin, until we trace it back into the age in which it had its origin, and we show that the best intellects, and characters of the people among whom it had its origin accepted it as of divine origin. We trace each book of the Bible back in this way into the age, and unto people among whom it had its origin. We can begin with the oldest books and trace out the frame-work of corroborative history, geography, literature, customs, etc., in which it had its origin, and into which it dovetails and interlocks at every point, fitting such frame-work, as the holes in the fuller's web fit on to the tenter-hooks on which it has been stretched. We prove that its actors authors and writers and speakers, acted spoke and wrote as the Bible declares they did. Having established its authenticity, genuineness and truthfulness, we prove that its speakers, actors and writers, were inspired when the Bible declares they were inspired, for we have proved the truthfulness of the Bible. II. We then examine its contents and prove by prophecy that has been fulfilled—by miracles that are authenticated by monumental institutions—by truths that are above man's power and must have been revealed and by its exact accordance in its teachings and in its results with the claim of inspiration that it is inspired and of divine origin.

My opponent cannot appeal to one particle of the first line of proof. He can trace his book no farther back than to Imposter Joe Smith. It has not one particle of frame work of corroborating history, geography literature and customs into which it interlocks. It stands on the naked assumption that Imposter Joe was inspired and on that alone. If he was inspired, then we should believe that he translated the Book of Mormon by inspiration, and of course it is true, and of divine origin. The Book itself has not one iota of interlocking corroborating,

or collateral evidence. It steps out into human life from the hand of Imposter Joe as the Goddess Minerva burst from the head of Jupiter. He claims that he received it from an angel by miracle and that he translated it by inspiration. Therefore it is of divine origin and mankind should accept it. There are no monumental institutions no literature based on it. It has had no career in the life of our race of which we have one particle of knowledge or proof except the assertions of the book itself. If my opponent appeals to the Bible, as Jesus appealed to the Old Testament, he must show that the Bible, in its history, narrates the same events as are found in the Book of Mormon. It does not hint one of them, except what the book of Mormon steals from the Bible. Or that the Bible foretells the events recorded in the Book of Mormon. He has attempted this, and oh how weak an attempt. I can prove that the Bible foretells the Koran or Swedenborg's writings just as clearly. The false prophets and false Messiahs of Israel furnished far more proof from prophecy than he has produced. Even if the Bible foretold the events narrated in the Book of Mormon, that would not prove that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin. The Bible foretells events narrated in Assyrian and Egyptian history. That does not prove that the books recording what the Bible foretells are of divine origin. Do the prophecies he quotes, even if we admit his fanciful application, prove that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin, one particle more than prophecies in the Bible of events recorded in Egyptian history, proves that the Egyptian books were of divine origin? Where does the Bible prophesy in such a way as to prove that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin.

The only proof of the divine origin of the Book of Mormon is the pretended inspiration of Imposter Joe Smith. If Imposter Joe was inspired, then of course he translated the Book of Mormon by inspiration, as he claimed, and we can believe his story that he received it from an angel by miracle, and that the angel told him that the Book of Mormon is what it pretends to be, and true. If he was not inspired, we have not a shadow of proof of the divine origin of the Book of Mormon. My opponent can establish that Imposter Joe was inspired by proving that he wrought miracles, as nearly all of the inspired men of the Bible did; or that he foretold future events, as Noah, John the Baptist and others did, who wrought no signs, or that he had superhuman wisdom, and revealed what man could not know, as the inspired men of the Bible did, or that his character was such that he would not

claim to be inspired, if it were not so, as we show in the case of Christ. If he appeals to the Bible as Jesus and the apostles appealed to the Bible, let him produce from the Bible the proof they did. Let him prove that the Bible prophecies directly and clearly of Imposter Joe, his work and his book. Let him show that the work of Imposter Joe and the Book of Mormon are a clear fulfillment of Bible prophecies. The appeals to prophecy, made by Christ and his apostles, were clear direct positive and overwhelming. They were not such far fetched fanciful distortions and perversions of the Bible, as we hear from Mormonism. He seems to be afraid to affirm and defend the inspiration of Imposter Joe. If he abandons that, he abandons the sole basis of his claim for his book. The only basis for the claim for the divine origin of the Book of Mormon is two assertions. I. An angel revealed to Imposter Joe the existence of certain plates and gave them to him and told him that the contents were true. II. That Imposter Joe translated these plates, and we have in the Book of Mormon the contents of the plates. Prove that you establish the divine origin of the Book of Mormon. Fail in that and you utterly fail to establish such claim.

My opponent attempted to prove the divine origin of his book by appealing to these facts: I. It claims to come from the right source. So does the Koran. II. It claims to be a proper message to mankind. So do the Shasters of India. III. Its object is good, the salvation of mankind. The same can be said of the revelations of Anni Lee. IV. Its teachings are good. So were the sermons of Stephens Burrows, the greatest scoundrel that ever lived. He, a vile imposter, stole and uttered the teachings of the Bible. So did Joe Smith and the Book of Mormon. If Imposter Joe was inspired, and his book a revelation Burrows was also inspired and his sermons revelations, on precisely the same ground. My opponent asserts that I should follow him in argument. That depends on where and how he leads. If he presents the issue clearly and fully, and any proof of his position, I will follow him. If he does not, I will present the issues myself, and refute his system, whether he presents it or not. I am surprised that one who claims to be a lawyer, as does my opponent, should be ignorant of the rules of debate, that the negative is free to pursue two courses. I. Reply to the attempted arguments of the affirmative. II. Or by an independent line of argument prove that his affirmative is untrue. If he pursues the latter course, he completely overturns the affirmative's position, if he never notices one of his pretended arguments.

My opponent's feelings seem to be very badly hurt by my calling Smith an imposter, a deceiver, a scoundrel. If I prove that he pretended to be inspired and was not, that his book was a fraud, I prove him to be an imposter, a scoundrel of the blackest dye. A woman once declared, "I don't

like Mr. Brown. He called my husband a liar. And that was not the worst of it. He proved it." Mormons will have the same reasons to dislike Mr. Braden. I have called Joe Smith an imposter, a scoundrel and I will prove it. My opponent reminds me that the Jews called Jesus a drunkard, a glutton, a lover of harlots and vile persons. Will he answer one question? If the charges of the Jews had been true, would it not have proved that Jesus was an imposter? That he was neither inspired nor divine. If I prove that Joe Smith was a vile character, will it not prove that he was not inspired? Now answer if you dare. The fallacy of the Jews, was not in using the wrong argument, but in making a false accusation. Jesus admitted that if their charges had been true, it would utterly destroy his claim to be sent of God and divine, when he challenged them "Who of you have convicted me of any wickedness?" In that question, Jesus flatly contradicts the nonsense my opponent uttered last night. He appeals to the errors and sins of men that the bible says were inspired. When he proves that they were ever inspired while living in such sin, while committing or practising it, we will notice his argument. What portion of the Bible was uttered or written by a man, while committing these vile sins? What inspired act or utterance of David, Solomon, Moses or Paul, have we that was acted or uttered while they were committing vile sins?

He admits that he who transgresses the teachings of Christ is not of God. That admission overturns all his special pleadings, in appealing to the sins of Bible characters. While in transgressions, they were not of God, not inspired, nor were their acts or utterances revelations. Then comes the one everlasting text of Mormonism "He that hath the teaching of the Christ hath both the Father and the Son." He assumes that if they have the Father and the Son, they are of God. True but that does not prove that they are inspired, nor that what they say or write is a revelation. Even if Joe Smith had been a good man, it would not prove that he was inspired, or that his book was a revelation, any more than the fact that Wesley was a good man, proves that he was inspired, and his sermons revelations. "But Joseph Smith claimed to be inspired. If a good man makes such a claim it must be true." No, a good man may be deceived. Hundreds of good men have been deceived in believing that they were inspired and that the stuff they uttered were revelations.

The gross absurdity of the use that Mormons make of that passage will be seen if my opponent will answer question. How must a man have the teaching of Christ in order to have the Father and the Son? In mere preaching alone? Or in living them out in life? When the scoundrel Burrows had the doctrine of Christ in his sermons, did he have the Father and the Son? Would not the fact that he was a hypocrite, an imposter and a scoundrel, prove that he

did not have the Father and the Son, no matter what he preached? Does the fact that Joe Smith stole and put the teachings of the Bible into the Book of Mormon, prove that he had the Father and the Son, that he was a good man, that he was inspired, that his book was a revelation? When the devil quoted the words of God to our Saviour, did it prove that he had the Father and the Son? That he was inspired and that his utterances were revelation? Even if the moral and religious sentiments of the Book of Mormon, that are stolen from the Bible, are good, it does not prove that its statements of pretended facts are true, and much less does it prove that the book is a revelation, that Joe Smith was inspired, or even a good man. Language can hardly express the idiocy of this pet argument of Mormonism. It would prove that when the devil transforms himself into an angel of light, and utters, hypocritically and to deceive, good sentiments, he is good, inspired, and his utterances revelations, just as clearly as it proves that Imposter Joe had the Father and the Son, was a good man, inspired and his book a revelation, because he stole good teaching from the Bible, and hypocritically gave it to the world, in the Book of Mormon, lying and claiming that his fraud was a revelation.

The quotation from Acts 17, no more proves or hints the divine origin of the book of Mormon than a repetition of the multiplication table. Neither does the quotation from Acts 10. The quotation from John 10; 14-16, teaches the opposite to what he claims it teaches. In Gen. 17, 15, we read: "The uncircumcised person shall be cut off from my people. He has broken my covenant." Circumcision was the mark of the flock. If the Nephites were circumcised, they were of the same flock as those Jesus was addressing. If they were not circumcised, they had ceased to be Israelites, and not a prophecy that my opponent quotes can have any reference to them. Neither the Bible, nor the Israelites, nor Jesus ever speak of Israelites outside of Palestine, as belonging to a fold separate and different from those in Palestine. If the Nephites of the Book of Mormon were circumcised Israelites, they were as much members of the fold Jesus was addressing, as the Israelites in Egypt or Palestine. The sheep that were not of that fold of which Jesus was speaking, were not circumcised Israelites in Egypt or America or any other place, for all circumcised Israelites were one fold. The other sheep that were not of that fold, that was made up entirely of circumcised Israelites, were Gentiles. The language has reference to the breaking down of a wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, and making Jews and Gentiles one fold in Christ.

The quotation from Ezekiel 34, "My sheep were scattered upon all the face of the earth" proves nothing for in such phraseology, often the Bible means no more than that they were widely scattered, and it never refers to more than the old

continent which was all that the Israelites knew anything about. The quotation from the highly poetical figurative language of Jacob's blessing on Joseph, with its bold hyperbole, proves nothing. The Mormon interpretation is an unnatural one, foreign to the subject, and forced on to the language to sustain a theory. There is nothing in the language that was not fulfilled in Palestine, as much as the hyperbole of many other prophetic promises, that all admit did not extend beyond the land of Palestine. Even if it did extend beyond the land of Palestine, it need include no more than the old continent. It need not extend beyond the Josephites in Europe, Asia and Africa. My opponent reverses the order of the line of argument. He must prove that the Josephites migrated beyond the old world, to America, before he can extend the language of the prophecy to America. He absurdly assumes that the language must extend beyond the old world to America, in order to prove that the Josephites came to America.

ORIGIN OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

I propose now to refute the claim made by my opponent that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin, by proving that it had a very base human origin, about seventy years ago. If I can show that it was gotten up by three men, in the first half of the present century, through base motives, and for purpose of fraud, and gain by fraud and deception, I utterly explode all claim to divine origin. I propose now to trace out such origin, for the Book of Mormon, as clearly as a chain of title to a piece of land. Let us first state what the Book of Mormon professes to be. It purports to be a history of America from the time its first inhabitants entered it, just after the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel, till about A. D. 400, a period probably of nearly 4000 years. It asserts that this continent was peopled by three different families. I. The family of Jared, who emigrated from the Tower of Babel, over 3000 years before the birth of Christ, and whose descendants were exterminated, one portion of the book declares about 600 years before Christ; another portion of the book declares about 250 years before Christ. II. The family of Lehi, a Manassehite, who emigrated from Jerusalem, 600 years before Christ, early in the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah. His descendants divided into two nations, the Nephites, the righteous portion; and the Lamanites, the wicked portion; III. The people of Zarahemla, Judahites who left Jerusalem about eleven years after Lehi. The descendants of these Judahites were destroyed in war or absorbed by the Nephites. In war, the Nephites were exterminated by the Lamanites, about A. D. 384. The Lamanites remained sole possessors of the continent, and are the American Indians. I wish the reader to notice that, according to the Book of Mormon, not an Ephraimite, ever came to America. How then can the prophecies in regard to Ephra-

im apply to the aboriginies of America, even if the history in the Book of Mormon be true? According to the Book of Mormon the deeds of this people were, by divine direction, engraved by their prophets, on plates of gold, brass, and ore (what ever that nondescript substance may mean). These plates were religiously preserved by divine direction. The Book of Mormon tells us, on almost every page, with painful iteration and reiteration, of plates, of how they were prepared, preserved and revised, handed down from generation to generation—how careful the Lord was to see that this was done, until they fell into the hands of one Mormon, who about A. D. 384 made an abridgement and buried the originals, together with certain relics, in a hill which is now near Manchester Ontario Co., New York. He handed this abridgment "these few plates" to his son Moroni, providently leaving a few pages for him to use in finishing the abridgement. Moroni finishes, by engraving on the few pages left by his father, what happened after his father revised his record. Then he writes, and on nothing, for he tells us that his plates are full, and he had nothing to make plates of and is alone, an abridgment of the history of the Jaredites. Moroni then boxes up these few plates containing the abridgment made by his father, and his appendix to it, written on the few pages his father left him for that purpose, and buries them in a hill, Cumorah, that was in what is now Manchester, N. Y. He buried only "these few plates," and nothing with them for Mormon had buried everything else years before, in an entirely different locality.

"These few plates" remained in this box, till September, 22, 1823, when Moroni, then an angel appeared to Joe Smith, and revealed to him the existence of these plates, their place of burial, and a summary of their contents. September, 22, 1827, Moroni delivered the plates to Joe Smith, who by means of a peep stone that he had stolen from the children of Willard Chase, translated them, and gave their contents to the world, in the Book of Mormon.

The Book of Mormon mentions a perfect museum of relics that are "hid up" somewhere near Palmyra, New York. We give the list that our readers may see how careful the Lord was to have the records and relics preserved. We cite the pages of the Book of Mormon, English edition, where they are mentioned. It shows with what iteration and reiteration "plates" are mentioned, and how much pains the authors take to convince the sceptical, that these records were so carefully preserved, there can be no doubt about the accuracy of the Book of Mormon. I. Plates of Laban, pp 9—11—144—145. II. Brass genealogical plates, p 11. III. Brass plates of Lehi, afterwards abridged by Nephi, pp 3—44—62. IV. Brass plates of Nephi containing "the more part of the history" (shades of Murray what English) pp, 16—138. V. Brass plates of Nephi containing "the more part of the ministry" (shades of Addison,

forgive the English of the fullness of Mormon inspiration) pp, 16—144. VI. Ore (what nondescript substance is that?) plates of Nephi "containing mine own prophecies" p 44. VII. Plates of Zarahemla containing genealogy, p, 140. VIII. Plates of Mormon, containing an abridgment of Nephi's plates that contained "the more part of the ministry," p, 141. IX. Plates containing a record from priest Jacob to king Benjamin, p 141. X. Plates containing record of Zeniff, p 161. XI. Golden plates of Ether, pp, 161,—312—516. XII. Plates containing Alma's account of "his afflictions," p, 196. XIII. Plates Jared "brought across the great deep," p, 530. XIV. Copies of Scriptures "out of which the sons of Mosiah studied 14 years," pp, 255—271. XV. Many records kept by people "who went north-west," pp, 394—395. XVI. Twelve epistles by different prophets on different themes. The Book of Mormon gives us only an abridgment of these. The originals are "hid up." XVII. The liabona—the sacred brass globe called the brass compass or brass director of Lehi, pp, 38—314. XVIII. The record of Laban, pp, 145—143—145. XIX. The engraved stone of Coriantumer p, 140. XX. The sixteen stones that God touched with his fingers, p, 20. XXI. The two stone interpreters of Moroni, pp, 162—204. XXII. The two stone interpreters of Jared's brother, pp, 522—523. XXIII. A white stone Gazelme, p, 212. XXIV. A brass breastplate found with Ether's plates, p, 161. Besides all these Smith and other Mormons describe articles different from these enough to increase the number indefinitely. Mormon tells us p 492, that he hides all of these relics, and hands only "these few plates" containing his abridgment to his son Moroni. They are "hid up" no one knows where. The reader will observe we have piles of plates, a score of them, mentioned scores of times. No one dare deny the accuracy of records kept on metallic plates, imperishable material, with such constant care, and by divine direction, and inspiration.

It is our purpose to prove that the Book of Mormon originated with Solomon Spaulding, was revamped by Sydney Rigdon, and given to the world by Impostor Joe Smith. We shall give first a sketch of Spaulding, and his work until he came in contact with Rigdon. Then a sketch of Rigdon and of his work, until he confederated with Impostor Joe, to give his stolen fabrication to the world, by means of his stolen peepstone. Solomon Spaulding was born in Ashford Connecticut in 1761. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1785, with the degree of A. B. He studied theology and graduated in theology in 1787, and received the degree of A. M. He preached until after 1800. On account of failing health he went into business in Cherry Valley, New York. He failed in merchandizing and moved to Conneaut, Ohio, in 1807 or 8. Here he went into the foundry business and failed again. There were in the township of Conneaut a great

many mounds and other relics of an extinct race of people. Mr. Spaulding became very much interested in these antiquities. In 1809 he began a romance, in which he assumed that the ancestors of the Indians were Romans. After writing forty or fifty pages, he abandoned this idea, because as he said, the Romans were too near the time in which he was writing. This MS was the only one Philastus Hurlbut said he found in the trunk, supposed to contain all of Spaulding's MS's, when they examined the trunk at Mr. Clark's house, in 1834. This MS we will designate as Roman MS or MS No 1.

Ever since the European missionaries began to labor among the Indians, as early as the year 1500, Spanish, French, English and Portuguese Missionaries had observed certain things among the Indians, that led some of them to believe that the Indians were of Israelite origin, descendants of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. Such ideas can be found in the writings of Spanish Portuguese, and French Monks, and in the writings of Elliott, Cotton Mather and scores of American writers, before the commencement of the present century. Mr. Spaulding was a firm believer and earnest advocate of this theory. He began to write a romance, in which he assumed, that the aborigines of America, and the authors of its mounds and other antiquities were Israelites. He commenced writing this MS as early as 1809. His brother, J. Spaulding, certifies that he visited his brother Solomon in 1810, and found him writing a book which he called, "The Manuscript Found," which he intended to publish, and hoped by the sales to pay his debts. He described it as follows:

'It was a historical romance of the first settlers of America, and endeavored to show that the American Indians are the descendants of the Jews, or the Ten Lost Tribes. It gave a detailed account of their journey from Jerusalem, by land and sea, until they arrived in America, under the command of Lehi and Nephi. They afterwards had quarrels and contentions, and separated into two distinct nations, one of which he denominated Nephites, the other Lamanites. Cruel and bloody wars ensued, in which great multitudes were slain. They buried their dead in large heaps which caused the mounds, so common in this country. Their arts, sciences and civilization were all brought into view, in order to account for all the curious antiquities found in various parts of Northern and Southern America. I well remember that he wrote in the old style, and commenced almost every sentence with, "And it came to pass," or "Now it came to pass."

I will leave it to the reader, if the average Mormon can give a better synopsis of the historical part of the Nephite portion of the Book of Mormon, then John Spaulding gives in describing his brother's romance the "Manuscript Found."

Martha Spaulding, wife of John Spaulding, and sister-in-law of Solomon Spaulding, testifies:

"I was at the house of Solomon Spaulding shortly before he left Caneaua. He was then writing a historical novel founded on the first settlers of America. He represented them as an enlightened and warlike people. He had for many years contended that the aborigines of America were the descendants of some of the Lost Tribes of Israel; and this idea he carried out in the book in question. The lapse of time which has intervened prevents my recollecting but few of the leading incidents of his writings; but the names Lehi

and Nephi are yet fresh in my memory as being the principal heroes of his tale. They were officers of the company which first came off from Jerusalem. He gave a particular account of their journey by land and by sea, till they arrived in America, after which disputes arose between the chiefs, which caused them to separate into bands, one of which was called Lamanites the other Nephites. Between these there were recounted tremendous battles, which frequently covered the ground with slain and these being buried in large heaps, was the cause of the many mounds in the country. Some of these people he represents as being very large."

Again, I ask the reader if an average Mormon could give a better outline of the historical part of the Nephite portion of the Book of Mormon than Mrs. Spaulding gives in describing the "Manuscript Found" of her brother-in-law Solomon Spaulding.

Henry Lake, Solomon Spaulding's business partner testifies:

Solomon Spaulding frequently read to me from a manuscript which he was writing, which he entitled the "Manuscript Found," and which he represented as being found in this town. I spent many hours in hearing him read said writings, and became well acquainted with their contents. The Book represented the American Indians as being the descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel, and gave an account of their having left Jerusalem, and of their contentions and wars, which were many and great. I remember telling Mr. Spaulding that so frequent use of the words: "And it came to pass," "Now it came to pass," rendered the book ridiculous."

Aaron Wright testifies:

"One day when I was at the house of Solomon Spaulding, he showed and read to me a history he was writing of the Lost Tribes of Israel, purporting that they were the first settlers of America and that the Indians were their descendants. He traced their journey from Jerusalem to America. He told me his object was to account for the fortifications etc. that were to be found in this country, and said that in time, it would be fully believed by all except learned men and historians."

Oliver Smith testifies:

"Solomon Spaulding boarded at my house six months. All his leisure hours were occupied in writing a historical novel, founded upon the first settlers of this country. He said he intended to trace their journey, from Jerusalem by land and sea till their arrival in America, and give an account of their arts, sciences, civilization laws and contentions. In this way he would give a satisfactory account of all of the old mounds, so common in this country. Nephi and Lehi, were by him, represented as the leading characters, when they first started for America. Their main object was to escape the judgments which they supposed were coming on the old world."

Nahum Howard testifies:

"In conversation with Solomon Spaulding I expressed my surprise that we had no account of the people once in this country, who erected the old forts mounds etc. He told me he was writing a history of that people."

Artemus Cunningham testifies:

"Solomon Spaulding described to me his book. He said that it was a fabulous or romantic history of the first inhabitants of this country, and it purported to be a record found buried in the earth, or in a cave. He had adopted the ancient or Scriptural style of writing. He then read from his manuscript. I remember the name of Nephi, who appeared to be the principal hero of the story. The frequent repetition of the phrase "4 Nephi" I remember distinctly as though it were yesterday. He attempted to account for the numerous antiquities which are found upon the continent."

John N. Miller who was a member of Solomon Spaulding's household for many months testifies:

"I peruse Dr. Spaulding's manuscripts as I had leisure more particularly the one he called his "Manuscript Found." It purported to be a history of the first settlers of America. He brought them off from Jerusalem, under their leaders detailing their travels by land and by sea."

MR. KELLEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—By way of reminding you of the fact that sometimes a man gets frightened at his own evil surmisings I call attention to the statement of my friend, "That he was not going to be scared down." This was certainly uncalled for. Who has tried to scare him down? Have I, or has a single person in this audience? Now, I take this as the simple upbraidings of his own conscience. It reminds me of the story of the boy that got terribly scared upon a certain occasion. His hair began to stand up right lively, and the cold chills coursed down his back. Finally he gathered up a little courage and edged up a little toward the object of his fright and after straightening up, he stammered out, "Who's afraid?" It turned out that the boy had only been stuffed with a few ghost stories and was frightened at nothing. And it seems to me this is the true condition of my opponent. There is no necessity of being afraid here. I hope my friend is not afraid. I can say truly to you that I am not. What is he afraid of? I want him in this discussion to bring the strongest evidence he can. To do his worst, as well as best. Only let him state facts?

He makes a statement with reference to the prophecy of Jacob in the 49th chapter of Genesis where in blessing Joseph, he tells him his "branches," (daughters), "should run over the wall," and says that men have read it for thousands of years and never thought of applying it as I have in this discussion. Is that an argument against the force of my position? On the contrary it occurs to me to be an argument in favor of it. When men have read it, scanned it, for thousands of years, and no one conceived the idea of applying it to its proper place until it was made known as we claim by the revelation of God, it argues in favor of the divine knowledge. It is something that was not likely to be spontaneous in the heart of man, but let down from heaven as were many other things that I will be able to show you during this discussion. And yet will he deny that the Book of Mormon has given a single new truth to the world? Another thing he has referred to as an argument, is the sermons of the "notorious Stephen Burrows," using his language. He seems to have been a faithful student of Burrows. Now, his sermons may be good, as he claims from his or the Disciples' (Campbellites) standpoint of judging; but I will state to this audience fairly and candidly that no such man as he says he was, could preach good sermons from the standpoint of the Latter Day Saints, nor the standpoint of the Bible; and they are not good sermons. I invite him to produce the sermons now, and I will examine them before you and show that they are not good.

Another thing. He said that he could show that the prophecies of the Bible which I have quoted refer as much to the Koran as the Book of Mormon. Why does he not do it then? What is he here for but to show what they apply to? Let him do it. I deny that he can select a single one that has a like or similar application, and demand the proof. When he names one, I will show it does not, nor cannot be made to apply to the Koran as obviously as the Book of Mormon. He has so far failed, or refused, to follow me and notice my arguments, although he is in the negative of the proposition. I shall not be so kind with him, but will both set forth my affirmative proofs, and expose the fallacies in his positions. In his desperation to make out a case against the Book of Mormon he does not hesitate to ignore as applicable to man after the Apostles' time, all that is assuring and comforting to the Christian.

The beautiful promises, "Seek and ye shall find," "Knock and it shall be opened unto you," "Ask and it shall be given unto you," Matt. 7:7; "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him," James 2:5; "How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him," Matt. 7:11; and many other like assuring and comforting promises, are all things of the past with him. Confined to the apostles' age. Jesus says, "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and will manifest myself to him." Again, "My Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him," John 14:21, 23. But according to my friend's theory, all of these promises are limited to the apostles, and those upon whom they laid their hands. His theory limits pretty much all of the New Testament to the apostolic times; especially does it, all giving assurance that the Christian may have a knowledge of God. Christ said, "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another comforter that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of Truth," John 14:16, 17. "Where two or three are met together in my name there I am in the midst." But my opponent makes this limited to the olden time. What is the use praying then, if God cannot give, and Jesus cannot be in the midst. Again, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you," Rom. 8:11-16. This is also limited

by the theory of the negative. Yet, it is clear from the texts themselves, that these promises and experiences were, and are, for the doers of the word, the faithful in Christ in every age.

John said, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Matt. 3:11. And Jesus in keeping with this says, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." John 3:5. These texts prove that the influence and power of the Spirit was to follow the baptism by water. But my opponent limits the baptism of the Spirit, and holds on to the water. But upon what authority? A vain assumption evidently thought necessary to bolster up his Campbellite theory. His arguments prohibit salvation to the race after the apostolic age. Jesus taught, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Yet, Mr. Braden says, there is no birth or baptism of the Spirit now. There would be more consistency in abandoning both baptisms as they are both taught by the same persons and at the same time. In his madness he not only wars against the claims of the Book of Mormon and the Latter Day Saints, but all Christians who hold to a Christian experience under the divine energies of the Holy Ghost. Every Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Friend, Independent, or what not, who has testified of tasting the heavenly gift—the joy of the Holy Ghost shed abroad in the heart, in any age or time since the Apostles, has witnessed falsely. Their experiences are but vain things and they, deceivers of themselves. There is no Spiritual communion, so Mr. Braden claims, except through the medium of the word. His is but a first step in Atheism. It destroys or removes God out of the world, if not out of the universe. Inspiration is not only confined to the early church, but God, and Christ, and the Holy Ghost, are barred out:—limited and confined to the Apostles alone and can no longer move upon the Christian's heart. But thank God, we are assured of better things: Says Paul, "And hope maketh not ashamed; because the love of God is shed abroad in the heart." How is the love of God shed abroad in the heart? "By the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5:5. "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." 2 Cor. 1:22. "And because you are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba Father." "In whom ye also trusted after that ye heard the word of truth the gospel of your salvation, in whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory." Eph. 1:13. This was not attained through the medium of

the word as my opponent would have you believe, for the Apostle says, verse 13, "After ye heard the word of truth, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of promise the same which Jesus said, "When he is come he will testify of me." This promise of the Spirit to burn in the heart of the Christian in fact, was to continue until the redemption of the purchased possession, and is the evidence of the right of possession. But Braden's theory confines all this to the apostles' time, and all the experience, and knowledge, that men can have of God now, is through the written word. Jesus says, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved and he that believeth not shall be damned; and these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name they shall cast out devils. They shall speak with new tongues," etc. Mark 16. This message included the entire world of believers. The promise is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and "These signs shall follow them that believe." Wherever the message was to be obeyed, the signs were to follow. Where the signs are limited, the duties enjoined by the message are limited. This proves too much for my opponent's theory and faith, for he professes great faith in the water part of the message. But if he confines the result of obedience to the age of the apostles, he must confine the obligation to obey the ordinance of baptism to that age, and per consequence the duties preceding it, faith and repentance, which are necessary to prepare one to obey the ordinance of baptism. Thus he not only limits the Holy Ghost to the age of the apostles, but faith, repentance and baptism also. Hence he has God and Christ and the Holy Ghost out of the world, and so far away that neither can commune with Christians, and the essential feature of the gospel itself is confined to the apostolic times and people. But Peter held to a better faith. Said he, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." This promise was to be realized when they accepted the gospel message as is shown in verse 38, of Acts, second chapter. "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Nothing is more certain than that the obedient doer of the word was to receive the gift of the Holy Ghost wherever the gospel message was sent, as is clearly shown by these texts. It is not limited to Pentecost day, nor to that age. Whenever, and wherever, the remission of sins took place in all the world, in every age, "ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Hence Paul says, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Cor. 12:13.

This body to which he refers, is the church, the body of Christ, so termed. Those who joined in this relation became "fit temples for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost." If these powers and blessings were limited to the early apostles' time, then the body of Christ, the church of God on earth was limited to that age.

Paul foreseeing that such a theory would be foisted upon the world in the future from his day, raised a warning voice to the people, declaring, "that in the last days perilous times shall come," by men, "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." The advice that follows this announcement is most striking and cheering: "From such turn away," 2 Tim. 3:5. The apostle Peter also, as if on purpose to put the question beyond caviling, and at rest, says, "The promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." To all who are called to repentance and salvation, and not to miraculous power, as has been stated; but called to Christ Jesus. God thus calls all men in every age. "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." "Come unto me, all ye ends of the earth," says God, "and be ye saved." But my opponent says, Christ limited Joel's prophecy made to all flesh, to Pentecost day, and that Peter meant when he said, "Even as many as the Lord our God should call," "That all should receive the Holy Ghost on whom the apostles laid their hands."

This is evidently a subterfuge, and false rendering, for there is not a statement in the Bible anywhere to the effect that none were to receive the Holy Ghost but those on whom the apostles should lay their hands. This is gotten up out of whole cloth and added to the word of God in order to support a weak theory. But my opponent seems to be driven to the last ditch here. He assumes to turn Jesus against his prophets. Says he, "Christ limits Joel's prophecy to those on whom the apostles should lay their hands." Why does he want Joel limited? Ah! Joel speaks too loud for his theory. Let me read it: "And it shall come to pass afterward," (after the time of the re-gathering of Israel when they shall never again be ashamed), "That I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: And also upon the servants, and upon the handmaids in those days I will pour out my Spirit. And I will show wonders in the heavens and the earth, blood and fire, and pillars of smoke," Joel 2:28-30. When shall this be? In the "last days," when God shall have set his hand a second time to gather his people. "When Jacob's (Israel's) face shall no longer wax pale;" "afterwards." All the prophets agree as to the time. Not on Pentecost day; nor at the time when the apostles laid on hands during their ministry. Not on a few on Pentecost day, and those upon

whom the apostles should lay their hands; but "upon all flesh." In the period of the world's history when God should "show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood and fire and pillars of smoke." When, "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood before the great and notable day of the Lord comes." This prophecy was not fulfilled on Pentecost day. Nor does the apostle so state. He says, referring to the Holy Ghost that had then rested upon and imbued the disciples, "This is *that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel,"—the Spirit that Joel referred to which should be poured out in the last days, by which men should see visions, dream dreams and prophesy. Not the accomplishment of what Joel said would take place,—but the presence of the Spirit—the agency—by which it would be accomplished. Joel prophesied of certain things to take place in the "last days." My opponent's position is that Christ corrected him and says, no prophesying in the "last days;" this is to be confined to Pentecost and those on whom the apostles shall lay their hands. Who is right? Joel or my opponent? He says again, that no one received the Holy Ghost save under the apostles' hands. But Ananias, who was not an apostle, laid his hands upon Saul that he "might receive the Holy Ghost," and be healed. This shows that the authority to lay on hands for the healing of the sick and the bestowing of the Spirit, was vested in the same class of officers. Jesus says, "They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." Mark 16. James also tells us who shall lay hands on the sick, showing the practice under the Savior's instruction: "Is there any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church," &c. James 5:14. Hence, Paul addresses Timothy, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. 4:14. Here the presbytery, body of elders, officiated in laying hands upon Timothy, and a gift was manifest by prophecy through the ordinance. But the negative in his ramblings goes from bad to worse. He says that the Christian Institution under Christ and the apostles was a little boy, playing with toys, compared with the excellency, perfection, and power that followed after. How wonderful! Then they had apostles, prophets, the gift of the Holy Ghost, communion with God, and the visitation of angels, the healing of the sick and the love of God shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost which they received; yet he stands before you and claims that this is nothing to be compared with the condition of the church that followed in after ages and is now extant almost universally, and from which all of this heavenly clothing and adornment has been stripped, as the woman going into the wilderness was shorn of her beauty and heavenly power.

One is inclined to think he is joking here, rather than talking in earnest; the absurdity is so palpable. The Church of

Christ was to be "a habitation of God through the Spirit." This new theory leads to the conclusion that the world is better off and religion more excellent not to have God in either. When God talks with men, and the Holy Ghost fills their souls, and they have the testimony of Jesus and certainty in religion, it is a dark and trying time;—"a boy with his toys;" but when neither God nor Christ, nor the Holy Ghost, nor the prophets nor apostles are known in the church, or in the world; and division, and discord and contention, distraction and uncertainty everywhere reigns, the full grown man appears, with all his captivating influences and enticing graces. The gifts having passed away, he says, we have love, joy, peace, etc. But did not they have all this and God, and Christ besides in the "toy day," that he refers to? To support this hallucination he refers to 1 Cor. 13, and endeavors to show that there is a "more excellent way," than to have communion with God, through the Holy Spirit, and the realization of the gifts in the church. "Charity never faileth." Right; but it is found in and enjoyed most by those exercising the gifts of the gospel. Charity is love, the pure love of God. It is for the saints here, and in the future world, when they shall reign with God. "But whether there be prophecies they shall fail; whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away." When shall these things cease? My opponent says, in the age of the apostles, i. e., when the apostles died and there was no one to lay on hands; and thus from sheer necessity. But this proves too much for him. If it was because the apostles died, it could not have been because, "that which is perfect is come," unless the killing of the apostles brought perfection. Knowledge, prophecies, and tongues are classed together, and if he takes it that these are to cease without reference to the "part" exercise of them as explained by the apostle himself, all are mustered out together, and become things of the past at the same time. It would scarcely do for me to tell such a towering light as my opponent; that knowledge ceased in the apostolic age; that was the age of boys, the "toy age." But his theory forces him to do so. If it is said that this refers to miraculous knowledge, I ask what kind is that? Certainly it does not come under that classed as learning, erudition, scholarship, &c. Nor "cognition, notice," &c. It must be then of "apprehension, comprehension, understanding, discernment, judgment." Will he take the position that this kind of knowledge has ceased from the church? No wonder things looked dark to Mr. Wesley. Let us permit the apostle to be his own interpreter here. Verses 9 and 10, "For we know in part, and prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." What shall be done away? Doing in part. Knowledge in part; prophesying in part; speaking in languages

only in part. When shall it be done away? Answer: "When that which is perfect is come;" and this is when part prophesying and knowing in part will cease. My opponent says, Paul is contrasting two states of the church: One under the spiritual gifts, the other under a "perfected" state without spiritual gifts, or communion with God except as may be received through the written word;—that is from reading the Bible. This is another of his fallacies. Paul is contrasting the state of the church and saints here with the condition that is to be attained in the future world, at the coming of Jesus the second time. "Now, (in this life—this side of a time of perfection,) I see through a glass darkly; but then shall I know, even as I am known." When this perfect time shall come then Paul will know as he is known; until that time he sees through a glass darkly walking by the light of prophesying in part, and knowing only in part. There is nothing more clear, than if Paul with his spiritual vision, knowledge and prophecy, could know only in part, there has been no state of the church since his day when man attained to a more perfect knowledge. And more especially must this be conceded by my opponent, when he and his Campbellite Church, assumes that all that men can know of God, and religion now, is by reading the Bible written in part by Paul himself, and wholly, so far as its divinity is concerned, when men were blest with the spiritual gifts and had communion with God. The facts are these: The light of God only comes to earth in part. The Saints of old knew in part and prophesied in part; but they looked forward to the future when the knowledge in part should be a thing of the past, and they would know as they were known. My opponent says, this was after the apostles passed away and the church became a full-grown man. But who can believe him when he further says that the Christians, or the world, knows more of duty and the light of heaven, and are in a higher, more advanced and perfect state than when the spiritual gifts, were extant and there was communion with God? The gifts were to continue until the day of perfect knowledge should come. "The day of Christ." 2 Thess. 2:2. Paul says in the Ephesian letter, fourth chapter— "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets and some, evangelists; and some pastors and teachers." What for? "For the perfecting of the Saints the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ," or the church. How long was this inspired ministry to continue? The apostle answers in the next sentence. "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." And all this for the purpose:—"That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; but speaking the truth in love, may grow up unto him in all things, which is the head, even Christ. From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the

"effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in 'in love.'" 11 to 16 verses.

This scripture confirms the opinion that the apostles and prophets were designed to continue in the church, that the people might be "no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine."

But Mr. Braden reverses it, and says the apostles and gifts ceased that we might be no more children, but full grown men.—That was "the children or toy day" of the church. However the apostle further tells us, that they were to continue till we all come to, "the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Again, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues," 1 Cor. 12:28. "God has set the members every one in the body as it hath pleased him." This body in which he placed these members is his church; and he placed them in the body, the church, to edify the same and to continue therein, until "we all come to the knowledge of the Son of God;" but now we are gravely told that they are not necessary or essential to the proper growth of the body, and that they are not to continue "till we come to the knowledge of the Son of God." But since it is by this same Holy Spirit that was manifest on Pentecost day, and by which the signs followed the believer, and which God gave by gift to the ministry, and poured out upon all the believers, that we may at all attain to the knowledge of Christ, will he now be so kind as to tell us whether he expects by banishing the means of knowledge, to have the people become enlightened? "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord," [come to the knowledge of him], "but by the Holy Ghost." 1 Cor. 12:3.

He says again, the "Mormons baptize for miraculous gifts." But he also told you, they got their baptism through a Campbellite preacher, Sidney Rigdon. Do they baptize for miraculous gifts? The Saints do not now, nor never did baptize for miraculous gifts. That is out of whole cloth.

They baptize "for the remission of sins," and then say as the apostles taught, that the obedient doer of the word is entitled to, the Holy Ghost by reason of the "promise."

Again, he claims that the Book of Mormon is an addition to the Bible. This is incorrect. The Book of Mormon stands alone, as a work or as a revelation from Deity; and is complete of itself; as the Bible stands alone and is complete, so far as the book is concerned and a record of God's will as revealed upon the Eastern continent, so is the Book of Mormon of a like history and of that same will, as revealed, upon the Western continent. The Book of Mormon is in no true sense an addition to the Bible; no such claim is, or has ever been, made for it, by the book itself, or its friends. But it con-

firms the Bible in its testimony, and this is answer enough if we had no other as to the good of the work. The Bible is a record of the Jews and their religion. The Book of Mormon is a record of the people who came to and lived upon the Western continent and their religion. It is not true as asserted, that the Latter Day Saints hold the revelations in the Book of Mormon in higher veneration than they do the revelations of the Bible. With them a revelation from God, given to the world in Palestine, is just as worthy of consideration and respect, as one given in America; and one from a similar source in America, just as good as one given in Palestine. Neither is age a consequence as to the truth or applicability of it. God over all is rich, and none can limit His power of giving and revealing. If a church that denies to its members the light and gift of the Holy Spirit, of communion with God, through the Comforter, and an approach to the life of the church of the First Born, and Jesus the Mediator, is not a Jack o'lantern light to the world, then there is no faint and dim glimmering anywhere. Now I wish to refer hurriedly to what he stated last evening by way of an illustration, using the American government, or the compact of the Constitution and the framers, in a comparison to the apostles and their work, or to those whom he says gave us the Bible. The trouble with his illustration is, that it is not a parallel case as used by him. The framers of the American Constitution were selected by the American people, and authorized by them to meet and in their own wisdom frame a constitution which should, if ratified, be the governing or fundamental law. In the word of God, as committed to the world, the apostles are not the framers, or makers, neither the ones to ratify as well as devise or institute. They could approve or reject as they chose, but this action could not affect the law, only themselves, as witness the act of Judas. They were the means simply of communicating that knowledge to the world that was framed and devised by Deity himself. And when my opponent seeks by his illustration to reason apostles out of the world, he makes the blunder of placing the apostles in the position occupied by Deity himself, to the New Testament, and his illustration legitimately, instead of showing that apostles were to cease, puts God out of the Universe and out of the church, instead of the apostles. This is why I object to his theory. It is but on a par with his other argument, wherein he has sought to shut the Holy Ghost, the life and power of the gospel out of the church. God gave the covenant or constitution of the Christian Church, and it was not the work of the apostles. The apostles were the means of teaching this constitution to the world;—"ambassadors" to publish the glad news. The publication of the constitution of the United States, was not by the framers, but by means of another's agency, the press, and public criers selected for that purpose. The framers of the constitution so far as their work was concerned, would

bear a likeness to Deity, who framed and gave the gospel law. Says Jesus in his delivery of the law; "The Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." John 12:49. The apostles are, in the comparison, in fact but the publishers, ambassadors, preachers. For God to give direction now he would have these laws carried out, would not necessarily either, be making *new constitution every day*;" any more than he was making new constitution every day in the time of Paul and John. Who will say that because we have a constitution or first basis in our government, we shall have no more laws. The only restriction is, that the laws shall not conflict with the constitution.

The next objection I shall take up and examine, is that profound and doubtless scholarly argument, based upon the miraculous in the creation of the world. That since God created the earth by miraculous power, therefore he says, I would have him continue to keep a miracle going all the time, in order that we might have miraculous things or new animals and plants. But he forgets that when God created the earth by miraculous power, if he wishes to call it miraculous, he at the same time established in the same miraculous manner, for aught my opponent can tell, a law by which those things which were created, that he calls miraculous, were to be reproduced. And we have the miraculous plants and animals now by virtue of that law. Just the same as he ordained in the first age of Christianity by the law of the Holy Spirit that apostles should continue if men kept the faith, and if they kept not the faith, then they should not continue; and if we have not the fruits by the ordination of the law of the Holy Spirit, it is because the law has not been kept, for God has not changed.

Will my opponent now stop to tell us whether the law by which the natural creation is now continued is not the same by which God originally wrought when it first germinated? When did Deity change, or at what time did the new law take the place of the old? Make the comparison, and follow it to its conclusion and you will see that instead of supporting his theory

it destroys it. God in the creation of the world brought forth certain things, and ordained a means by which they should continue and they continue as at the first by that means, and as the law provided, to the just and unjust alike. In the establishment of his church he did many things which showed the proper fruits of his law, by means of the Holy Spirit. He ordained that they should continue by means of the same agency and power, to the believer, the doer of the word, for this law was limited to such, and not as the other, made alike to the just and the unjust. Do they continue? Has God changed? The law governing should as in the order of creation cause the same effect, and bring to the believer, knowledge, wisdom, faith, prophecies, tongues and healings. These are the legitimate fruits of the law of the Holy Spirit to the believer. But my opponent says no. Why? The simple reason is his people do not have the fruits, and the application will show that they are not "doers of the word."

Now I call your attention to the real import of the story he related, which certainly displayed his ingenuity in taking an economical way of meeting my arguments. I have several times called your attention to the fact that he was not debating properly this question, and that he had abandoned any defense, so far as meeting my arguments is concerned; and now, he comes in and admits it in his story of the boy, that he says was only waiting for something sufficient to roll up so that he could have something to kick at. He is waiting for my arguments to roll up.

This reminds me of another boy. He saw an object in the path and at first sight he concluded he would kick it out. As he neared it, the object looked a little firmer than at first, but he thought he would kick at it any way. Finally he drew quite close and the object looked as if it was bundled up so tightly, that if he kicked he might get his toes hurt, and so he did not kick at all; and this seems to me to be the true reason why he has not foot-balled my argument.

(Laughter and applause.) (Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mrs. Matilda Spaulding, Solomon Spaulding's wife testifies, after stating that Mr. Spaulding was very much interested in the antiquities found around Comeau:

"Mr. Spaulding conceived the idea of writing a history of the long lost race that produced these antiquities. Their extreme antiquity lead him to write in the most ancient style, and as the Old Testament was the oldest book in the world, he imitated its style, as much as possible. As he progressed in his narrative, the neighbors would come in from time to time, to hear portions read, and a great interest in the work was excited among them. It claimed to have been written by one of the lost nation, and to have been recovered from the earth. The neighbors would often ask how Mr. Spaulding progressed in deciphering the manuscript, and when he had a sufficient portion prepared, he would inform them, and they would assemble to hear it read. He was enabled, from his acquaintance with the classics and ancient history to introduce many singular names, which were particularly noticed by the people, and could easily be recognized by them."

Let us say in passing that "Mormon" is one of those names. It is from the Greek and means literally a "bug-bear, a hobgoblin."

Miss Martha Spaulding, now Mrs. Kins-try, Spaulding's daughter testifies: "My Father read the manuscript I had seen him writing to the neighbors and to a clergyman a friend of his who came to visit him. Some of the names he mentioned while reading to the people I have never forgotten. They are as fresh in my memory as though I had heard them but yesterday. They are Mormon, Moroni, Lamanite and Nephi, etc., etc."

Joseph Miller of Amity, Pa., who was intimate with Spaulding while he lived in Amity, nursed him in his last illness, and heard him read much from his manuscript, says:

"Mr. Spaulding seemed to take great delight in reading from his manuscript written on foolscap. I heard him read most if not all of it; and had frequent conversations with him about it. Some time ago I heard most of the Book of Mormon read. On hearing read the account of the battle between the Amlicites (Book of Alma, chapter II.), in which the soldiers of one army placed a red mark on their foreheads, to distinguish them from their enemies, it seemed to reproduce in my mind not only the narrative but the very words, as they had been imprinted on my mind by reading Spaulding's manuscript."

Ruddiek McKee of Washington D. C. testifies:

"I was a boarder at Spaulding's tavern in Amity, Pa., in the fall of 1814. I recollect quite well Mr. Spaulding spending much time in writing on sheets of paper torn from an old book, what purported to be a veritable history of the nations or tribes that inhabited Canaan. He called it 'Lost Manuscript' or some such name. I was struck with the minuteness of its details and apparent sincerity and truthfulness of the author. I have an indistinct recollection of the passage referred to by Mr. Miller, about the Amlicites making a cross with red point in their foreheads to distinguish them from their enemies in the confusion of battle."

Mr. Abner Jackson of Canton Ohio who heard Spaulding read the MS. to his father in Comeau, just before his removal to Pittsburg, testifies:

"Spaulding frequently read his MS. to the neighbors and commented on it as he progressed. He wrote it in Bible style, 'And it came to pass' occurred so often that some called him 'Old come to pass.' The names, Mormon, Moroni, Nephi, Nephtie, Laman, Lamanite, etc., were in it. The closing scene was at Cumorah, where all the righteous were slain."

We propose now to introduce Sidney Rigdon himself. Rev. John Winter, M. D. was teaching school in Pittsburg, and was a member of the First Baptist church when Rigdon was its pastor and was intimate with Rigdon. He testifies that

"In 1822 or 3 Rigdon took out of his desk in his study a large MS. stating that it was a Bible romance purporting to be a history of the American Indians. That it was written by one Spaulding a Presbyterian preacher whose health had failed and who had taken it to the printers to see if it would pay to publish it. And that he (Rigdon) had borrowed it from the printer as a curiosity."

James Jeffries, an old and highly respected citizen of Churchville Hartford Co. Maryland, testifies, in a statement he dictated to Rev. Calvin D. Wilson, Jan. 20th 1884, in the presence of his wife and J. M. Finney, M. D.; and attested by Dr. Finney, Rev. Wilson and Mrs. James Jeffries:

"Forty years ago I was in business in St. Louis. The Mormons then had their temple in Nauvoo Illinois. I had business transactions with them. I knew Sidney Rigdon. He acted as general manager of the business of the Mormons (with me). Rigdon told me several times, in his conversation with me, that there was in the printing office with which he was connected in Ohio, a MS. of the Rev. Spaulding, tracing the origin of the Indians from the lost tribes of Israel. This MS. was in the office several years. He was familiar with it. Spaulding wanted it published but had not the means to pay for printing. He (Rigdon) and Joe Smith used to look over the MS. and read it on Sundays. Rigdon said Smith took the MS. and said 'I'll print it,' and went off to Palmyra New York."

"Forty years ago" would be the fall of 1844, just after Rigdon had been driven out of Nauvoo. The *Times and Seasons* assailed him bitterly, that fall and winter, for exposing Mormonism. On his way from Nauvoo to Pittsburg, he called on his old acquaintance, Mr. Jeffries, in St. Louis, and, in his anger at the Mormons, he let out the secrets of Mormonism, just as he told the Mormons he would, if they did not make him their leader.

George Clark, son of Jerome Clark of Harwicke, N. Y., testifies that Mrs Davidson left the trunk containing her first husband's MSS. at his father's, before she went to Munson Mass, to live with her daughter. He says:

"Shortly before Hurlbut got the MS. from fathers, during a visit to fathers, Mrs Davidson gave to my wife to read, a MS. written by her first husband, and Spaulding; remarking as she handed her the MS.: 'The Mormon Bible is almost a literal copy of this MS.'"

It was this MS. Hurlbut obtained from Jerome Clark, and which he never delivered to Howe. He retained it and gave to Howe a few leaves, the beginning of an entirely different MS.

Scores of witnesses who would have corroborated the above could have found

where the Book of Mormon appeared, but these are enough certainly.

We wish now to call the attention of the reader to these facts. I. We have proved by sixteen witnesses of the highest character, one Solomon Spaulding's brother, another his sister-in-law, another his wife, another his daughter, another his business partner, another one who was an inmate of his family for many months, another one with whom Spaulding boarded for months, and the others intimate acquaintances, that between the years 1809 and 1816 Solomon Spaulding spent much of his time in preparing manuscripts for a book he intended to publish called the "Manuscript Found."

II. That from reading it and hearing him read it they became more or less familiar with the contents of his manuscript. III. Their description of his manuscript is as accurate an outline of the historic portion of the Nephite part of the Book of Mormon, in the plot of the story, the starting point of the history, its leading incidents, journeys, wars etc., the names of the principal characters, as any average Mormon can give. IV. They mention only the Nephite portion of the book of Mormon, with one exception, which we will soon give. V. They all declare that there was no religious matter in his manuscript. VI. Oliver Smith testifies that Spaulding told him just before going to Pittsburg, that he would prepare the manuscript for press while there, living a retired life for that purpose. VII. J. N. Miller testifies, that in explaining his book to him, Spaulding told him that he landed the people at the Isthmus of Darien which he called Zarahemla.

From all these facts we gather these conclusions. That Spaulding wrote, at first only the historic part of the Nephite portion of the Book of Mormon. This was his second manuscript which we will call manuscript No. II. or Mormon manuscript No. I. It was this small manuscript that Mrs. Martha Spaulding his daughter saw in the trunk at W. H. Sabin's her uncle's in Onadago, Valley, N. Y. about the year 1823. From the amount of writing Spaulding did during the seven years, and from Miller's description, it is evident that he prepared a more complete manuscript adding the Zarahemla emigration. This we will call manuscript No. III. Mormon manuscript No. 2. In 1812 Spaulding moved to Pittsburg, for the purpose of publishing his book, intending, as he told Oliver Smith to lead a retired life and rewrite it for the press. He showed it, his daughter testifies to Mr. Patterson, a publisher in Pittsburg who told him to rewrite it for the press and he would publish it. He did so and added the Jaredite emigration. Mrs. Spaulding, his wife, and Miss Spaulding his daughter, testify, that he sent the manuscript to Patterson's publishing house. Mr. Miller, Mr. McKee and Dr. Dodd of Amity, Pa., testify that Spaulding told them he had done so. In 1814 Spaulding then in very poor health went to Amity, Washington Co., Pa. His wife kept tavern

and supported the family. Spaulding continued to write on his manuscript and read it to all who would listen to him until his death Oct. 20th 1816.

His wife and daughter put his manuscript and papers that they found, into a trunk and took it with them to the residence of a brother of Mrs. Spaulding, W. H. Sabin, Onadago, Valley, Onadago county, N. Y. In 1820 Mrs. Spaulding went to Pomfret Conn. Sometime afterwards she married a Mr. Davidson of Hartwicke, Otsego, county N. Y. and went there to live. She left her daughter Miss Martha Spaulding with her uncle Mr. Sabin, and left the trunk containing the manuscripts in her care. Miss Spaulding testifies that she read one of the manuscripts, a small one, either Spaulding's first draft of the story, or his Mormon manuscript No. 1.—the one he wrote in 1809-10. She also testifies that while she was at her uncle's, Joseph Smith worked as teamster for her uncle, and learned of the existence of the manuscript. Imposter Joe places his first vision concerning the plates, Sept. 1823. As this is his way of dressing up his first knowledge of the manuscript he worked for Sabin in September, 1823, and learned of the existence of the manuscript then. Sometime after her moving to Hartwicke, and after Sept. 1823, Mrs. Davidson sent for the trunk and it was sent from Onadago, Valley, to the house of Mr. Davidson in Hartwicke. In 1828 Miss Martha Spaulding married Dr. McKinstry and went to Munson Mass. to live. 1830 Mrs. Davidson left Hartwicke and went to Munson to live with her daughter Mrs. McKinstry. She left the trunk containing the manuscript and papers—that is all she and her daughter found after Spaulding's death, in care of her brother-in-law Jerome Clark, in Hartwicke. Here it stayed until it was opened by Philastus Hurlbut and Jerome Clark in 1834. Hurlbut had visited Mrs. Davidson and Mrs. McKinstry in Munson, and obtained an order from them authorizing him to open the trunk, and examine its contents.

We are ready now to introduce the person who was instrumental in giving to the world the "Book of Mormon." Sidney Rigdon was born near the village of Library in St. Clair township, Allegany county, Pa., February 19, 1793. He lived on the farm of his father until the death of the latter in 1810; when Sidney was 17 years old. All the education he obtained he got in a log school-house near his home. After his father's death he still made his home at his mother's pretending to work on the farm and to farm the land part of the time, but was, his neighbors say, too lazy or too proud to work. A dispute has arisen over the question whether he was in Pittsburg before he went there in 1822, to take charge of the first Baptist church. His friends assert that he did not live in Pittsburg till that time. A dispute arises over the question whether he learned the printers' art in early life. Also whether he worked in the office of Patterson, when Spaulding's manu-

script was taken there to be published. His friends deny this, and persons employed in Patterson's office before and after that time, say they remember no such employee of the office, and Rigdon denied it most emphatically. Mr. Patterson remembers nothing of him. On the other hand Mrs. Davidson, Spaulding's wife, declares positively that he was connected with the office. Mr. Miller of Amity, Mr. McKee, and Dr. Dodd testify that Mr. Spaulding so informed them. There must have been some foundation for such positive impressions on the part of Mr. and Mrs. Spaulding, and many others.

I think Mrs. Eichbaum who was clerk in the post office, in Pittsburg, from 1812 to 1816, gives the key to the matter. A young man by the name of Lambdin was in Mr. Patterson's employ and became his partner in 1818. She states that Rigdon and Lambdin were very intimate and that Mr. Engle foreman of Patterson's printing office complained that Rigdon was loafing around the office all the time; that Rigdon was working in a tannery at the time. The explanation then is that Rigdon was intimate with Lambdin one of the leading employees of Patterson, while he was working in a tannery in Pittsburg, and from this intimacy, persons supposed that he was in Patterson's employ; especially when he was around the office so much. Rigdon was then a young man, noted for his gift of gab, and fondness for discussion, especially on religious topics. We are now ready to prove that Rigdon came in contact with the Spaulding manuscript. Joseph Miller of Amity, Pa., who took care of Spaulding in his last illness, testifies: "My recollection is that Spaulding left a transcript of the manuscript with Patterson for publication. The publication was delayed until Spaulding could write a preface. In the mean time the manuscript was spirited away, and could not be found. Spaulding told me that Sidney Rigdon had taken it or was suspected of taking it. I recollect distinctly that Rigdon's name was mentioned in connection with it." Mr. McKee says that Rigdon was mentioned to him by Spaulding as the employee of Patterson. Dr. Dodd who took care of Spaulding in his last illness declared that Spaulding's manuscript had been transformed into the Book of Mormon, and that Rigdon was the one who did it. He made this statement years before Howe's book appeared, the first public statement of such a theory. He did it on account of what he had heard of the Spaulding manuscript, and what Spaulding had told him. Mrs. Spaulding positively declares that Rigdon was connected with Patterson's office, when the manuscript was there, and that he copied it. That the manuscript was a subject of much curiosity and interest in the office. That it was well known that he had a copy of it.

We can now collate the evidence. Rigdon was intimate with Lambdin a prominent employee in the office. He loafed

about the office so much that Mr. Engle the foreman complained of it. His fondness for religious discussion and love of the strange and marvelous, caused him to take a deep interest in the Spaulding manuscript. It was just what would interest such a cast of mind as his. The manuscript was missed. He was blamed with spiriting it away. Mrs. Spaulding thinks he copied it. She, in the course of her husband's last illness did not learn all the facts, or did not remember clearly. She was mistaken in regard to his copying it and that it was returned, as Miller, McKee and Dr. Dodds statements, in regard to Spauldings own statements show. We have now traced the manuscript that Spaulding prepared for publication into Rigdon's hands. The statement of his friends that he staid on the farm till he went to Pittsburg, in 1822, they contradict themselves. It does not harmonize with Rigdon's character. Mrs. Eichbaum's statement is confirmed by the fact that Rigdon went to work in a tannery, when he quit preaching in 1824. He had learned the trade in 1812 to 1816. That Rigdon was in Pittsburg, when Spaulding, manuscript was in Patterson's office learning the tanner's trade. He was intimate with Lambdin, an employee of Patterson. He was about the office so much that Engles complained that he was always hanging about. He was just such a person as would be excited over Spaulding's manuscript. He took great interest in it. That was what made him hang around the office. The manuscript was stolen, and Spaulding said that Rigdon was suspected of taking it.

Rigdon joined the Baptist church on Piney Fork of Peters creek May 31, 1817. He studied theology during the years 1818-19 with a Mr. Clark a Baptist Preacher of Beaver, county, Pa. He was licensed to preach by the Connequessing Baptist church in 1819. He went to Warren Trumbull county Ohio, where his uncle was a prominent member of the Baptist church and joined that church, March, 4th, 1820. He was ordained to preach as a regular Baptist Preacher by that church, April, 1st, 1820. He preached for that church and other churches in that vicinity during the years 1820 and 21. He married Phebe Brooks in Warren, in 1820. In January 1822 he moved to Pittsburg and was made Pastor of the First Baptist church Jan. 28th 1822. He embraced many of the teachings of Campbell and Scott. His church and Scott's often met together in worship. He was arraigned for such doctrinal errors and excluded Oct. 11, 1823. He preached for his adherents in the court house till in the summer of 1824. Then for two years did no regular preaching. He says he studied the Bible and worked in a tannery.

We will now prove that he had the Spaulding manuscript in his possession at this time. Rev. John Winter M. D. who was a member of Rigdon's congregation when he was pastor of the First Baptist church, and very intimate with him testifies; that Rigdon in his presence in his

house took out of a desk a manuscript and remarked that a "Presbyterian minister Spaulding whose health had failed brought this to a printer to see if it would pay to publish it. It is a romance of the Bible—and he got it from the printer to read as a curiosity." Here we have clear proof that Rigdon had Spaulding's manuscript in his possession in 1823. In the winter of 1826 Rigdon moved to Bainbridge, Geauga, county Ohio. Soon after he was visited by his niece now Mrs. A. Dunlap of Warren, Ohio. She testifies:

"That in her presence her uncle went into his bedroom and took from a trunk which he kept carefully locked, a manuscript and came back seated himself by the fire and began to read. His wife came into the room and exclaimed: 'What you are a studying that thing again? I mean to burn that paper.'" Rigdon replied: "No indeed you will not. This will be a great thing some day." When he was reading this manuscript he was so completely occupied that he seemed entirely unconscious of anything around him."

We have now proved that Rigdon had the Spaulding manuscript in his possession, and that he expected to make some great thing out of it and spent much time over it.

In June 1826 Rigdon was invited to preach the funeral sermon of Warner Goodall of Mentor Ohio, and so pleased the congregation, that they chose him their preacher, and he became a Disciple Preacher. He was now 33 years old. He had barely what was a common school education of those days, and was never a student or reader, except of the visionary and mysterious. He had a wonderful command of language, an extravagant imagination and a marvelous power of word painting. He excelled in declamation and in a kind of pulpit power, that arouses revival excitement. He never was regarded as a reasoner, or a man of profound thought. He was relied on as a revivalist rather than as a regular preacher. His favorite theme was the millennium, on which he was fond of declaiming, and entertained the ideas now found in the Book of Mormon. He was always talking of some great time, coming, some great thing going to happen. He brought with him many of his Baptist ideas, and never accepted all Disciple teaching. His power in revivals and his love of revival excitement, inclined him to the idea then popular in all churches, except the Disciples of direct and immediate or miraculous power of the Holy Ghost. His extravagancies and eccentricities gave constant annoyance to the Disciples, who overlooked them on account of his power as a revivalist. They would often say: "Oh well it is Rigdon. It is one of Rigdon's oddities." His imagination and love of the marvelous lead him constantly into exaggerations, that often were absolute falsehoods. Those who who watched him closely were soon convinced, that he lacked logical mental power and moral stamina, and was unreliable in his statements, and wanting in moral principle. He was a vain showy pulpit orator but never was a trusted preacher among the Disciples.

We propose now to show that Rigdon knew

of the appearance of the Book of Mormon before it appeared, and knew of and described its contents. Adamson Bently Rigdon's brother-in-law and one of the most reliable men that Ohio has ever known, declares in the *Millennial Harbinger* of 1844, page 39: "I know that Sidney Rigdon told me as much as two years before the Mormon Book made its appearance, or had been heard of by me, that there was a book coming out, the manuscript of which was engraved on gold plates." Alexander Campbell whose word not even sectarian hatred ever dared to impeach, clinches the matter by adding his testimony:

"The conversation alluded to in Brother Bently's letter, was in my presence, as well as his. My recollection of it led me, some two or three years ago, to interrogate Bro. Bently concerning his recollections of it. They accorded with mine in every particular, except in regard to the year in which it occurred. He placed it in the summer of 1827. I placed it in the summer of 1826. Rigdon, at the same time, observed that on the plates dug up in New York, there was an account, not only of the aborigines of this continent, but it was stated also that the Christian religion had been preached on this continent, during the first century just as we were then preaching it on the Western Reserve."

That clinches the matter.

We will now introduce Darwin Atwater of Mantua, who testifies:

"Sidney Rigdon preached for us when the Mormon defection came on us, and notwithstanding his extraordinary wild freaks he was held in high repute by many. For a few months before his pretended conversion to Mormonism, it was noted that his wild extravagant propensities had been more marked. That he knew beforehand of the coming of the Book of Mormon, is to me certain, from what he had said during the first of his visits to my father's some years before (in 1826). He gave a wonderful description of the mounds and other antiquities found in some parts of America, and said that they must have been made by the aborigines. He said there was a book to be published containing an account of these things. He spoke of them in his eloquent enthusiastic style as being a thing most extraordinary. Though a youth I took him to task for expending so much enthusiasm on such a subject instead of the things of the gospel. In all my intercourse with him afterwards he never spoke of the antiquities or of the wonderful book that should give an account of them till the Book of Mormon was really published. He must have thought that I was not the man to reveal to."

That is true. Darwin Atwater was not, Parley P. Pratt was. He was the right man for Rigdon's schemes.

Rigdon made a convert of Pratt then teaching school in Lorain county Ohio. Pratt began to preach for the Disciples. Rigdon let him into his scheme and Pratt entered heartily into it. We will now prove that Rigdon was away from home, engaged in getting out his manuscript, that he told his wife would be a great thing some day. Zebulon Rudolpho Mrs Garfield's father testifies:

"During the winter previous to the appearance of the Book of Mormon, Rigdon was in the habit of spending weeks away from home, going no one knew whither. He often appeared preoccupied and he would indulge in dreamy visionary talks, which puzzled those who listened. When the Book of Mormon appeared and Rigdon joined in the advocacy of the new religion the suspicion was at once aroused that he was one of the framers of the new doctrine, and that probably he was not ignorant of the authorship of the Book of Mormon."

John Rudolph, brother to Z. Rudolph says:

"For two years before the Book of Mormon ap-

peared. Rigdon's sermons were full of declarations and prophecies that the age of miracles would be restored, and more complete revelations, than those in the Bible, would be given. When the Book of Mormon appeared, all who heard him were satisfied that he referred to it."

Almon B. Green, well known in Northern Ohio, says:

"In the Annual Meeting of the Mahoning Association held in Austintown in August, 1830, about two months before Sidney Rigdon's professed conversion to Mormonism, Rigdon preached Saturday afternoon. He had much to say about a full and complete restoration of the ancient gospel. He spoke in his glowing style of what the Disciples had accomplished but contended that we had not accomplished a complete restoration of Apostolic Christianity. He contended such restoration must include community of goods—holding all in common stock, and a restoration of the spiritual gifts of the apostolic age. He promised that although we had not come up to the apostolic plan in full yet as we were improving God would soon give us a new and fuller revelation of his will. After the Book of Mormon had been read by many who heard Rigdon on that occasion they were perfectly satisfied that Rigdon knew all about that book when he preached that discourse. Rigdon's sermon was most thoroughly refuted by Bro. Campbell, which very much offended Rigdon."

Scores of others who were present have made similar statements hundreds of times.

Eri M. Dille testifies:

"In the autumn of 1830 Sidney Rigdon held a meeting in the Baptist meeting-house on Euclid Creek. I was sick and did not attend the meeting, but my father repeatedly remarked while it was in progress that he was afraid that Rigdon was about to leave the Disciples for he was continually telling of what marvelous things he had seen in the heavens and of wonderful things about to happen and his talks indicated that he would leave the Disciples."

We will now prove that Rigdon came in contact with Smith in 1827-28-29, while Smith was getting out the Book of Mormon, Pomeroy Tucker, a native of Palmyra, New York, an intimate acquaintance of Imposter Joe, who read much of the proofs of the Book of Mormon says:

"A mysterious stranger now appears at Smith's and holds out recourse with the famed money digger. For a considerable time no intimation of the name or purpose of this stranger transpired to the public, not even to Smith's nearest neighbors. It was observed by some that his visits were frequently repeated. The sequel of the intimacies of this stranger and the money digger, will sufficiently appear hereafter. There was great consternation when the 118 pages of manuscript were stolen from Harris for it seems to have been impossible, for some unaccountable reason, to retranslate the stolen portion. The reappearance of this mysterious stranger at Smith's at this juncture was again the subject of inquiry and conjecture by observers, from whom was withheld all explanations of his identity and purpose. When the Book of Mormon appeared Rigdon was an early convert. Up to this time he had played his part in the background and his occasional visits to Smith's had been observed by the inhabitants as those of the mysterious stranger. It had been his policy to remain in concealment until all things were in readiness for blowing the trumpet of the new gospel. He now came to the front as the first regular preacher in Palmyra."

Mrs. Eaton, wife of Horace Eaton D. D. for thirty-two years a resident of Palmyra says:

"Early in the summer of 1827 a mysterious stranger seeks admission to Joe Smith's cabin. The conferences of the two are most private. This person whose coming immediately precedes a new departure in the faith was Sidney Rigdon a backslidden clergyman, then a Campbellite preacher in Mentor Ohio."

J. H. McCauley, in his history of Franklin County, Pennsylvania, states:

"As a matter too well known to need argument that Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism and Sidney Rigdon were acquaintances for a considerable time before Mormonism was first heard of."

Abel Chase, a near neighbor of the Smith's, testifies.

"I saw Rigdon at Smith's at different times with considerable intervals between them."

This disproves the statement that Rigdon never was at Smith's but once and that after the book appeared. He was there several times and some visits must have been before the book appeared.

Lorenzo Saunders, another near neighbor, testifies:

"I saw Rigdon at Smith's several times, and the first visit was more than two years before the Book appeared."

We have now brought Rigdon the second character in the origination of the Book of Mormon, in contact with the Imposter Joe Smith the third and last character in originating the fraud. This acquaintance could have been brought about in two ways. Parly Pratt the school teacher in Lorain county Ohio, that Rigdon converted, had been a peddler in Central New York, and was acquainted with every noted character in it. When Rigdon let him into the secret of his scheme, he could have suggested to Rigdon that the seer and famous money seeker of Manchester, with his wonderful peep-stone, would be the very person to introduce his fraud to the world, as a revelation by miracle. Or it could have occurred in another way. The work of Smith and his gang in digging over a large scope of country in southern New York, and northern Pennsylvania, had been extensively commented on by the press. Rigdon could have learned of this wonderful seeker after treasure, and his wonderful peep-stone through the press, and it occurred to him that here was the one to give his stolen manuscript to the world as a new revelation, by miracle, translating pretended plates with his peep-stone. We are now ready for a sketch of Imposter Joe.

Imposter Joe was born Dec. 23, 1805, in Sharon, Windsor county Vermont. The minister employed by the Home Missionary Society, to labor in Vermont 1809-10-11-12-13 says, in his autobiography, that in 1812 a religious imposter created an excitement in the neighborhood of the Smith's. He taught that miraculous spiritual gifts could and should be enjoyed now, and claimed to exercise them. He claimed to be a prophet, and then a Messiah, Christ in his second advent. Among the most active of his followers was Imposter Joe's father and mother, especially his mother. She prophesied, at the time, that Joe, then seven years old, would be a prophet, and give to the world a new religion. Joe was raised with this idea before him. All the family were taught and believed it. Joe's father used to speak of Joe as the "genus," as he termed it, of the family. This accounts for Joe's peculiar gravity when but a child, and as a youth. He was to be a prophet, and he must not act as other children and boys did. In 1815 the Smiths moved to Palmyra N. Y. and in 1813 they squatted on an unoccupied piece of land, belonging to minors and lived there until they went to Ohio in 1830. Soon after coming to Palmyra, in a revival excitement, Joe showed

some interest in religious matters, and joined the class of probationers on probation, and was soon left off 'on suspicion' as the Yankee expressed a similar experience of his own. This is all there is of the long story that Imposter Joe wrote in 1843, twenty three years afterwards, of his wonderful vision, of his going to the Methodist preacher with queries, that would be in character, had the querist been a person of mature mind, well versed in the controversies of the age, but were utterly out of character in the mouth of an ignorant illiterate boy of fifteen, that was remarkable chiefly for his power of exaggeration and falsehood, and not for thought. The ideas that he said he had then, he never dreamed of until he learned them from Sidney Rigdon, years afterwards.

In Sep. 1822, while digging a well for Willard Chase, Imposter Joe's father found a singularly shaped stone of cloudy quartz, strangely resembling a child's foot. Imposter Joe, who was loafing around was very much interested in the stone and finally stole it from Mr. Chase's children. This stone is the Urim and Thummim of Mormonism. Rigdon had stolen the "Book of Mormon." Now Imposter Joe steals the Urim and Thummim, with which he pretended to

translate Ridgson's stolen manuscript. In Sept. 1823 Imposter Joe worked for W. H. Sabin, in Onondago Valley N. Y. Here he learned of the existence of the Spaulding manuscript then at Mr. Sabin's in the care of Martha Spaulding, Solomon Spaulding's daughter. During the year 1823-24-25-26-27, Imposter Joe was engaged in loafing around, strolling over the country, pretending to find water by witching for it with a witch-hazel rod, and pretending to find lost property, buried treasures, and minerals, by means of the stone he had stolen from Mr. Chase's children. He had, a part of the time, with him, a gang of idle superstitious men, who dug holes over a large scope of country, in several counties in southern New York, and northern Pennsylvania. His knavish tricks, and frauds, had attracted to him great notoriety. His proceedings with a gang of dupes were published and commented on in several of the papers of New York and Pennsylvania. By this means Rigdon who was still looking around for some means to publish his stolen manuscript heard of the Seer of Manchester, and his wonderful peep-stone. It occurred to him that here was the means of getting his new revelation—his "Golden Bible" before the world.

MR. KELLEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—This evening I shall introduce first, some of the unmistakable corroborative evidences of the truth of the Book of Mormon as found contained in the reports and records of eminent travelers, explorers, scientists, historians and archaeologists, of the world.

The *Spaulding Romance* no doubt will still be the means of entertaining you upon the part of the negative, as it seems to be a much easier task for him to spin out that yarn, than to attempt to answer the arguments of the affirmative. I will promise you one thing however, that is, that the Spaulding tale shall not go unanswered, if the arguments of the affirmative are. I will show you before the close of the discussion of this question, if the negative holds out the time agreed upon, that, that thing is so rotten and deceitful in conception, so false and malicious in publication, so absurd and ridiculous in belief, that you shall in your hearts feel ashamed that you ever entertained the thought, that there might be something in it. In the meantime carefully follow him; he is a good reader and has the story well rehearsed.

But to the facts: In 1827 and 1828, when the greater part of the Book of Mormon was translated and put in manuscript, and in the year, 1829, when it was put in the hands of the printer, very little was known as to the peoples, ancient races and civilization, of the American continent. Taken in the light of what is known of these ancient peoples to-day with the later developments, there was comparatively nothing known at that time. There were then speculations and theories afloat as to the probabilities of an older people than the Indians in a few cases, brought out by the finding of a few relics of rude implements and ornaments together with some bones, &c., unaccounted for, and in a few instances speculation as to the cause of certain mounds of earth, whether such showed a higher state of civilization and was the remains of an older people than was then to be found among the savages of the forest. But there was no one who for a moment thought that the country had been inhabited by a people whose state of civilization and enlightenment had equalled, if not surpassed, that of Europe itself. In the arts and the sciences; in agriculture and

mining; in masonry and architecture; in painting and sculpture; in engineering and mechanical skill, in physics and medicine and in mathematics and astronomy. Not only this, but to that time no one speculated in all the domain of history, science or literature, that the continent had been successively inhabited by different peoples of a high state of civilization, who in turn had become extinct or dwindled into barbarism. It was also at that time a speculative belief that the continent was settled from the north, the people gradually making to the south when it *was* settled, and that probably some of the rude tribes which inhabited northeast Asia had at some period wandered across Behring's strait and gradually made their way southward upon the continent. It was also speculated that perhaps at some time some of the daring and hardy seamen of maritime Europe had discovered the country and formed small settlements which were afterwards destroyed by the more powerful nations, for the relics discovered up to 1829, were only in certain places, which would only indicate the landing of a ship's crew at the point; and again, that the Chinese had been cast upon its shores in some accidental manner and the Indians were descended from them; and later by some, that the "Ten tribes of Israel," that were carried away captive from Samaria by Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, may have made their way to the continent and after a time fallen into idolatry and a state of savagery. But in turn every one of these theories have given way as the light of discovery and research has been thrown upon them, and now none find a support as demonstrable facts. At the time before referred to however, there was published to the world by a young man in the State of New York, a record claiming to give a positive and correct account of the peoples who had formerly inhabited this continent. The places from whence they came; the different times of their coming; the countries of first settlement; the varied states of civilization; their knowledge of the arts, sciences, agriculture, languages and literature. The manner of settlement, leading from south to north. The extent of settlement and the magnitude of the population. Giving a general account of their hundreds of cities and the glory and grandeur of them; of the industries, pursuits and character of the people, and their final overthrow. And singular as it may seem, every statement with reference to these matters is in harmony with the facts which have been developed by the later researches of science. And upon nearly every one of its marvelous revelations as to these people, the result of the work of the archaeologist has been to furnish corroborative evidence of their truthfulness. Notwithstanding the fairness and candor in which the statements of this record have been published to the world, from the day it met the public eye, self-constituted leaders, theologians, and paltry politicians have

taken it upon themselves to inform the public mind of their views of its teachings, always careful, however, to, if possible, keep the record itself in the background lest it reveal their perversions, until at this time, I think I may safely assert and keep within the bounds of truth, that there is not published in America, a single Encyclopedia, Gazetteer, Geography, History; History of the Religious Denominations, Review or Expose which has spoken of the work and undertaken to give its statements, unless such publication was made by the friends of this record, that does not contain a false, garbled and perverted account of what it contains and teaches. I ask in the broad world of books everywhere, for one. Why is this my audience? If the book is a bad one will it not be sufficient to prove it so by giving its statements without perversion? Has it come to this! That men are compelled to resort to falsehood and trickery in order to overcome and put down an evil thing? In the apostles' time the injunction was, "to be not overcome of evil, and overcome evil with good." But perhaps this with the other good things of the New Testament was confined to the apostles, and "to those upon whom they laid their hands." The truth is my friends that there is method in this madness. Somebody is just afraid that if the light is turned on they may be discovered to be sitting in darkness. It may be said as of olden time: "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God."

It was stated by my opponent last night that Sidney Rigdon said in 1823, that a book would be published some day, "and be a big thing," "And," says he, "it is a big thing."

Well it seems to me he makes Rigdon out a prophet, and a true one too, rather early in the career. According to this Rigdon was a prophet while he belonged to the Baptists, and after he was with the Disciples; and I make my guess right here that if he had not found out they were not in accordance with the Bible and left them he would be accounted such with them to this day; yes, and the grandest and ablest of them all; making no exception to Campbell, or Scott or Barton W. Stone. It is much like the case of Saul of Tarsus, who while he was a Pharisee was hail fellow well met. But when he became converted to the full light of the gospel, and afterwards preached good to the people and told them how many bad things he did when a Pharisee, "They cried out, Away with such a fellow, he ought not to be permitted to live upon the earth."

But to return to the "big thing." This work my friends will prove to be a big thing to this age yet; not to the destruction of Christianity, but to its full establishment. Why! do you not know that I can go side by side with the scientist and the skept-

tic into the National Museum of our country and corroborate that work by the collections, from the rude arrow-head of the Indian to the cities of the cliff-dwellers which are there set out in full representation, simply by turning to the wonderful history in this book? And not only in these but in the fossil and other collections from the time you strike the bones of the mastodon till you come to those of the common domestic animals. It is truly an ensign set up bearing the most indisputable tidings that Jesus was the Son of God and that God is, who created the heavens and the earth and revealed himself to man upon this as upon the other continent; and this fact alone ought to be a sufficient answer to the question, "Of what use is the book?" Since it is brought to light in an age of the world when whole multitudes disbelieve in the existence of God, and millions whose fear toward him are taught by the precepts of men, believe in him only as a God of the past, but not now having any especial thing to do with the human family, the use of it is as apparent as any known thing in the universe. Opening this record (the Book of Mormon), I hurriedly cite some of its pages upon the civilization of the continent.

First of the civilization which came out from Babel four thousand years ago. Page 520 of the record:

"And the whole face of the land northward, [that is from the straits, from what we term the Isthmus of Panama northward], was covered with inhabitants; and they were exceeding industrious, and they did buy and sell and traffic one with another that they might get gain. And they did work in all manner of ore, and they did make gold, and silver, and iron, and brass, and all manner of metals; and they did dig it out of the earth: wherefore they did cast up mighty heaps of earth to get ore, of gold and of silver, and of iron and of copper. And they did work all manner of fine work. And they did have silks, and fine twined linen; and they did work all manner of cloth that they might clothe themselves. And they did make all manner of tools to till the earth, both to plough and to sow, and to reap and to hoe, and also to thrash. And they did make all manner of tools with which they did work their beasts. And they did make all manner of weapons of war. And they did work all manner of work of exceeding curious workmanship. And never could be a people more blest than they, and more prosper by the hand of the Lord."

Then I refer you to page 517 for another description:

"And in the space of sixty and two years," (that is from the time that Emer one of their kings began to reign), "they had become exceeding strong, inasmuch that they became exceeding rich, having all manner of fruit, and of grain, and of silks, and of fine linen, and of gold, and of silver, and of precious things, and also all manner of cattle, of oxen, and cows, and of sheep, and of swine, and of goats, and also many other kinds of animals which were useful for the food of man; and they also had horses, and asses, and there were elephants, and cureloms, and cumoms, all of which were useful unto man, and more especially the elephants, and cureloms, and cumoms."

Citing you now to page 43, I refer you to the situation of the country as it appeared and was found to exist when the second people came to the continent—Those who came out from the land of Jerusalem six hundred years before the birth of the Savior:

"And it came to pass that we did find upon the land of promise, as we journeyed in the wilderness, that there were beasts in the forests of every kind, both the

cow, and the ox, and the ass, and the horse and the goat, and the wild goat, and all manner of wild animals which were for the use of men. And we did find all manner of ore, both of gold, and of silver, and of copper."

On page 394 we have a further description, and also of the habits of the people:

"And behold, there was all manner of gold in both these lands, and of silver, and of precious ore of every kind; and there were also curious workmen, who did work all kinds of ore, and did refine it; and thus they did become rich. They did raise grain in abundance, both in the north and in the south. And they did flourish exceedingly both in the north and in the south. And they did multiply and wax exceeding strong in the land. And they did raise many flocks and herds, yea, many fattlings. Behold, their women did toil and spin, and did make all manner of cloth, of fine twined linen and cloth of every kind."

Leaving the description of the country and the people as set out in the book, I next refer you to their society and moral and religious instruction. The book shows that the people were taught by Jesus when he manifested himself to many upon this continent. Jesus said unto them page 456:

"And as I have prayed among you, even so shall ye pray in my church, among my people who do repent, and are baptized in my name. Behold I am the light; I have set an example for you."

"Pray in your families unto the Father, always in my name, that your wives and children may be blessed. And behold, ye shall meet together oft, and ye shall not forbid any man from coming unto you when ye shall meet together, but suffer them that they may come unto you, and forbid them not; but ye shall pray for them, and shall not cast them out; and if it so be that they come unto you oft, ye shall pray for them unto the Father, in my name; therefore hold up your light that it may shine unto the world. Behold I am the light which ye shall hold up—that which ye have seen me do. Behold ye see that I have prayed unto the Father, and ye all have witnessed; and ye see that I have commanded that none of you should go away, but rather have commanded that ye should come unto me, that ye may feel and see; even so shall ye do unto the world: and whosoever breaketh this commandment, suffereth himself to be led into temptation."

I might cite its pages to show you with regard to the hundreds of cities that it refers to, and magnificent ones too, located upon different parts of the continent, and especially upon the part of the continent known as Central America, and of which I shall refer hereafter; and also that part of the continent known now as Peru and Bolivia. But will proceed at the present upon another line.

Having given you a glance into the history as published in the years 1829 and 1830, I will briefly enumerate some of the prominent things mentioned in the work which have since been verified, and then introduce the evidences from Archaeologists.

1. The book states that three civilizations have existed, flourished and decayed, upon parts of the continent, and one on nearly every part.

2. One of these, first settled north of the Isthmus, or "narrow neck of land" as described by them, and inhabited first what is now called Central America, and afterwards the more northern parts of the continent.

3. The second settled on the east coast of South America and first inhabited that country occupying the territory that is now known as Peru and Bolivia, and from thence spread over the whole continent.

4. The third landed on or near the coast of what is now called Yucatan in Central America.

5. The last two of these civilizations were contemporaneous, and that they after a time united and were known as one people.

6. That the habitation of each began about 590 years before the Christian Era, and the joint habitation ceased about four centuries after, except as to the estranged tribes.

7. That the occupancy of the first or original inhabitants ceased at least a thousand years before these.

8. That the last prophets understood the Egyptian language in part and wrote in a brief and phonetic system of their language.

9. That they also wrote in other languages as did also the earliest of the peoples. That the civilization so far as to the occupancy of the country were in each instance from south to north originally.

10. That they builded many great and fine cities in the northern parts of South America; also, on and near the narrow neck of land, and north in the country of Central America, where the cities were the finest, largest, and most numerous. They also builded farther north upon all parts of the continent.

11. That the ancestry of the last two peoples was Israelitish, but not the lost "Ten Tribes."

12. That there was early brought to the continent by the first people, the common domestic animals and many others. (Here I will also state that the fossil remains of many of these were not discovered or known to the world to have existed upon this continent till a very late date, some as late as the year 1860.)

13. That many of their cities were walled with solid masonry and made immense fortresses and that they had engines of war, and the battle ax, the cimeter, the sword and many other kinds of instruments of war.

14. That classes had fortified cities in the mountains far up, so much so that it was impossible to dislodge them, and they retired and lived there, except to sally forth and prey upon the people in the land or the agricultural portions.

15. That the structure and manner of building of their temples was upon a grand and magnificent plan and they were decorated with much expense and many curious and unique ornaments.

16. The enlightened and civilized part of the people were peaceably inclined and not warlike, and highly cultivated in morals and religion. This is the history as given in the Book of Mormon.

I will now turn to my evidences with regard to this, as ascertained and published by explorers since the publication of the Book of Mormon, citing you the first volume of John L. Stephen's explorations in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan, page 131. Mr. Stephens here sets forth the first reference made to the distinguished city of Copan, as being made by Francisco de

Fuentes in 1700; but he only mentions it casually, and in his description he represented it as containing figures of men likewise represented in Spanish habits, with hose, and ruffle around the neck, sword, cap and short cloak. But that history has never been published in the English language. And little known of it in any part of the world, and it contained no true or full description of this ancient city.

"From this time," says the author, "there is no account of these ruins until the visit of Col. Galindo in 1836, before referred to, who examined them under commission from the Central American Government and whose communications on the subject were published in the proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of Paris, and in the Literary Gazette of London." This was in the year 1834.

I might remark here that there is in the books reference made to, a Spanish gentleman, and also an explorer, who examined some of these ruins, and left his manuscript in the hands of the government, and which was published in London in the year 1822. But the publication in English of that manuscript was confined to such narrow limits that at the time Stephens wrote this work, (1841), he had never himself seen the work, and such a journal as the London Literary Gazette had never heard of it in 1834. Mr. Stephens continues with reference to the first published account by Col. Galindo in 1834, as follows:

"Not being an artist his account is necessarily unsatisfactory and imperfect, but it is not exaggerated. Indeed it falls short of the marvelous account given by Fuentes one hundred and thirty five years before, and makes no mention of the movable stone hammock, with the sitting figures which were our great inducement to visit the ruins. No plans or drawings have ever been published, nor anything that can give even an idea of that valley of romance and wonder, where as has been remarked, the genii who attended on King Solomon seem to have been the artists."

I cite you next to the account on page 142 of the same work, where the author in describing some of the sculptured art of this ancient people says:

"Between the two principal personages is a remarkable cartouche, containing two hieroglyphics well preserved, which reminded us strongly of the Egyptian method of giving the names of the kings or heroes in whose honor monuments were erected. The head-dresses are remarkable for their curious and complicated form; the figures have all breastplates, and one of the two principal characters holds in his hand an instrument, which may, perhaps, be considered a scepter; each of the others holds an object which can only be subject for speculation and conjecture. It may be a weapon of war, and if so, it is the only thing of the kind found represented in Copan. In other countries, battle-scenes, warriors, and weapons of war are among the most prominent subjects of sculpture; and from the entire absence of them here there is no reason to believe that the people were not warlike, but peaceable and easily subdued."

Do not forget the fact in the examination that the only account pretended to have been given prior to 1834 of this city, that of Fuentes in 1700, represented these relics as adorned in Spanish dress and costume, and which would have really misled a reader of the true character of the ruins.

On page 155 of the same work we have another concise description of their sculpture:

"The monument, unhappily, is fallen and broken. In sculpture it is the same with the beautiful half-buried monument before given, and I repeat it, in workmanship equal to the best remains of Egyptian

art. The fallen part was completely bound to the earth by vines and creepers, and before it could be drawn it was necessary to unlace them, and tear the fibres out of the crevices. The paint is very perfect, and has preserved the stone, which makes it more to be regretted that it is broken. The altar is buried with the top barely visible, which, by examination we made out to represent the back of a tortoise."

Before Mr. Stephens visited Central America—and in a manner he was under the auspices of the government of the United States—he had visited all of the distinguished countries of the Eastern continent, and examined their cities, and had written or given partial accounts of them. He was a man well calculated to look closely into these cities of Ancient America and give a reliable account and description of them.

I next refer you to page 310 of his second volume. In his description of the temple of Palenque another ruin city of Central America he says:

"It stands on an artificial elevation of an oblong form, forty feet high, three hundred and ten feet in front and rear, and two hundred and sixty feet on each side. This elevation was formerly faced with stone, which has been thrown down by the growth of trees, and its form is hardly distinguishable. The building stands with its face to the east, and measures two hundred and twenty-eight feet front by one hundred and eighty feet deep. Its height is not more than twenty five feet, and all around it had a broad projecting cornice of stone. The front contained fourteen doorways, about nine feet wide each, and the intervening piers are between six and seven feet wide. On the left (in approaching the palace), eight of the piers have fallen down, as has also the corner on the right, and the terrace underneath is cumbered with the ruins. But six piers remain entire, and the rest of the front is open. The building was constructed of stone, with a mortar of lime and sand, and the whole front was covered with stucco and painted. The piers were ornamented with spirited figures in bas-relief."

On page 346 we have this further description:

"The principal subject of this tablet,—that is one of the sculptured figures that was found there, called 'the tablet of the cross,'—is the cross. It is surrounded with a strange bird, and loaded with indescribable ornaments. The two figures are evidently those of important personages. They are well drawn and in symmetry of proportion are perhaps equal to many that are carved on the walls of the ruined temples in Egypt. Their costume is in a style different from any hereto ore given, and the folds would seem to indicate that they were of a soft and pliable texture like cotton. Both are looking toward the cross, and one seems in the act of making an offering perhaps of a child, all speculations on the subject are of course entitled to little regard, but perhaps it would not be wrong to ascribe to these personages a sacerdotal character. The hieroglyphics doubtless explain all. Near them are other hieroglyphics, which reminded us of the Egyptian mode for the recording the name, history, office or character of the persons represented. This tablet of the cross has given rise to more learned speculations than perhaps any others found at Palenque."

On page 356 we have this statement of

the author in the conclusion of his description of the fallen city:

"Here were the remains of a cultivated, polished, and peculiar people, who had passed through all the stages incident to the rise and fall of nations; reached their golden age, and perished entirely unknown."

I refer you next to the late work of Mr. John T. Short, entitled, *The North Americans of Antiquity*. On page 387, he says of Palenque:

"The accompanying cut shows Waldeck's drawing (employed by Mr. Bancroft). Four hundred yards south of the palace stands the ruins of a pyramid and temple, which at the time of Dupax's and of Waldeck's visits were in a good state of preservation, but quite dilapidated when seen by Charny. The temple faces the east, and on the western wall of its inner apartment, itself facing the eastern light, is found, (or rather was, for it has now entirely disappeared), the most beautiful specimen of stucco relief in America. Mr. Waldeck, with the critical insight of an experienced artist declares it 'worthy to be compared to the most beautiful works of the age of Augustus.' He therefore named the temple *Beau Relief*. The above cut is a reduction from Waldeck's drawing used in Mr. Bancroft's work, and is very accurate. However, the peculiar beauty of Waldeck's drawings is such that it must be seen in order to be fully appreciated. It is scarcely necessary for us to call the reader's attention to the details of this picture, in which correctness of design and graceful outlines predominate to such an extent that we may safely pronounce the beautiful youth who sits enthroned on his elaborate and artistic throne, the American Apollo. In the original drawing the grace of the arms and wrists is truly matchless, and the muscles are displayed in the most perfect manner."

I hope the audience will not overlook the fact of the high order of art here set out. This is the latest work on American antiquities, bearing the date of 1882. Fifty three years after the Book of Mormon was in the publisher's hands, and yet every line of these grand descriptions are in perfect keeping with the high attainments of the people set out in that book most full and complete.

On page 392 of the same works he says:

"The stuccoed roofs and piers of both the temples—Cross and Sun—may be truly pronounced works of art of a high order. On the former Stephens observed busts and heads approaching the Greek models in symmetry of contour and perfectness of proportion. Mr. Waldeck has preserved in his magnificent drawings some of these figures, which are certainly sufficient to prove beyond controversy that the ancient Palenqueans were a cultivated and artistic people. In passing to Uxmal the transition is from delineations of the human figure, to the elegant and superabundant exterior ornamentation of edifices, and from stucco to stone as the material employed. The human figure, however, when it is represented, is in statuary of a high order."

"The elegant square panels of grecques and frets which compose the cornice of the Casa del Gobernador delineated in the works of Stephens, Baldwin and Bancroft, are a marvel of beauty which must excite the admiration of the most indifferent student of the subject."

(Time expired).

MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: A stock argument of Mormons in proof of the inspiration of Imposter Joe, and that the Book of Mormon is true and a revelation, is stated, "The Book of Mormon based on the idea that the aborigines of is America were Israelites. Such an idea was not thought of or advocated, until years after the Book of Mormon appeared. Some years after its appearance, scientific research demonstrated the truth of the basic idea of the Book of Mormon. Joseph Smith was an unlearned man. He could have obtained such an idea by revelation, and in that way alone." Young men who were as great readers as Joseph Smith was, have originated as startling ideas without inspiration. But we will now utterly explode this impudent falsehood. I have here two books. One is "The Wonders of Nature and Providence," written by Josiah Priest, and copyrighted by him June 2d, 1824, in the office of R. R. Lansing, Clerk of the District of Northern New York, and printed in Rochester in 1824. The other is the "Book of Mormon," copyrighted by Joseph Smith in the office of the same R. R. Lansing, Clerk of the same district, June 10th 1829, printed in Palmyra, twenty miles from Rochester, in 1830.

On the 297th page of "The Wonders of Nature and Providence," begins an article by Mr. Priest, the author, in which he argues at great length, that the Indians are descendants of the Israelites. Not only so, but he quotes from Clavigero a Catholic Missionary, who advocated the same idea in the seventeenth century. From Wm. Penn, who advocated it in 1788. From a work published by Mr. Adair of New Jersey who advocated this theory in 1774. From a sermon of Dr. Jarvis preached before the American Historical Society in 1811. Jarvis quotes from books of Sewall, Willard and several New England historians. Priest quotes further from Menasses Ben Israel, from Dr. Boudinot, from Dr. Edwards, from Charlevoix, Du Pratz's History of Louisiana, from Lock and Escarbotus Dr. Williams, Governor Hutcheson, Dr. Beatty, McKenzie, Maracz, Col. Smith's History of New Jersey, and many others. Priest quotes in all from over forty writers, of whom over twenty were Americans, who advocated the idea that the aborigines of America were Israelites. Most of these lived and wrote before Smith was born. He proves that it was the almost universal opinion of the ministers of New England and the Middle States. That it had been, from the time of Elliott until Priest's own day. Not only is this true, but Priest, in his argument, quotes nearly all of the passages of scripture quoted by Mormons to prove the theory. It was from Priest's book that Rigdon and the Pratts stole their arguments.

We show then that a book copyrighted in the same office as the Book of Mormon, published within twenty miles of Smith, circulated all over New York, Western Pennsylvania and Eastern Ohio, years before the Book of Mormon appeared, advocated the idea upon which it is based, and urged the same arguments in favor of the theory that Mormons use. That ends all claim that Joe Smith must have obtained the idea by revelation. It shows that not only did Rigdon steal the book, and Joe steal the peep stone to translate it, but Mormons stole their arguments to sustain it from Priest.

We will now take up my opponent's long array of prophecies. I might let them pass untouched, for he did not make an application of them, to the aborigines of America, that was worthy of notice. There was published in London, a few years ago, a work by a Mohammedan quoting and applying most of the same prophecies to the Ishmaelites to the Arabs and to the Koran. I have before me an argument, applying the same prophecies to the Anglo-Saxon race. The stick of Ephraim is England, of Judah, America. There is an organization, with many societies, that publishes a paper, advocating this idea. Scores of publications have been published, and they make a much better argument than Kelley has made. This shows the absurdity of such farfetched perversions of the poetic language of prophecy. If we admit that the prophecies extend beyond Palestine, I defy my opponent to quote one prophecy that is not met by the dispersion of Israelites over the old continent. Israelites were scattered into Spain, Italy and the islands of the Mediterranean, into Morocco, Congo, in west Africa, and over northern Africa, into Egypt and Ethiopia. Also into China, India, and over central and southern and western Asia. I defy my opponent to name one prophecy that extends beyond these countries to America. Now here is a fair challenge and test. Until he meets this, his prophecies are worthless. Isaiah, XVI—8, refers to the dispersion of Moab, has not the least reference to Israel. Jeremiah XX—XXI refers to dispersion in Assyrian Empire. Has no reference to America. So of every quotation from Jeremiah.

Isaiah xi—11. The 16 verse reads: "There shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria like it was to Israel in the day he came up out of Egypt." This shows that it refers to Israelites in the Assyrian Empire, and has no reference to America. We now come to the pet passage of Mormonism, Ezek. xxxvii—the sticks of Ephraim and Judah. The Book of Mormon declares in several places the Nephites were Manassehites,

and the people of Zarahemla Judahites. The stick of Ephraim can have no reference to them. Stick does not mean a book. The stick of Judah is not the Bible. The stick of Ephraim is not a book. Numbers, xvii. Aaron is told to take twelve rods or sticks and write on them just as Ezekiel is told to take two sticks and write on them. Aaron wrote the name of a tribe on a stick, writing twelve names, using twelve sticks. Ezekiel wrote the name of a tribe or a nation on a stick—for Judah represented the southern kingdom and Ephraim the northern kingdom—using two sticks. Gen. xlix. the rod, staff, stick or scepter of Judah is mentioned. We read of the rod, staff or stick of Aaron that budded, that Moses used. Then stick is a symbol of power. What the prophet's act meant was that the northern kingdom or Ephraim, and the southern kingdom or Judah, should be united again, after the captivity, as they were before the rebellion of Jereboam. In verse 23 the prophet declares these Israelites were scattered in captivity for sin. Lem and Nepht were taken by the Lord from Jerusalem, because they were so good to save them. The prophecy cannot refer to the Nephites. Verses 26-27 declares the Lord will bring Israel or Judah from their enemies' lands, not from America, into their own land, and leave none in their enemies' lands. We might examine every passage and show that they have no reference to America—can have none. That the context confines the prophecy to Asia, North Africa, and that it refers to the return, under Ezra and Nehemiah; but this is sufficient. Isaiah xxix.—In the first verse the prophecy is against the city where David dwelt, Jerusalem. In the seventh verse the prophecy is confined to Jerusalem. It has no reference to America. It speaks of the ignorance of the people of Judah, their failure to understand the prophets. It has not a ghost of reference to America. We have shown that the prophecies need not extend beyond the old world. We defy our opponent to name one that need extend beyond the old world. We have proved by the context that in every instance they refer to the old world and usually to the immediate neighborhood of Palestine.

We are now ready for our opponent's Holy Ghost speech, a speech that the audience will hear a dozen times before we are done. My opponent charges the Disciples with denying the power of godliness, the power of God, the power of the Spirit of God. The Bible declares that God has accomplished all things by his Spirit and by his word. In these is all power that God has exerted in the Universe. There are four different exercises of power by the Holy Spirit mentioned in the Bible. I. The miraculous power, as seen in inspiration, and in spiritual gifts, including all miraculous power mentioned in the Bible. This the world, sinners, cannot receive. John XIV: 16-17. "The Father will give you (the apostles) the Comforter, whom the world can not receive." This is not con-

verting or sanctifying power, for the sinner can not receive it to convert him. It is not sanctifying power, for it was to the apostles alone, and was to endow them with miraculous power for their mission, and not to sanctify them. It did not descend on the apostles at Pentecost, nor was it imparted to the Samaritans nor to John's disciples at Ephesus to convert them, for all these had been converted before. II. Converting power. Roman II: 16: "The Gospel is the power of God into salvation to all who believe." John IV: 38. "The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and life." Peter I: 5: "We are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." III. Indwelling power. Gal. IV: 6: "Because ye are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts." Because by the converting power, the Gospel, you have been made sons, God has sent the indwelling power into your hearts. Eph I: 13: "Having believed in Christ, you were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise that is the earnest of your inheritance." John XIV: 23: "Jesus said 'If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.'" Eph. III: 15-17: "I pray that you be strengthened with might in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith." I John II: 24: "If that which you have heard from the beginning abide in you, you shall continue in the Son and the Father." John III: 23-24: "This is the commandment of God, that we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, and he that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in God, and God in him." IV: 15-16: "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God' God is love. He that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." Col. III: 16: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom."

IV. Resurrecting power. Romans viii — "If the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead, dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies, by the Spirit of Christ that dwells in you." When? I Thess. 14-15-16: "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, and with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first." So also I Cor. xv. 51-52. We have proved that there are four manifestations of power of the Holy Spirit. I. The miraculous. This is not converting power, for the sinner cannot receive it to convert him. The apostles and others who received it were already converted. II. Converting power. This is the Gospel, the word of God, which begets, makes alive, converts. III. Indwelling power. This is not miraculous power. It is by and through faith, belief, by the word

of God. God and his Spirit dwells in us, when his word dwells in us, and we live it out in life. IV. Resurrecting power at the general judgment. My opponent, with the Book of Mormon and all of Joe Smith's revelations, and with the inspiration of a Mormon Elder, and with all his miraculous illumination, is so grossly ignorant as to quote and jumble together passages in which these four manifestations are mentioned; and is as ignorant as a dead man of these palpable distinctions. The miraculous power has ceased. The resurrecting power is to come. The converting and indwelling power that are exerted through the truth remain, and we believe in them as God's word teaches, and not as Mormon ignorance and delusion teach. That is the difference between us. The miraculous power was not a moral influence. It was given to wicked men, and even to animals, to Baalam's ass. It was given regardless of character. It made men no wiser or better, when it had passed away from them, as the cases of Baalam, his ass, Saul, Jonah and Caiaphas show. It converted no one, unless it be Baalam's ass, and if Mormons belong to that class, they may be converted by it, as the other ass was; but *men* never were converted by it.

We will now take up the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. We showed that there is one baptism in the church, in water, into the name of Father, Son and Spirit, it is a memorial and symbolical institution. There can be no other baptism, and baptism in the Spirit which was a miracle, ceased. My opponent can not touch this. We said that Joel's promise was to all flesh. That Christ's was to believers alone. That Peter's was only to believers that God should call. That is just what the Bible says. We said an apostle had to lay hands on believers, before they could receive the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. That is just what the VIII chapter of Acts declares. We said that this power never descended to a third person. He has not found a case. We said that there is a more excellent way than the exercise of the best of these miraculous powers. That is just what Paul says. I said that prophecy, or speaking by inspiration, miraculous knowledge or revelations, speaking with tongues or miracles, signs were to cease. That is just what Paul says. Kelley asks who believes it? All who believe the word of God believe it. I said that the partial was the inspiration, the revelation imparted by this miraculous power. It was but a fragment of the truth, only that could be uttered at a time. The whole, that which is perfect, is the complete word of God. So says common sense. So says the word of God. The word is perfect, makes Christians perfect. I said that as one of the members of the comparison, the imperfect was a state of the church—the state when these gifts, these fragmentary revelations were given; the other member is a state of the church, when the word of God is completed, and these gifts; these frag-

ments of revelation do not exist. So say Paul and common sense. He quotes "ask." I inquire how? "Seek." I ask how? "Knock." I ask how? In accordance with God's law and word. If we ask for miraculous power, we ask contrary to God's law. "If any man lack wisdom let him ask." How? In accordance with God's word. If he asks for miraculous power, he asks contrary to God's law. "We will manifest ourselves to him." How? Not in miraculous power, for for that is contrary to God's word. "We will abide in him." How? In miraculous power? No, for that has ceased. "If two or three are gathered I will be in the midst." How? In miraculous power? No, for that has ceased. "Witness of Spirit." "The Spirit witnesses." How? In miracles? No, for he cannot utter teaching in that way. In his word, the word of truth, the only way one intelligence can testify to another "Born of Spirit." How? By miraculous power? No, "He that believes is born of God." "Christian experience." Must it include miraculous power? No, for that has ceased. "Son of God will dwell in our hearts." How? By miracle? No, for it cannot be done in that way. We love him because he loved us. By learning his love for us. "Holy Spirit in Christian." How? In miraculous power? No, for that has ceased. When his word dwells in us richly.

"By one Spirit are we baptized." Yes, in obedience to command of one Spirit, just we are begotten of Christ in obeying his word. My opponent does not know enough to know that there is a difference between being baptized in the Spirit, and being baptized in obedience to the command of the Spirit. He says I deny the power of the Spirit. No. I do not confound the four powers of the Spirit as he does. I separate them as the word of God does, and believe that the miraculous power has ceased, as the word of God teaches. I remove God from men and religion now, he says. No. I believe that as God is not in the work of bringing animals and plants into being by creation now, but in the operation of natural law, so he is not in men and religion now, in miracle, but in the operation of his word. I no more remove God from religion than I remove him from nature. I believe he is present in a higher sense, and in a higher way. That miracle in each case was only preparatory to this higher operation of divine power. My opponent assumes that the only power of God in both cases must be miraculous.

How are apostles and prophets and the Holy Spirit in the church now? Just as Christ is present in the church. He is not present in person, on earth. He is in heaven. He is present in his word and law. The apostles are present in their words. The Holy Spirit in his word. He blunders over the illustration of the constitutional convention. The people were not in the convention in person, yet the constitution says: "We, the people, ordain this constitution." How did they ordain? Through

their appointed delegates. God in person never spoke to men but three times. He speaks through his representatives. God organized the church, gave its constitution, the New Testament, through the apostles, just as the people ordained the constitution and government through their representatives. The apostle says "in Christ's stead—God in us—through us." They teach that they were God's representatives. His blundering in comparing apostles to trees is ridiculous. Miraculous power created the first trees, but miraculous power was no part of the things created. The apostles gave the constitution, the New Testament, and organized the church under it; but were no more a part of the church that they organized than delegates that framed our constitution are a part of the government they organized for us. Can my opponent understand that?

We want to call our opponent's attention to a defect in his stock argument on Mark XVI. Let us read it:

"Afterwards Jesus appeared unto the eleven as they (the eleven) sat at meat, and upbraided them (the eleven) because they (the eleven) believed not. He said unto them (the eleven), 'Go ye (the eleven) into all the world, and preach, etc. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be condemned. These signs shall follow them (the eleven again) who shall believe.' After the Lord had spoken unto them (the eleven) he was received into heaven, and they (the eleven) went forth preaching the word, the Lord working with them (the eleven) confirming the word (of the eleven) with signs following."

The language itself extends no farther than the eleven. They were the ones who were to preach. Those of them who believed and went forth and preached should have these signs. They believed, went forth and the signs followed their preaching. The promise does not necessarily or logically include a single human being except the eleven who were upbraided with unbelief, and who were to preach, and were told that if they believed and preached the signs would follow, for the conclusion says they (the eleven) went and preached, and the signs followed, the Lord working with them (the eleven). We will now resume our history of the Book of Mormon.

Rigdon visited Smith in the spring of 1827. The two concocted their scheme. Smith was to pretend to have a "Golden Bible," a book made of plates of gold, and pretend to translate it with his stolen peep stone. Spaulding had intended to pretend that his fabrication had been found in a mound, or in a cave, in MS. He intended to call his fraud "The Manuscript Found." From 1818 to 1827 there had been published accounts of finding glyphs or metallic plates, with strange characters on them, in mounds and old ruins in America. This suggested to Rigdon to claim that his fraud had been found in that way. A hoax started in 1827, that a pile of such plates, called "The Golden Bible," had been found in Canada, suggested the name. Rigdon always spoke of his fraud, when prophesying of its appearance, as a "Golden Bible." Smith, however, in publishing it, changed the name to

the "Book of Mormon." But from the time the Smiths began to talk of Imposter Joe's wonderful revelations, they spoke of it as a "Golden Bible," and did so until about the time it was published.

In their conferences Imposter Joe told Rigdon of the existence of the other Spaulding manuscripts, then at Hartwicke, New York, in the house of Mrs. Davidson, formally Spaulding's wife and widow. The two concocted a scheme to steal them and thus destroy all likelihood of detection of the theft of the Spaulding manuscript, and exposure of the fraud. Smith was loafing in Hartwicke, in the summer and early fall of 1827, superintending a gang of men, who were trying to find a silver mine, on the farm of Mr. Stowell. He dug some wells in the town also, one for Stowell. September 21-22, 1827, Smith succeeded in stealing some of the Mormon manuscripts of Solomon Spaulding, perhaps Mormon manuscript No. 1, the one Miss Martha Spaulding had read a few years before at her uncles when the trunk was in her care, and the first one Spaulding wrote, the one he read to most of the witnesses who lived in Conneaut, also Mormon manuscript No. 2, the one he told Smith he was writing before he left Conneaut, the one of which he read a portion to J. N. Miller—the one to which he added the Zarahemla portion. This theft of the manuscripts is the true interpretation of Smith's wonderful visions of September 21-22, 1827. Smith's neighbors say that he never mentioned his visions of 1820 and 1823 while in the state of New York, and his visions of September 1827, as first told, have no resemblance to his final version. The version quoted by Mormons was written in 1843 or 1844. In it he fabricated the first vision. He dressed up his hearing of the existence of the Spaulding manuscripts into his second vision of September 1823. He dressed up his theft of the manuscripts from Mr. Davidson's house into his third vision of September 1827.

Having in possession they supposed all means of exposing their fraud the confederates now went to work. Smith sat behind a blanket, pretending to look through his stolen peep stone, which was placed in his hat. He claimed that God, by miracle, caused one word at a time to appear before his vision. He announced this to a scribe who sat on the other side of the blanket, who wrote it, and then it disappeared, and another appeared. Some old Mormons say he handed out sheets of manuscript to the scribe who copied them. What he actually did, was to read from Rigdon's manuscript which was a remodeling of Spaulding's Manuscript No. III, which he had concealed behind the curtain. He may have handed out leaves of this manuscript at times. Martin Harris was his first chief scribe. It is said his wife and his brother-in-law wrote a little each. After 118 pages had been copied by Harris and others, Imposter Joe gave Harris the leaves to take home with him, to use in making converts, dupes or

confederates, in the scheme. Mrs. Harris took the manuscript and burned it, one night while her husband was asleep. There was dire consternation, and Rigdon appears on the stage. I want to call the reader's attention to a singular coincidence here. Mr. Lake, Spaulding's partner testifies that when Spaulding read to him his romance, Mormon Manuscript No. 1, he pointed out an inconsistency in the story of Laban which Spaulding promised to correct, but the same blunder is in the Book of Mormon. That

can be explained. Spaulding no doubt did correct it in the manuscript prepared for the press, but when Mrs. Harris destroyed the 118 pages, Rigdon had to restore the stolen portion from an older manuscript, in which the blunder had not been corrected, hence we have it in the Book of Mormon. It took Rigdon some months to remodel another manuscript to replace the stolen portion, and translation did not begin till the next June or the three I'd. Joseph says it began in March.

MR. KELLEY'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: While I am on the subject of American antiquities, I shall refer you to one or two statements made by my opponent with reference to my argument of last evening, and at another time take up and answer them more particularly.

The first statement, or misstatement rather, was that Mormons continually claimed that it was in favor of their book because nobody ever claimed that the aborigines of this continent were of Israelitish origin before its publication. I had just stated to you, however, in my argument that such claims were made long before. Now, why he will make such a statement as that before you when I had stated to the contrary, is a question for this audience to answer. Is that the way to argue questions—to get up and state something as the claims of an opponent's people which they do not nor never did believe, and say that that is their faith or position, and attack it? I stated to you in the beginning of this part of my argument, fairly and fully, that one of the theories and speculations long prior to the year 1830, with regard to the settlement of the American continent was, that the "lost ten tribes," as they are termed, came to the continent; and that is what is referred to in Mr. Priest's work; but it is not what the Book of Mormon refers to, or teaches. There is where these would-be critics and story tellers are mistaken, and have been all the time.

Pursuing now my argument from the position of the scientific discoveries as left when my time was called, I cite the work of J. D. Baldwin, page 156, entitled, "Ancient America." He says:

"The evidence of repeated reconstructions in some of the cities before they were deserted has been pointed out by explorers.

At Palenque as at Mitla, the oldest work is the most artistic and admirable. Over this feature of the monuments and the manifest signs of their difference in age, the attention of the investigators has lingered in speculation. They find in them a significance which

is stated as follows by Brasseur de Bourbourg: 'Among the edifices forgotten by time in the forests of Mexico and Central America we find architectural characteristics so different from each other, that it is impossible to attribute them all to the same people as to believe they were all built at the same epoch.'

Here are the two different civilizations, both of a high order and cultivation. That fact was never known or published to the world until years and years after the publication of the Book of Mormon, and you cannot find it in any work or record prior to the publication of that book. If you can, bring your record here and read it to the audience, any time. I come here claiming to be armed with facts, and will be only too glad to have them weighed and sifted to the bottom. But Mr. Baldwin proceeds:

"In this view, the substructions of Mayapan, some of those at Tulha, and a great part of those at Palenque, are among the older remains. These are not the oldest cities whose remains are still visible, but they may have been built in part upon the foundations of cities much more ancient."

Remember that these are highly civilized nations that he is writing of, not a barbarous nation coming upon and occupying the land where a civilized nation had dwelt, but one highly cultivated and enlightened nation following and inhabiting upon the ruins of another. He says:

"No well considered theory of these ruins can avoid the conclusion that most of them are very ancient, and that to find the origin of the civilization they represent, we must go far back into the 'depths of antiquity.' On all the fields of desolation where they exist, everything perishable has disappeared. Wooden lintels are mentioned, but these can hardly be regarded as constituting an exception when the character of the wood, and the circumstances that contributed to their preservation are considered. Moreover, wooden lintels seem to have been peculiar to Yucatan, where many of the great edifices were constructed in the later times, and some of them of perishable materials. Everywhere in the older ruins, nothing remains but the artificial mounds and foundations of earth, the stone, the cement, the stucco hard as marble, a other imperishable materials used by the builders."

Next in this investigation I introduce the work entitled, American antiquities, by Josiah Priest. The book that I have was

published in 1833, and the earliest publication that I have ever seen of the work was made in the year 1831. If Mr. Braden has an earlier copy than that, as he claimed before this audience, I will examine his copy and see what it contains, and if there is anything in it of these marvelous works, which the Book of Mormon describes, I will give due credit to it on to-morrow evening. But I state here without fear of contradiction that it does not contain the remarkable things that the Book of Mormon sets out, neither as to the habitation, extent of civilization, or anything else. Neither does the book I have before me, which was published in 1833. But there is an account of a few interesting things in this. Turn to page 170, an account and description of articles obtained from a mound in the state of Ohio.

One, "The handle either of a small sword or large knife, made of an elk's horn; around the end where the blade had been inserted, was a ferule of silver, which, though black, was not injured by time; though the handle showed the hole where the blade had been inserted, yet no iron was found, but an oxide or rust remained, of similar shape and size." "About twenty feet to the north of it was another skeleton, with which was found a large mirror, about three feet in length, about one foot and a half in width, and one inch and a half in thickness; this was of isinglass, (*micra membranacea*). On this mirror was a plate of iron, which had become an oxide, but before it was disturbed by the spade, resembled a plate of cast iron. The mirror answered the purpose very well for which it was intended." "The knife or sword handle was sent to Peale's museum, Philadelphia." "On the south side of this tumulus, and not far from it, was a semicircular fosse, or ditch, six feet deep; which, when examined at the bottom, was found to contain a great quantity of human bones, which it is believed, were the remains of those who had been slain in some great and destructive battle; because they belonged to persons invariably who had attained their full size, while those found in the mound adjoining, were of all sizes, great and small, but laid in good order, while those in the ditch were in the utmost confusion."

"The mirror was a monstrous piece of isinglass, a lucid mineral, larger than we recollect to have ever heard of before, and used among the rich of the ancients, for lights and mirrors. A mirror of any kind in which men may be enabled to contemplate their own form, is evidence of a considerable degree of advancement in the arts, if not even luxury itself."

Passing from this important discovery as published by Mr. Priest, I call your attention to the work of Mr. Stephens, vol. 1, page 105. Speaking of the remains which he had examined in his explorations of these peoples' cities he says: "Architecture, sculpture, and painting, all the arts which embellish life, had flourished in this overgrown forest; orators, warriors, and statesmen, beauty, ambition, and glory, had lived and passed away, and none knew that such things had been or could tell of their past existence."

Now I will call your attention to some authorities touching the nativity of this last people who inhabited Ancient America, showing their common origin with the Asiatic race known as Hebrews. First, the work of Mr. George Catlin, published by H. G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden, London, in the year 1857, and entitled: "North American Indians, vol. 2, page 231:

"The North American Indians and all the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands, speaking some two or three hundred dif-

ferent languages entirely dissimilar, may have all sprung from one people."

"ISRAELITISH EXTRACTION."

He proceeds with the following thoughts:

"I believe with many others that the North American Indians are a mixed people.—That they have Jewish blood in their veins, though I would not assert as some have undertaken to prove, that they are Jews, or that they are the 'ten lost tribes' of Israel. From the character and composition of their heads, I am compelled to look upon them as an amalgam race, but still savages, and from many of their customs, which seem to me peculiarly Jewish, as well as from the character of their heads, I am forced to believe that some part of those ancient tribes who have been dispersed by Christians in so many ways, and in so many different eras, have found their way to this country where they have entered among the native stock."

"I am led to believe this from the very many customs which I have witnessed among them that appear to be decidedly Jewish, and many of them so peculiarly so that it would seem almost impossible, or at all events exceedingly improbable, that two peoples in a state of nature should have hit upon them and practiced them exactly alike."

"The first and most striking fact among the North American Indians that refers us to the Jews is that of their worshiping in all parts, the 'Great Spirit,' or of Jehovah, as the Jews were ordered to do by divine precept, instead of a plurality of gods as ancient pagans and heathens did, and the idols of their own formation." Ibid., page 232

Mr. Catlin then offers "TWELVE REASONS" why he accepted the idea that the American Indians are descendants from the Israelites in some way, and, as his investigations contain many facts which enter into this discussion, I offer them for your consideration.

1. "The Jews had their Sanctum Sanctorum, and so it may be said the Indians have, in their council, or medicine houses, which are always held as sacred places."

2. "As the Jews had, they have their High Priests and their Prophets."

3. "Among the Indians as among the ancient Hebrews, the women are not allowed to worship with the men, and in all cases also, they eat separately."

4. "The Indians everywhere believe that they are certainly like those ancient people, persecuted, as every man's hand seems raised against them."

5. "In their marriages, the Indians, as did the ancient Jews, uniformly buy their wives by giving presents, and in many tribes, very closely resemble them in other forms and ceremonies of their marriages."

6. "In their preparation for war, and in peacemaking, they are strikingly similar."

7. "In their treatment of the sick, burial of the dead and mourning, they are also similar."

8. "In their bathing and ablutions, at all seasons of the year, as a part of their religious observances—having separate places for men and women to perform these immersions—they resemble again."

9. "The custom among the women of abasing themselves during the lunar influences, is exactly consonant to the Mosaic law."

10. "After this season of separation, purification in running water and anointing, precisely in accordance with the Jewish command, is required before she can enter the family lodge."

11. "Many of them have a feast closely resembling the annual feasts of the Jewish Passover, and amongst others, an occasion much like the Israelitish feast of the Tabernacle, which lasted eight days (when history tells us they carried bundles of willow bows and fasted several days and nights), making sacrifices of the first fruits and best of everything, closely resembling the sin offering and peace offering of the Hebrews (See this history in vol. 1, pp. 159, 170 of 'Religious ceremonies of the Mandarins.')

12. "Amongst the list of their customs, however, we meet a number which had their origin, it would seem, in the *Jewish ceremonial code*, and which are so very peculiar in their forms that it would seem quite improbable, and almost impossible that two different peoples should have hit upon them alike, without some knowledge of each other. These I consider go further than anything else as evidence, and carry in my mind, conclusive proof that these people are tinctured with Jewish blood." *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 232 to 235.

In keeping with these facts and deductions of Mr. Catlin, are other authorities equally positive. Mr. Bradford, in his researches into the origin of the Red race, adopts the following conclusions with regard to the ancient occupants of this continent:

1. "That they were of the same origin, branches of the same race, and possessed of similar customs and institutions."

2. "That they were populous and occupied a great extent of territory."

3. "That they had arrived at a considerable degree of civilization, were associated in large communities, and lived in extensive cities."

4. "That they possessed a use of many of the metals, such as lead, copper, gold, silver, and probably the art of working in them."

5. "That they sculptured in stone, and sometimes used that material in the construction of their edifices."

6. "That they had the knowledge of the arch, of receding steps; and the art of pottery—producing urns and utensils formed with taste, and constructed upon the principles of chemical composition; and of the art of brickmaking."

7. "That they worked the salt springs, and manufactured that substance."

8. "That they were an agricultural people, living under the influence of regular forms of government."

9. "That they possessed a decided system of religion, and a mythology connected with Astronomy, which with its sister science, Geometry, was in the hands of the priesthood."

10. "That they were skilled in the art of fortification."

11. "That the epoch of their original settlement, in the United States is of great antiquity," and lastly,

"That the only indications of their origin to be gathered from the locality of their ruined monuments, point toward Mexico."

Thus far I have read copiously from these celebrated authors, and yet their pages are filled with unnoticed and untouched corroborative proofs of what I have stated to you of the greatness and grandeur of the ancient civilizations of this continent. I have also gathered in running through the works of various authors upon these things brief statements which will aid you in determining to some extent the certainty of the applications of my arguments to these ancient peoples as reflected in their own history, as I claim, set out in the Book of Mormon. They are as follows:

1. "They had a standard of measurement and had a means of determining angles." Baldwin p. 24.

2. "These ruins were not built by the Egyptians." Stephens, vol. 2, p. 441.

3. Yet of a figure in Palenque Mr. Short in his work p. 392, states "The head dress has been pronounced Egyptian by all who have seen it."

4. "They had Priests." Stephens, vol. 2, p. 447.

5. "Diviners and Priests." *Ibid.* vol. 1, p. 175.

6. "They were agriculturists and also engaged in spinning and weaving." Baldwin p. 40 41.

7. "Made use of astronomical instruments." *Ibid.* 42.

8. "Used military machines in war." Stephens, pp. 177 178.

9. "Believed in the flood, and had traces of the tower of Babel." Short 263.

10. "Possessed a knowledge of the sciences, and metals and used tools of porphyry." Baldwin, pp. 39 40.

11. "A phonetic system of writing was had among them." *Ibid.* 187.

These evidences are clear and satisfactory. I hope my opponent will take them up one by one, and examine them. But during the remainder of my time this evening, I shall examine another matter. Look after his tirade upon character, etc.

The statement made by him on last evening, that the Bible was believed in by the best minds of every age, and so the messages of the prophets, is not true, if he means by this what the world called best in their time. What the world called the best minds, did not accept God's messages through the prophets when brought, in any age. Scarcely a household received the message sent by Noah, and doubtless there were many plausible reasons hatched up, and set afloat, by the cunning craftiness and deception of malicious men, and rendered plausible, in order to feed the vain and foolish minds of the lovers of falsehood; and thus they were led along in blindness and darkness to destruction. Under the vile array of slander and falsehood, the masses were marshaled against Elijah the Prophet, and they sought his life, and he was compelled to flee his country for safety; and in the wilderness, he was fed by a bird of the forest. Moses was derided and falsely accused in the very camp of Israel, and it was necessary that

God open the earth and swallow up his maligners. Isaiah was sawn asunder. Something was hatched up by the enemies of the truth, and made the basis of an accusation, which inflamed and encouraged this vile attack, or it never could have been made. Jeremiah was accused as a traitor to his country, was imprisoned, and put in a pit of mire and filth, and left to die; and only escaped as by a miracle. Indeed, so universally had the prophets been opposed, slandered, misrepresented, and lied about, from the days of Adam to Christ, that it was stated by him—and seems to have grown into a proverb—"A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." Why not? Because of the misrepresentations and slanderous accusations, invented and hawked about by the enemies of the message which he brings. Not being able to answer the message upon the ground of truth and fairness, they resort to unfairness, falsehood, and stories hatched up and ingeniously circulated in order to break down the prophet's character, to blind the people and prejudice them against the message. This was the devil's system of warfare from Adam to Christ. When Jesus Christ came with a message from God, the arch-deceiver appeared upon the field of battle armed with the old weapons of slander and misrepresentation. The accuser always feigned great piety and love and reverence for all past prophets and heavenly messages. He did this in order to more readily gull the pious. Among their first moves, they came to Christ and said: "Master, we would see a sign from thee." But he replied, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." Indicating that honest men believe the truth from other evidences,

They were soon in counsel seeking to invent a scheme by which to destroy him, Matt. 12:14. They sent a committee to catch him in his words, and failing in this they assailed his character and filled Jerusalem with slanderous stories. When he did a good deed it was in their view, by the inspiration of the devil, "Beelzebub." They accused him of being born of fornication, of low parentage and of coming from a low city. Called him a "glutton and a wine bibber," and accused him of being a friend of publicans and sinners; he was so defamed, black mailed, slandered, and lied about by certain of the people, that the masses were blinded and marshaled against him, and demanded his life; all from the stories of lying lips. This, too, while they were making great pretensions to piety and reverence for the ways of God and the prophets of the past.

Jesus discovering their hypocrisy, retorts:

"Woe unto you Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! because ye build the tombs of the prophets, and garnish the sepulchres of the righteous, and say, If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been partakers with them of the blood of the prophets. etc. Wherefore ye be witnesses yourselves that ye are the children of them that killed the prophets. Fill ye up the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the dam-

"nation of hell. Behold, I send unto you prophets and wise men and scribes, and some of them ye shall kill and crucify: and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city," etc.

Their great pretensions to the love of the cause of God was feigned, that they might more easily blind and influence the multitude against Christ. Did they assail his doctrine: oh no; that was too hard for them. Moving in the dark, among the masses, peddling hatched up stories was the effectual way of procedure. This ungodly method of warfare against the grandest being that ever lived was carried on until Jerusalem was moved to join hands and demand the life of the Christ, and failing to make out a just case, they falsely accused him, and suborned witnesses to testify against him, and he was condemned to die and crucified. "Many bore false witness against him." Mark 14:56. The death of Christ did not relieve him from the false charges of his enemies. While his body lay in Joseph's new tomb, then went they to Pilate saying, "Sir we remember that that decener said, while he was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead, so the last error shall be worse than the first." Matt. 27:53, 64. All this took place while the witnesses of Jesus were in the midst of the people, ready to vindicate his character, but they had no ears to hear them. They loved stories, and inventions and what the *old neighbors* said, rather than truth. Finally, when Jesus had arisen from the dead according to his word, it did not fool the persistency of his enemies, or assuage their malice or hate, so they circulated the story, "His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept;" and, they gave the soldiers large sums of money to circulate this story, with the promise, that if it came to the "Governor's ears, we will persuade him and secure you." Matt. 28:12, 13, 14. But the misrepresentations, cunning inventions, and slanders against the cause of Christ, did not stop here; they followed the apostles wherever they went, and called them "blasphemers," "pestilent," "and movers of sedition among the Jews throughout the world." Acts 25:5. This was so widely circulated that it was said, "As concerning this sect, we know that it is everywhere spoken against." Acts 28:22.

Later, in the time of the grandson of St. Luke, this same unjust course was followed, and they were published and vilified everywhere. But, says my opponent, they were false stories. Who said they were false? Their enemies or their friends? Why, the descendants of the enemies to this very day maintain that the stories were true, and that the Christians were deceivers. And in the narrative of such a learned historian as Gibbon, we have an account that in the time of these grandsons, before referred to, the Emperor of Rome sent a committee to interrogate them and spy out the

probable damage they might likely be able to inflict upon his kingdom, if let live, and the messenger returned the answer, that they were men who were settled on a little spot of ground, and had hard, rough hands from working as slaves for a livelihood, and not worth noticing. Before this, a like interview had been had with the apostle Paul by one of the most-noted scholars of the age, and he returned the answer to his Emperor that, "Paul entertained no opinions that were calculated to interest or benefit men of attainments and culture." Great God! I could reproduce such stories which were affirmed to be true for hundreds of years after Jesus' time against the early Christians, until I might arouse the indignation of this audience against them, were I disposed to stoop to gathering garbage for weapons. The books are so laden, that when Gibbon had gone through them, although before a devoted Christian, it nauseated his hope in Christ, and he turned from worship, saying it seems to me that if the great things told of in the scriptures are true they ought to be had by the people now as then, and I "find by running through the history of the world, that mankind have been more ready to accept the history as correct of what occurred in their forefather's time, than to believe the evidences of their own senses." He therefore came to the conclusion that no miracles were ever performed as claimed by Jesus and the apostles. The quotation is made from memory, but I am sure if not the exact wording, the true thought and idea is carefully preserved and presented.

Volumes might be adduced to show that the work of scandalizing, has been the method pursued by the enemies of truth and progress in every age; not only to meet prophets and religious truth, but scientific truth as well; and the battle has been waged almost in every instance when a new message has been sent to man, or a new truth revealed. With such a history before the world, is it not strikingly strange that in the blaze of the light of the nineteenth century, that men professing as profound a reverence for Jesus and the apostles, as the Jews did for Moses and the prophets, will accept this method of warfare, and scour the universe to hunt stories and gossip, to meet the claims and argument of a people, rather than accept the gage of fair and honorable warfare, and investigate their claims in the light of the facts presented. Strange as it may appear, this is all the kind of warfare that has ever in the least succeeded against the message brought by the Book of Mormon, and believed by the Saints. It is much easier to call Joseph Smith an "infamous scoundrel," and a

"fraud," than to prove his message false. It is easier to assert that Sidney Rigdon was "fanatical" and "lazy," than to prove the doctrine of the Latter Day Saints untrue.

It is far more suitable to perverted tastes to drink a little satisfaction from a misuse of the words, Mormon, Mormonism, and "it came to pass," than to accept the word of God.

Stories, slander, the traducing of character is the method adopted by my opponent. This is not new, but an old system of attack; but the only one that ever did succeed even momentarily against the truth.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, did you ever listen for so long a time, to such a dark and misty web as was spun by my opponent last night? The whole material of which was gathered from the ebony cloud of gossip, tattle and scandal. Somebody said that one Spaulding wrote a romance. Some one else said that they had heard it read. It would seem from one of the stories, that Spaulding made a business of going around and reading it to his neighbors. In process of time it was left with a printer. It was not seen afterwards. Sidney Rigdon was in the tanning business in that city; he was awful lazy, however; and of course he must have stolen it. The printer Patterson, said no such manuscript was ever there, but that is nothing, the story runs on just as glibly. Then there were some old trunks, over in Pennsylvania and York States, left in back-rooms and by-places, etc., etc. One Rigdon reads a book on one occasion and would not let his niece see it. This was in Ohio. Finally a stranger is seen in Palmyra, N. Y. No one knows indeed who, and there is no evidence in fact that there was one there. Finally the Book of Mormon was published in March, 1830, and in the fall of the same year Sidney Rigdon came in contact with the latter Day Saints, believed their message, and, therefore he is the author of the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith is the cat's paw by which it is to be foisted upon the world under the inspiration of a peep stone which is stolen from one of his neighbor's children. Wonderful indeed! He did not tell us whether Joseph could really see anything extraordinary in the stone or not. If so, there might be something in the seeing business after all. If not what inducement was there for Joseph to steal one in order to perpetrate a fraud, when he had but to stoop down to pick one up and run no risks. It matters not however, which horn of the dilemma my opponent takes, his story will run on just the same.

(Time expired).

MR. BRADEN'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mr. Kelley started out with the assertion that at the time the Book of Mormon appeared, no one had thought of certain facts in archaeology, ethnology, philology and antiquities of America, that are assumed and stated as facts in that book. Therefore if scientific research has demonstrated, since the Book appeared, that these statements and assumptions are true, the Book must be true. It is either a revelation of such truths, for it stated them before they were learned by any human means of learning, or an actual history of them. He claims that it is an actual history given to Joe Smith, by revelation, and translated by him by inspiration. The Book of Mormon may be divided into two portions: I. Certain assumptions and statement in archaeology, ethnology, philology and the antiquities of America. II. Certain historical statements based on these assumptions, in archaeology, ethnology, philology and the antiquities of America, that assume to account for the antiquities of America, and to explain its archaeology, ethnology and philology. My opponent's argument has been an attempt to establish the truth of the first part. He has never touched the second. If we prove that all of the first part was well known long before the Book of Mormon appeared we refute his proof.

I have before me a work entitled "Atlantis," by I. B. Donnelly. In it he traces certain legends such as the Deluge, and certain stories all over America, and shows that they are found in Europe, in Asia, and Africa. He traces resemblances between the arts and antiquities of the Old World and the New. He traces resemblances in philology or languages, between peoples of America and peoples of Asia, Africa and Europe. He traces ethnological affinities between the tribes of America and the Celts, the Scandinavians, Basques, Iberians and other Europeans—the Egyptians, ancient Africans, and the Negroes, the Chinese, Hindoos, Persians and Malays. He traces resemblances in arts, civilization, sciences, literature, customs between the peoples of America and peoples of Europe, Asia and Africa. A larger portion of the authorities he quotes were written before the Book of Mormon appeared. It has been known from the conquest of Mexico by Cortez, that there were three civilizations in Mexico, three immigrations into that country, the Toltecs, the Chicmas and the Aztecs, and that the first were very highly civilized. It has been known since the conquest of Peru by Pizarro that there had been three or more civilizations there, that of the Incas being the last. It had been known for more than one hundred years before the Book of Mormon appeared, that mounds, fortifications, ruins, antiquities and relics

had been found all over North America. It had been decided that they had been the work of races that were in America before the Indians. If this is denied we will give the names of the authors. It had been a prevalent idea that the Indians were of Israelite origin. Affinities of some tribes to the Scandinavian, Welsh, Tartars, Hindoos, Chinese, Persians, Israelites and Egyptians, had been observed and published.

My opponent makes much of the cities of Central America. Cabrera and others had published descriptions of these long before the Book of Mormon appeared. It was such books and not the Book of Mormon that caused Stephens Squiers and others to explore Central America. Not only so but Cortez in his conquest of America conquered Central America, then a part of the Aztec Empire, and conquered these very cities, and his companions who wrote of his conquests describe them. They were inhabited when Balboa, another Spanish adventurer, explored the Isthmus and countries around it. So declare Herrera and other Spanish writers quoted by Wilson Prescott and other American writers.

Baron Humboldt visited Central America and described these ruins and his book was published in England and America in 1806. Spaulding was familiar with it. The Book of Mormon agrees literally with Humboldt. Where he is right, it is right. Where late research proves that he is in error, it is in error. That is all we need to say in regard to his long lingo in regard to antiquities.

We have proved that Solomon Spaulding was an enthusiast in American antiquities, believed that the Indians were descendants of the Israelites. As an earnest advocate of such theories, and as an enthusiast in American antiquities, he was well versed in the literature of the subject. Seventeen witnesses of the highest character testify that he wrote his "Manuscript Found" assuming all these facts and theories, pretending to give a history of the people who were the authors of these ruins and antiquities several years before the Book of Mormon appeared. That Rigdon stole his manuscript and interpolated the religious matter. I challenge my opponent to name one theory or assumption in the Book of Mormon that research has sustained, that I cannot prove to have been well known before the Book appeared. This overturns his entire argument. Let him prove that the Jaredites, Nephites and Zarahemlites came to America and had such a history as recorded in the Book of Mormon. All that he quotes from the Book of Mormon was well known before it appeared. If he will prove the truth of its historic statements he will sustain his book. Proving that certain assumptions are true, no more prove that his book is true, than proving

that similar assumptions in Scott's novels are true, proves that those novels are real.

I will agree to take Scott's novels and prove that a far greater portion of Waverley or Ivanhoe is true in archaeology, antiquities, etc., than my opponent can prove to be true in the Book of Mormon. Not only so, but I will prove that its characters were real persons in a majority of instances, its places real, its battles real, and yet they are novels. He can not prove that a person, a place, or a battle of the Book of Mormon is real. I can offer ten fold as much proof of the very kind he offers, to prove the truth of the Book of Mormon, for Ivanhoe, and of the same kind. His line of proof is absurd to idiocy. He takes the romance written by Spaulding, in which he assumed certain things well known, as the basis, and claims it is all true, because these facts so assumed as the basis are true. I will prove Robinson Crusoe to be true and of divine origin in the same way.

We will now resume our history of the Book of Mormon. We have come down to the time of publication.

In the fall of 1829 Martin Harris, one of the gang, mortgaged his farm, and E. B. Grandin of Palmyra, began the publication of the Book. The manuscript was carried by several of the gang, a small portion each morning, and removed at night, for weeks. At last they were less careful. Mr. Gilbert says that the Imposter was very particular to insist that the manuscript be set up exactly as written. The translation had been done by inspiration, and it would be blasphemy to alter one iota. But as there was no punctuation, but little use of capitals, and as it abounded in misspelled words, and the most outrageous grammatical blunders, the printer absolutely refused to allow such an atrocious affair to go forth with his imprint on it. The printer was allowed to correct some blunders in the manuscript. When one reads the book, and sees the thousands of blunders in it, after all the printer's care, the query arises "What must the manuscript have been?" What a pity the printer interfered with inspiration, in the way he did. If the manuscript had been printed exactly as it came from the inspired lips of Joe, and as it was penned by the inspired Oliver, who had special divine commission and unction to do his work, no doubt the world would have been converted long ago by such sublime evidences of inspiration. That printer robbed the world of "the more part" of the inspiration of the Book of Mormon.

In the meantime Rigdon was preaching and working constantly to prepare the way for his scheme. He preached extravagant ideas of the millenium, such as are in the Book of Mormon—community of goods—restoration of miraculous gifts—new revelations and that something wonderful was going to happen. In private he approached persons as he did D. Atwater. A portion of the Kirtland Church of Disciples that was organized by him and made up largely of his converts formed a common stock com-

munity and practiced feet-washing, another Mormon peculiarity at the beginning. They did this under the direction of Rigdon and Titus Billings, who became a Mormon with Rigdon. In June, 1830, Rigdon attended the Annual Meeting of the Mahoning Association in Austintown. In an address he presented his hobbies in regard to return to community of goods, and restoration of spiritual gifts, a restoration of everything in the apostolic churches. He was signally defeated, in discussion by Campbell. He left the Association soured and disappointed, declaring that he "had done as much for the Restoration as Campbell and Scott, yet they got all the honors." Tradition tells us that, by advice of Campbell, Rigdon was put up to preach on Lord's Day, as a plaster to his wounded egotism. He discoursed on "Envy," and took the conduct of Haman towards Mordecai as an illustration of the meanness of envy. All understood what he meant. Campbell and Scott were the Hamans, who, although mounted on the King's horse of public honor, were envious of Rigdon, the Mordecai sitting in the gate. When he came to a description of Haman's triumphal procession on the King's horse, the horse ran away with Sidney. He mounted that horse and cavorted miraculously for some minutes. He turned him into a veritable Pegasus, and, like Bellerophon, he cleft the skies, and soared among the stars. As he was skyscraping in his description of King Ahasuerus' horse, Walter Scott took aim at him, and brought him down from among the stars by roaring out in his broad Scotch, "Glory to King Ahasuerus' horse!" Rigdon had gone up like a rocket; Scott brought him down like a stick.

Rigdon returned home to Mentor. He sent for Pratt who came through Mentor in August, and went from Rigdon straight to Manchester, in the wilds of New York, thirty miles from any public thoroughfare, and Imposter Joe's mother says he arrived Saturday night, all worn out after an excessive day's journey, and was converted that night and made a preacher of the New Dispensation the next day, doubtless, "according to previous appointment," as the preachers say. Pratt visited his brother Orson and enlisted him in the scheme. Then he and Cowdry and Whitmer returned to Mentor. After weakly pretending to be ignorant of the scheme, and to oppose it, Rigdon is miraculously converted, by a vision, embraces Mormonism, goes to New York, he and Imposter Joe have a revelation, that Joe is the Moses, Sidney the Aaron of the movement, and that Kirtland is to be possessed by the saints forever, and Smith and his adherents, made up chiefly of confederates in his money-digging frauds and schemes, and confederates in the new fraud, the Book of Mormon, move to Ohio. Rigdon takes his new brethren around to the congregations for which he had preached, and which he had industriously prepared for his move, and the Rigdonites in these churches embrace Mormonism and the fraud

was fully inaugurated in Kirtland, Ohio, in 1831.

We have thus traced the origin of the Book of Mormon. We have proved that Solomon Spaulding was the author of the historic portion. Sidney Rigdon the author of the religious portion, and that Impostor Joe gave it to the world by means of his stolen peep-stone. It was begotten by Spaulding in sin, conceived by Rigdon in iniquity, and brought forth by Impostor Joe in depravity and pollution. It has spoken lies from its birth, and has lived on fraud and fanaticism, and has resulted in delusion and ruin to thousands. It has gone to seed in Utah, in pollution that would disgust Priapus himself, and horrify a satyr. Priapus Young and He-goat Kimball are the ripened fruit of the infamy. We will now take up the detection of the fraud. In an article published in the Boston Journal, May 13, 1829, Mrs. Matilda Davidson, formerly Solomon Spaulding's wife and widow, testifies:

"In 1834, a Mormon preacher, in a meeting in Conneaut, Ohio, read copious extracts from the Book of Mormon. The historical part was immediately recognized, by all the older inhabitants, as the identical work of Mr. Spaulding, in which they had been so deeply interested years before. John Spaulding was present, and recognized perfectly the work of his brother. He was annoyed and afflicted, that it should have perverted to so wicked a purpose. His grief found vent in a flood of tears, and he arose on the spot and expressed to the meeting his sorrow and regret that the writings of his deceased brother, should be used for a purpose so vile and shocking. The excitement in Conneaut, became so great that the inhabitants held a meeting, and deputed Dr. Philatus Hurlbut, one of their number, to repair to this place and obtain from me the original manuscript of Mr. Spaulding, for the purpose of comparing it with the Mormon Bible, to satisfy their own minds, and to prevent the friends from embracing an error so delusive."

We wish to call the reader's attention to this statement, that narrates an occurrence that attracted great attention at the time. It was published in the papers of the Western Reserve, and all over the United States. The citizens of Conneaut, in 1834, assembled to hear for the first time a Mormon preacher. They hear the first words of the Book of Mormon that any of them ever heard. Scores of them, and among the number Solomon Spaulding's brother, his sister-in-law, his business partner, one who had boarded in his family many months, one who had boarded him many months, and other acquaintances, without any expectation or previous concert of action on their part recognized in the Book of Mormon, the historical romance of Solomon Spaulding with which they were so familiar from 21 to 25 years before. Now let us hear some of their testimony. John Spaulding testifies: "I have read the Book of Mormon, and to my great surprise I find nearly the same historical matter, names, etc., as were in my brother's writings. I well remember that he wrote in the old style, and commenced, nearly every sentence: 'And it came to pass,' or 'Now it came to pass' the same as in the Book of Mormon. To the best of my recollection the Book of Mormon is the same as what my brother, Solomon Spaulding

wrote except the religious matter." Martha Spaulding, wife of John, and sister-in-law of Solomon, testifies: "I have read the Book of Mormon, which brought fresh to my recollection the writings of Solomon Spaulding. I have no manner of doubt that the historical part of the book of Mormon is the same that I have read and heard read more than 20 years ago. The old obsolete style and the expressions: 'And now it came to pass,' etc., are the same." Henry Lake, Solomon Spaulding's business partner, testifies:

"When my wife read to me from the Book of Mormon, she had read but a few minutes before I was astonished to find the same passages in it that Solomon Spaulding had read to me more than 20 years before from his Manuscript Found. I have examined the Book of Mormon and have no hesitation in saying that the historical part of it is principally if not wholly taken from the Manuscript Found. I well recollect telling Mr. Spaulding that so frequent use of the words: 'And it came to pass.' 'Now it came to pass,' rendered the book ridiculous. One time when he was reading to me the tragic account of Laban I pointed out to him what I considered an inconsistency which he promised to correct, but on examining the Book of Mormon, to my surprise I find it stands just as he read it to me. He left here in 1813, for Pittsburgh, to get his book published, but I heard no more of his writings till I saw them in the Book of Mormon. Mrs. David on remarked to Mrs. George Clark, when she handed her the manuscript of Spaulding's Manuscript Found to read: 'The Mormon Bible is almost a literal copy of that manuscript.'"

J. N. Miller, who boarded months in Spaulding's family, testifies: "I have examined the Book of Mormon, and I find in it the writings of Solomon Spaulding from beginning to end, but mixed up with Scripture and other religious matter, which I did not meet in the 'Manuscript Found.' Many passages in the Mormon book are verbatim from Spaulding, others in part. The names Nephi, Lehi, Mormon, and in fact all the principal names are brought fresh to my recollection by the 'Golden Bible.' Aaron Wright testifies: "Spaulding traced the journey of the first settlers of America from Jerusalem to America, as it is given in the Book of Mormon, except the religious matter. The historical part of the Book of Mormon, I know to be the same as I read and heard read from the writings of Solomon Spaulding, more than twenty years ago, the names especially are the same without alteration. In conclusion I will say that the names and most of the historical part of the Book of Mormon, were as familiar to me, before I read it as most modern history." Oliver Smith testifies: "When I heard the historical part of the Book of Mormon, I at once said it was the writing of Solomon Spaulding. Soon after I obtained and read the book, on reading it found much of it the same as Spaulding had written twenty years before." Nathan Howard testifies: "I have read the Book of Mormon and believe it to be the same as Spaulding wrote, except the religious part." Artemus Cunningham testifies: "I have examined the Mormon Bible and am fully of the opinion that Solomon Spaulding had written its outlines before leaving Conneaut." Joseph Miller of Amity, Pa., who took care of Spaulding in his last sickness, and familiar with his manu-

script says: "The longer I live the more firmly I am convinced that Spaulding's manuscript was appropriated and largely used in getting up the Book of Mormon. I believe that, leaving out of the book, the portions easily recognized as the work of Joe Smith and his accomplices, Solomon Spaulding may be truly said to have been its author. I have no doubt of it." Rud-dick McGee, who boarded with the Spauldings and became familiar with Spaulding's manuscript, says that "the Book of Mormon was founded on and largely copied from the romance of Solomon Spaulding." Dr. Dodd who attended Spaulding in his last illness, declared years before Howe's book appeared, that "Spaulding's manuscript had been transferred into the Book of Mormon, and that Sydney Rigdon had done it. This declaration was based on his knowledge of the manuscript, and what Spaulding had told him about Rigdon's stealing his manuscript. Rev. Abner Jackson declares: "The Book of Mormon follows Spaulding's Manuscript too closely to be a stranger to it. In both many passages appear, having the same names, found nowhere else. Such as Moroni, Mormon, Nephite, Laman, Lamanite, Nephi, etc. In the second romance called the Book of Mormon, we are told the same story of the same people traveling from the same place in the same way, having the same difficulties and destination with the same wars, same battles and same leaders and same results, such as the Mormon account of the battle of Comorah in which all the righteous are slain. How much this resembles the closing scene in "Manuscript Found." Mr. Jackson, who was in the meeting at Conneaut, when the Mormon preacher read the Book of Mormon, says that Squire Wright shouted out, "Old-come-to-pass has come to life again." Mrs. McKinstry, Spaulding's daughter, declares that the Book of Mormon is largely her father's Manuscript Found. His wife declares that it is a wicked remodeling of her husband's work.

We might add scores of names who heard the Spaulding manuscript and recognized it in the Book of Mormon. The testimony of these seventeen witnesses, who were familiar with Spaulding's Manuscript Found" prove that the historical portion of the Book of Mormon what we charge Rigdon with stealing, is an almost verbatim reproduction of that "Manuscript Found." If my opponent were on trial for his life, one quarter of his testimony would hang him higher than Haman. He must do one of three things: I. Prove that these witnesses never so testified. II. Impeach them. III. Or disprove their evidence by rebutting testimony. Or lose his case. There has been some controversy over Spaulding's motives and object in writing his Manuscript Found. His wife and daughter strenuously insist that he wrote it merely to while away his time in declining health. That he had no intention of publishing it. That he refused to have it published, when Mr. Patterson offered to publish it. It is

probable that he so told his wife. He may have had two reasons for it. He had failed in business continually. His wife supported the family and he might have feared that she would oppose the idea of publication as one of his visionary projects. For the preservation of peace and that he might pursue his purpose unopposed, he doubtless told her what she says he did. Again she seems to have been a woman of decided moral convictions, and he may have feared that she would regard such a scheme as very questionable if not a downright fraud. But there can be no doubt about his intentions to publish it. His brother says he wrote it for that very purpose, hoping to make money by it. So say Lake, Smith, both the Millers, McKee, John Spaulding, his wife, and Cunningham. Joseph Miller and McKee say he prepared a manuscript for publication and took it to the publishing house for that purpose.

There can be no doubt that he wrote it for the sole purpose of publishing it and that he expected to make money by publishing it. There is nothing wrong about this. But that his motives, he knew, were some of them wrong, is evident from the fact that he kept them from his wife and daughter, and also lied to them in regard to his object in writing the manuscript. Some of his expressions show that his motives were very questionable. He intended to assert that his book was copied from a manuscript dug out of the earth, or found in a cave. He expected to deceive the world except the learned few, and cause them to believe this falsehood that he intended to palm off on them; and also to induce all, but the learned few, to believe his book to be veritable history as much so as any history. So he declared to Miller of Conneaut, Wright, Cunningham and others. No wonder he concealed his purpose from his wife and daughter. Howe says on page 289, of his history, that he has a letter in his possession that proves that Spaulding was sceptical in his last days. If so we can understand his caricaturing the Bible in the way he did, in his romance. The Book of Mormon was in its inception a deliberate fraud, conceived by a backsliden preacher, who intended to foist onto the world, the fraud by falsehood, stolen by another renegade preacher, who increased the blasphemy of the fraud by plagiarising the Bible, so as to deceive the world by it as a revelation. Joe Smith, a money hunting, fortune telling impostor and infidel, gave it to the world by means of his peep-stone which he stole from Chase's children. We repeat that the whole affair was begotten by Spaulding in sin, conceived by Rigdon in iniquity and brought forth by Impostor Joe in depravity and corruption, and it has thrived on ignorance, fanaticism and pollution, and has culminated in Utah, in infamy that would make devils blush.

Mrs. Davidson declares that Hurlbut wrote to her from Hartwicke that he found the Manuscript and would return it to her when through with it. He came to Howe

with a lie and told him he only found a portion of an entirely different manuscript. He sold the manuscript to Rigdon and Smith took the money and went to Western Ohio and bought a farm, and Mrs. Davidson and her daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, could never get a word of reply from him although they sent several letters to parties who wrote; they gave the letters to Hurlbut. This answers the Mormon "Why did not the Spaulding publish the Manuscript Found?" Because Mormons had gotten it into their possession by bribing Hurlbut.

This careful analysis of evidence enables us to brush to one side the fog that Mormons have raised over Rigdon's copying the manuscript. He did not, he stole it. Over the size of the manuscript, Miss Spaulding read at her uncles. She read only the small manuscript, the first draft of the book, her father made. Also the fog over the fact that the manuscript brought by Hurlbut was not what the one's sending him to search the trunk expecting him to bring. It explains how the 116 pages of stolen manuscript, was replaced. They were replaced from another Spaulding manuscript, probably Mormon manuscript No. II. This accounts also for the length of time that Spaulding spent in writing. He began in 1809 and closed in 1816, a period of time of seven years, and even after Rigdon stole his last manuscript he wrote on till he died. It accounts also for the differences in the descriptions of the witnesses. Most of them heard read Mormon manuscript No. I. Miller heard portions of Mormon No. II. Writing different manuscripts, and adding additional portions will account for discrepancies and contradictions. Such as Moroni saying his plates were full, and then writing the Jaredite portion. Spaulding added the Jaredite portion and forgot that he had made Moroni close the book with the destruction of the Nephites. Also the contradiction, which places Ethers plates in the hands of King Benjamin when they did not come to the knowledge of the Nephites until years after King Benjamin's death. The gross contradiction which makes Covantunni the last Jaredite, die among the people of King Zarahemla about 200 years B. C., when the battle of which he was sole survivor occurred more than 600 years B. C. Either he was over 400 years old or the Jaredites were not exterminated until 200 B. C. instead of 600.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE.

Let us now review the evidence we have presented, and settle several questions. I. Are the witnesses competent? II. Are they worthy of belief? III. What is established by their testimony? In determining the first and second queries there are several points to be weighed. I. Is the point at issue one that can be settled by testimony? No question is susceptible of clearer proof. The facts to be determined are I. Did Solomon Spaulding write a certain MS. II. What were its contents? II. Did they have adequate means of knowing these

facts? No witnesses ever had better. Mr. Spaulding was a preacher, in poor health and out of employment, the very man that would attract company, and have much company, and of the highest character and intelligence. There was much excitement and curiosity over certain mounds that had been opened. Spaulding had taken great interest in the matter. He was writing an unusual book concerning this exciting topic. He was very fond of reading his productions to all who would listen to him. All this would secure him a circle of intelligent hearers. The singularity of his theme would cause his hearers to remember what they heard. To such hearers Spaulding read large portions of his MS. III. Were they competent in intelligence? No one can read their testimony and fail to see that they were persons of unusual intelligence—the very class of persons that such a man as Spaulding would attract around him—that would be interested in his theme—the very ones to whom he would read his work—and who would talk with him. IV. Were they persons of good character for truth and veracity? Their character cannot be excelled. Compare them with the gang of loafing, money-hunting knaves and dupes, upon whose testimony the Book of Mormon stands. Their intelligence is infinitely above that gang of ignorant, superstitious, illiterate, ignoramuses. V. Were they interested in the points at issue? In no way whatever. On the other hand, no witnesses to the Book of Mormon all expected to make money out of the fraud, and had gotten it up for that purpose. VI. Is there any collusion in their testimony? There is absolutely none. Never were witnesses more independent and individual in their testimony. Each tells his story in his own way—tells what he knows, in his own way—is careful to tell no more—is careful where not certain to say so. Had they fabricated their testimony they would have stated more than they did. Contrast their evidence with that of the eight witnesses to the Book of Mormon. Those witnesses do not testify separately, but sign a statement prepared for them by Imposter Joe. They testified to what they did not know, and could not know. There is every evidence of collusion and perjury. The three witnesses are worse, for they testify to what an angel told them; the character of the entire twelve has been impeached. They had every motive to induce them to lie. They had concocted a fraud to make money and lied to carry it out. Our witnesses are absolutely free from all such fatal defects as those that utterly destroy the evidence of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon.

What facts are established by the testimony of the witnesses I. The plot and matter of Spaulding's "Manuscript Found." They describe it clearly and definitely. It is precisely the plot and matter of two Books and only two of all books that have ever been written. The Manuscript Found and the Book of Mor-

mon. II. That it purported to be a real truthful history of the aborigines—the first settlers of America. To this testify Mrs. Solomon Spaulding, Miss Martha Spaulding, John Spaulding, Mrs. John Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Smith, Wright, Howard, Cunningham, Jas. Miller, McKee, Dodd and Sidney Rigdon. III. An attempt to account for the antiquities of America by giving a real history of their construction. Mrs. Solomon Spaulding, Miss Spaulding, John Spaulding, Mrs. John Spaulding, Wright, Smith, Howard, and Cunningham. There never were but two books that had this feature. The “Manuscript Found” and the Book of Mormon. IV. It assumed that the Israelites were the aborigines of America. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Smith, J. N. Miller, Wright, Cunningham, Jackson. There were never but two books that had this feature, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found. V. That they left Jerusalem; J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Miller, Wright, Smith, Jackson. There never were but two books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that had this feature. VI. Journeyed by land and by sea. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Smith, Jackson. There never were but two books that had this feature, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon. VII. Their leaders were Nephi and Lehi. Miss Martha Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Smith, Cunningham and Jackson. There never were but two books that had this feature, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon. VIII. They quarreled and divided into two parties called Nephites and Lamanites. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Jackson. There were never but two books that contained this feature. The Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found. IX. There were terrible wars between the Nephites and Lamanites, and between parties into which these nations divided. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Jackson. There never but two books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that contained this feature. X. They buried their dead after the awful slaughter in their wars which were unprecedented, in great heaps, which caused the mounds. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding. There were never but two books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that contained this feature. XI. The end of their wars in two instances was the total annihilation, in battle of all but one who escaped to make the record of the catastrophe. Jackson. There never were but two books, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that contained this feature. XII. It gives a historical account of the civilization, arts, sciences, laws and customs of the aborigines of America. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Miller, Smith. There never were but two books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that contained this feature. XIII. These people were the ancestors of our American Indians. J. Spaulding, Mrs.

J. Spaulding, Lake, Wright. There never were but two books, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that contained this feature. XIV. The names Lehi, Nephi, Lamanite, Nephite, Moroni, Mormon, Zarahemla, Laban. Miss Martha Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Smith, J. N. Miller, Wright, Cunningham, Jackson. There never was but two books, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that contained these features. XV. These in every instance are the names of the same persons or places or things, and have the same characteristics and history, etc. J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Miller, Wright, Smith, Cunningham, Jackson. There never were but two books, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that had this feature. XVI. Written in scriptural style. Rigdon, Winter, Spaulding, Mrs. S. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Jas. Miller, Smith, Cunningham, Jackson. There never was but two books, the size of either of these books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that had this feature. Small articles have been so written for burlesque but never such large books. XVII. Absurd repetition of “And it came to pass,” “And now it came to pass.” Mrs. S. Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Cunningham, Jas. Miller. There never were but two books, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found, that had this feature. XVIII. One party left Jerusalem to escape judgments about to overtake the Israelites. Smith. There never were two books, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that contained this feature. XIX. History was written and buried by one of the lost people. Mrs. S. Spaulding. There never were but two books that contained this feature, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found. XX. The book was obtained from the earth. Lake, Mrs. S. Spaulding, Cunningham. There never were but two books claiming to be translations of manuscript dug out of the earth, the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found. XXI. One party of emigrants landed near the Isthmus of Darien, which they called Zarahemla, and migrated across the continent in a north-east direction. J. N. Miller. There never were but two books that had this feature, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon. XXII. In a battle the Amlicites marked their foreheads with a red cross so that they could distinguish themselves from their enemies. Jas. Miller, McKee. There never were but two books that had these features, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon. XXIII. The book could be, and as an addition to the Bible by an imposter, as an addition coming from America. There never were but two books that had this feature, the Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon.

We have now found that the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found contained twenty-three features, great features

exactly alike. Nothing but a miracle, scarcely credible, could have caused this agreement. One was stolen from the other. The Manuscript Found was in existence fifteen years before the Book of Mormon. It is as certain that the Book of Mormon was stolen from the Manuscript Found as that a child is the offspring of its parents.

Nearly all of our witnesses are careful to state that the religious portion of the Book of Mormon was not in the Manuscript Found. We will prove that Sidney Rigdon interpolated that into the manuscript that he stole. That will refute the objection raised by the three. I'd Joseph, that a Presbyterian preacher would not write such religious sentiments as those of the Book of Mormon. Nearly all of the witnesses in their descriptions mention only the historic part of the Nephite portion of the Book of Mormon. This shows that Spaulding had written only that portion, in his first manuscript. This meets a Mormon objection that some portions of the Book of Mormon were not mentioned by the witnesses.

We will now notice some of the retorts of Mormonism to this testimony. I. It is "the Spaulding story." So Antideluvians sneered at Noah about his "flood story," but the flood overwhelmed them all the same. Such evidence, given by seventeen witnesses can not be sneered down even by the prophet, the three. Id Joseph, as, "the Spaulding story," II. "It is all a pack of lies." Why is it a pack of lies? Do they

attempt to impeach the witnesses? No. Do they attempt to rebut the testimony? No. They jabber the great Mormon argument, "It is a pack of lies." III. The three Id Joseph says there is collusion in the testimony. He knew he was penning a falsehood when he wrote that sentence. There never were seventeen witnesses whose testimony was more independent, and marked with each one's personality than these. Contrast the seventeen independent statements, in which the individuality of each person appears, with the witnesses to the Book of Mormon. They sign a joint statement written out by Imposter Joe. IV. It is improbable that they would know so much of the manuscript. We have given the reasons why so many persons heard so much of the Manuscript Found. V. It is impossible that they would remember so much. The testimony shows that they were persons of more than usual mental power, with clear strong intellects. The contents of the manuscript were so peculiar that they would be remembered and recognized, when heard again, as the nick name old "Come to pass" and the exclamation of Squire Wright "Old come to pass, has come to life," show. VI. It is religious persecution. There was no suggestion of an attempt at religious persecution. Nor do the statements show any such spirit. They are remarkably calm and unsectarian in tone.

MR. KELLEY'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Last evening I took considerable time in presenting to you some of the evidences contained in the works of archaeologists and explorers of the ancient ruins and the remains of the extinct civilizations of the American continent; showing that the extent and greatness of them was equal to that given in the history, of the three civilizations which had existed here, two of them contemporaneous, as represented in the Book of Mormon. I was answered by my opponent at the time with this: "That those things were known to the world and were accessible to Joseph Smith at the time of the publication of the book;" and for proof he cited to Josiah Priest's work, which he said treated of these things and which was published it was averred, prior to the publication of the Book of Mormon. I did not state then that I did not believe it, for I was taught by my mother not to say

a thing was not true until I had tested it; and I have made no statement to this audience but what I believed to be as true as that the sun has this day been on his daily course. Neither do I expect to state to this audience anything but what I believe to be true, and strictly true. But to his, Priest's, work:—I asked for the book and examined it. Instead of finding a work that treats upon antiquities, or civilizations, such as I have proven to have existed, I found that the book did not contain a single thing upon these:—neither speculations upon ruined cities or a high state of enlightenment, nor a single mound referred to from which conclusions of a great civilization could be drawn;—not one single thing that tends to disprove a single statement that I dwelt upon last evening; and yet, you are expected to accept it as an answer to my argument. The work does not treat upon antiquarian researches even; but it is Mr. Priest's compi-

lation of certain things, entitled the "Wonders of Heaven and Earth." I stated in my opening remarks upon last evening that it was speculative, long prior to the publication of the Book of Mormon, that the ten lost tribes of Israel had been led to this country, and that afterwards they had dwindled into barbarism; and showed also that the common theory was that when the country was settled it was settled from north to south, and that, that was one of the main theories at the time of the publication of the Book of Mormon. I open this book that treats of the wonders of earth and heaven, and find an article referring to the ten tribes coming to this continent, giving the writer's speculations from what had been ascertained by conversing with the natives; and there is a long argument in it from page 297 forward for the purpose of showing that the people who inhabited this country, and of whom the Indians were descendants, were the lost tribes, as I had admitted in my opening argument upon these antiquities, stating that such were the speculations. But there is not a single work or mound cited in this book to prove it, or that the people attained a high state of civilization and builded great cities, etc., here as was my argument. But, turning to the book, page 201, I find that the speculation is here set out also, that they crossed at Behrings Strait, as I had claimed upon last evening, and afterward made their way southward. Not only that, but on turning further in this book I find some excellent things to show that the people upon this continent were of Israelitish origin, one of which is plainly and clearly set out, wherein it states that they formerly practiced circumcision on the continent. I call the attention of my opponent to that, because he challenged me to show upon a former evening, that any such thing as circumcision had been practiced upon this continent. That is a proof from his own work. Will he take his own witness? I refer to this fact of the Saint's actual position upon this for the reason, that I do not wish you to misunderstand my position upon the point. While there were many speculations in regard to whether the Indians were the first inhabitants of America, and how they came here, at the time of the publication of this book, as I have before stated, there was no understanding and no knowledge extant in the world of the grand civilization that had occupied here, that outnumbered by thousands and millions the present population of the country, if we are permitted to judge at all from the ruins and the discoveries that have been made since that time, and of the great enlightenment of the people. I expected to have collated to-day and presented to you this evening a concise account by the best authors of just when this knowledge was first developed and published to the world through explorers, and I shall do so upon to-morrow or some future evening; showing that it was not known to the world prior to 1834. There was one English

publication in 1822, but it was never known in this part of the world, and not widely in any; and I doubt if there is a man in the State of Ohio,—well, there possibly has been one in the State of Ohio,—but certainly not many more, who ever saw such a work or such an author as that of Fuentes or Del Rio. Mr. Stephens, whom I cited last evening, and who wrote in 1841, a traveler all over this globe, and a man that was versed not only in the English language, but in the Spanish also, in which Del Rio's work was originally written, had never heard of it at the time he first went to Mexico in 1839. But suppose that they had heard of the publication of the work, and that it had been all over the country in 1822, and that it contained anything of these great cities:—what would it benefit my opponent in this argument? His claim is that this "Romance" was written by one Solomon Spaulding in 1811. Well, if it was written in 1811, and the historical part of it gotten up by Mr. Spaulding, could Mr. Spaulding write correctly of these things when he did not know about them unless he was a prophet? Why not God inspire Smith to write and antedate these discoveries as well as Spaulding? The argument is, that neither Smith nor Spaulding could get these things out, for the manuscript of the Book of Mormon as they are described therein as early as the year 1829, (or 1811), and as they have since been found correct by the best authors. Not only that, but I read fully from the most authentic writers in support of the statements of the Book of Mormon, which was copyrighted and in the hands of the printer as early as the first part of the year 1829, on the question of the high state of the ancient civilizations of the continent; the magnificence of their cities, temples, palaces and works of art; their high attainments in the sciences, mechanical skill and inventions; and of the fauna as presented in the later-discovered fossils, etc. This however, was sneered at as though everybody knew of that, long before the Book of Mormon was printed, and that Smith could easily have located his Central American cities; told of the three different highly civilized peoples who had lived there; told what domestic animals they had, and what places on the continent these people first inhabited from such general knowledge, and thus had practiced a fraud upon the world. Now, my friends, nearly sixty years have passed since the book was published, with new discoveries being continually brought to light, and in an age when the means of transmission of news and knowledge was never so perfect it is thought; as gifted men as the times have produced, have given their attention and attainments to the research and development of these things, and the result is, they have gained no new light upon this subject, that was not possible for a poor, unlettered boy in the backwoods of New York State to gather and compile into a book in 1827 and 1828. Friends, can you swallow that? If you

can, it is possible you may swallow down and roll as a sweet morsel under the tongue the Spaulding tale, "Old come to pass," and all. What! says one, have not these new authors who have been publishing for the past fifty years unfolded something new as to the civilization that is not to be gained by reading the Book of Mormon? Nor anything either, that has been established as a truth that is conflicting with, or contrary to, that book? I answer they have not; and the book is full and explicit upon the civilizations. Will my opponent please show the new light or the fact of the difference or contradiction to the audience if they have? One demonstrable fact thus brought, which will show a statement in the book false, will have more weight with any honest investigator, than ten thousand Spaulding stories, all laid, brooded, hatched, raised and palmed upon the world years after the publication of the Book of Mormon.

This is his position fairly stated: The Book of Mormon was in press in 1829, and sent out as a publication in 1830.—A few persons under the guidance and leadership of one Philaster Hulburt, who, at the time had been cut off from the church of the Latter Day Saints for bad conduct, and who had publicly confessed his crime and had been taken back upon his profession of repentance as I will show you by the church publications at the time, and was again cut off; and a few others at Conneaut, Ohio, of a like stamp, got together in 1833, with the Book of Mormon in their hands and vengeance and hatred in their hearts, and got up some affidavits as to a story which it was surmised had been written before by Solomon Spaulding, a broken down clergyman of that place. Afterwards they found a confederate in Mr. Howe, of Painsville, Ohio, who was terribly mad and jealous because his wife and sister had joined the church here in Kirtland, and so between Hulburt and Howe and these testifiers, they published their tale between the years 1834 and 1841, years after the publication of the Book of Mormon and with that book in their hands from which to make their garbled statements. Therefore, he concludes the thieving Joseph Smith who was always an honest and honorable man, stole the Book of Mormon from the Spaulding story and made of the theft a Bible. This is logic for you with a rush! Who again will doubt that my opponent is a profound logician? But I have yet to give you the rich part of his tale. A few of the best citizens of Ohio, at Conneaut, got together one night and appointed one of their beloved number, to wit, the said Dr. Hulburt, who had before been ostracised from the Latter Day Saints for an open insult to a young lady in Kirtland, to go to New York, Pennsylvania, and other places, to get statements from other first citizens of the country (like to themselves), and get up a story to beat the Book of Mormon. Did you ever before hear of so many of the first citizens of the

country living near by you, who were never known outside of their neighborhood, except by the work of evil they did by signing false statements? His idea of best citizen is from the standpoint of whether they are on "our side;" not from a single truth he knows. But let me right here call your attention to the fact that he has not even presented the testimony of a single one of these best citizens he refers to in full. Not a single statement. Not even the poor show of reading to you a written statement in full of a single one of them. Not even the offer to read you a single affidavit of one of these "best citizens." I am here to examine the evidence in this discussion, and if he has any statements, or affidavits, I want him to read them here, and give the people a chance to judge and me a chance to examine them. I deny, sir, that you can produce affidavits or respectable statements proving the statements and assertions you read last night; and demand the evidence. Not a few lines from the witnesses but the testimony. I call attention to the fact that this opponent is the first I ever met who would stand before an audience and tell and rehearse what he says, somebody else said, old mother Grundy said about what somebody else said and did, and then ask his audience to take it for evidence. What would you think of an attorney, who after rehearsing his case to the jury or judge, without ever offering to introduce a witness or read a record except in extracts, would stand up and claim he had put his evidence in, and ask for a verdict in his favor? Can you not see, ladies and gentlemen, he has not proven a single thing? What evidence has he presented to you upon any matter? Mention, any of you who can. Oh, says one, he gave us Mr. Rudolph's testimony. Did he? I have not seen it or heard it read. I heard what Braden said Rudolph said Sidney Rigdon did; but what do you know about it? Mr. Rudolph is near here, if he knows anything, put him on this stand: you claim him as one of your own men, a Disciple Preacher. I want to examine him if his name is to be used, since he is near by and can be had. The only request I will have in the matter is that the evidence shall be taken on extra time; and that we do not take up the hour named for discussion. I deny here that Mr. Rudolph knows a single fact which can in the remotest degree connect Sidney Rigdon with Joseph Smith or the Book of Mormon, prior to the time when Sidney Rigdon was converted to the faith of the Saints in the last part of the year 1830. And I make this statement fearlessly, after having had a conversation with Mr. Rudolph on the subject of the book myself last summer.

Another thing: I state fearlessly before you that Mr. Howe of Painsville, who first published the Spaulding story and the affidavits which were gotten up to blacken the character of Joseph Smith, Sidney Rigdon, et al., and whose book is the key note from which all subsequent works have taken

their music, does not know one thing, not a single fact that can be made in the least to connect that Spaulding story with the Book of Mormon or show that Joseph Smith's character was bad; or that a single affidavit in his book is true. Will you put him on the stand here for examination? I will bear the expense of bringing him here as he is a little farther away than Mr. Rudolph. I do not make these assertions for bluff, or effect; but for the reason that the world has thought Mr. Howe knew something about the matter, or he would not have published the book which forms the basis of all other lying works; and if he does know anything now is the time to find it out. One other thing. It has been asserted here that he has a chain of evidence. A chain of evidence! What is it to make a chain of evidence? Can you use broken or pieces of links? Has Mr. Braden debated all his life and has not yet found out that to form a circumstance or truth, that the evidence of such circumstance or truth must be complete within itself and independent of another fact or circumstance which he claims to form another link? Each must be complete of itself to be evidence and constitute a chain. For illustration: It is said here by him that at one time a niece of Sidney Rigdon once saw him go to an old trunk, take out a manuscript, go to the fire place and read it, and that he would not let her see it. Suppose this is all true as the story goes; what of it? Is it pertinent to the issue until they in some manner connect that same manuscript with the one claimed by Spaulding? Why! Rigdon might have had a hundred manuscripts and read them, and taken them from an old trunk, and put them back without first having given them to his niece to read, and each and every one of them altogether different from the Spaulding manuscript; and if any such unconnected statement was offered as evidence in any court to sustain the most trivial case, it would instantly be ruled as improper. Before this can be made evidence the parties must also show by some other fact, or thing, that the manuscript which he is said to have read and would not let his niece see was the *Spaulding Romance*, and then they may use it all as a link to show that Rigdon did have an opportunity of copying the Spaulding manuscript. Don't you know that if Sidney Rigdon did have the Spaulding manuscript it is just possible he had another besides; mother Grundy's manuscript, a manuscript sermon, or manuscript article for publication, and that at the time his niece saw him he was reading mother Grundy's manuscript, and offering the people a false thing as evidence and asking them to accept it as true instead of accepting the facts. Take another one of his proofs (?). Mr. Rudolph says, so

Braden says, that one time during the year 1827, Sidney Rigdon, who was their pastor at Mentor, Ohio, went off some place and was away two or three weeks and they did not know where he went to. It might have been over to Hiram, down to Mantua, to Cleveland or Cincinnati; but no difference to him; he will have it at this very time he was in the wilds of Pennsylvania or New York, concocting the Book of Mormon with Joseph Smith. Where is his witnesses showing where Rigdon was at this time, or that he was in New York? There is none, nor never has been. Now according to their idea Smith has no rights that even a rogue is bound to respect; and so if they can show that their pastor Rigdon was out on a spree, Smith will have to bear the blame. My friends, don't you know that it would sink any man, prophet, priest, or king, to undertake to make of him a scapegoat to carry away the sins of many pastors of the Campbellite Church.

But I have only been arguing the matter in this suppositious form—sifting it;—when I come to ask for the evidence, I find out the whole thing is trumped up to defeat Sidney Rigdon because he left their church. I shall now present to you a supposable case upon facts proven, and ask you to compare the two methods of argument. Upon the part of the affirmative I have shown that John the Revelator, in the 14th chapter and 6th verse of his book, says: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." I use this to support the truth of my claim. But how? 1. I show by it, the time that is referred to, "The hour of God's judgment." 2. That it was to be after John's time, or the year A. D. 96, by turning to the preceding chapters. Rev. 1:19, 4:1, and 22:6. 3. That the hour of the judgment is the same as defined in Matt. 13 by Jesus. And it is "just afore the harvest," the same time referred to in Isaiah 18, when the ensign is lifted up; and that the ensign of God is the gospel of Christ; this is what he calls men to look to, saying, "Repent ye and believe the gospel;" and since it is the gospel and lifted up at the same time that John saw the angel bringing it, I must conclude they are the same in teaching at least, for there is but one gospel. 4. Then, when I notice that the same time and event is spoken of in both, as in Isaiah 29, and Ezekiel 37, where the message and event is represented as a book that should be brought to light which should contain "doctrine," and (connected with its publication), understanding attained, and the power of God brought to light, as was the gospel when it was in the world in its fullness before, as Paul says:—"Our gospel came not unto you in word only, but in power and in the Holy Ghost,

and in much assurance;" (1 Thess. 1:5), and that this is the same work specifically set forth as in the other texts, time, place and conditions each being complete of themselves and agreeing in all their phases, and that there is no reasonable interpretation or application of the prophecies agreeing with any other time, place, thing or event, I conclude that they all refer to the same thing, and that that thing is the gospel which is to be again committed to the earth at the time, "just afore the harvest;" in "the hour of His judgment," and hence committed again sometime after the apostles' time, and which may be in our own time, and must be in this or hereafter, for the harvest spoken of has not yet come. Having made such a connected chain as this, every link being in itself complete, since they all refer to a like, or the same thing, and that thing has a complete likeness in the coming forth and teaching of the Book of Mormon, and no other book known to men will answer to the fulfillment as this, and the time in the history of the world as predicted has arrived for the fulfillment, I say it is logical to conclude, and the evidence irresistible as showing that this is the prophetic work, notwithstanding Satan's old cry of deceiver.

How about his Spaulding story as compared with this logical deduction from admitted facts? In the argument of a proposition or the trial of an issue, there is what is termed an affirmative and a negative; a plaintiff and a defendant. One who affirms the truth of a matter and who must bring evidence to sustain this, and one who denies the sufficiency or application of the evidence, or else, admitting the statements of the one who affirms to be correct, he denies the conclusion, for the reason that something else is true which must destroy the correctness of the plaintiff's conclusion. This other thing or averment is what is termed an alibi, and may properly be made the defense in certain cases. But in other cases it cannot. For illustration: I set forth my claim and title to a certain piece of land, showing patent from the government, all due and legal transfers by proper conveyance; show that this patent and all transfers and steps of entry and possession are strictly in harmony and keeping with the law,—it would hardly be worth while for another to bring a suit to *oust* me under the plea that, it is true, he is properly entitled under the chain of title and I cannot break that claim, but then John Doe had a correct chain of title too, at one time, to a piece of land, and it is defendant's belief that plaintiff ought to be kept out of possession for the reason that John Doe now does not know what kind of land his was nor where it is. No judge would for a moment hesitate to say that not even an issue had been formed by such a plea. If my chain of title could not be broken, no amount of alibi's would help the matter in the case. That which is conclusive to the proving of a fact, which fact establishes the conclusion of a proposition, cannot be overcome by an attempt to prove some other fact; for the reason that

it is a contradiction to suppose that two facts exist and one the opposite of the other.

To defeat my title to the land then, the defendant would be compelled to break the chain, and this would form a direct contest. In the discussion of the proposition before this audience, as the one affirming, I had the right to set out my claim;—chain of title; make it full and complete under the law; and my opponent's right was to break this chain, and under the law he must do so or fail; for the conclusion of the law is, that he who comes bringing this chain is true, for no man can get hold of the chain unless he is the true and accepted one.

God has set this seal upon it; man understands the things of man by the spirit of man which is in him; "even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." I Cor. 2:11. For this reason in determining who are of God and who are not, you may safely rely upon the rule, "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John, 9th verse. He has established a law that man without the Spirit of God cannot look into his truth which is from above, and so select from it as to impose upon the people and at the same time conform to the truth. Jesus recognizes the rule as being correct in the 28th chapter of Matthew's gospel, wherein he tells his disciples, if they teach all things whatsoever he has commanded them he will be with them to the end of the world. He did not even promise to be with Peter, and James, and John unless they proved their mission by abiding in the doctrine. Not a part of it, but all of it, for this rule was to be given to his people and the world to test the true from the false; true teachers from false teachers; true prophets from false prophets. "If any man think himself a prophet or spiritual," says the apostle, 1 Cor. 14:37, "let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Not acknowledge by mouth through dissimulation simply,—but let his teachings conform to the established test, and agree in all things with that which Paul had written. "He that is of God heareth God's words;" and in all things. "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing; by their fruits you shall know them." Not judging their public acts by their doings in private life, nor by the lives of their followers; for this would destroy the entire list:—Noah, Moses, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Peter and Paul; and judging simply by the fruits of the followers, it would also prove as false, Jesus and the apostles; for all, except the twelve went back at one time; Judas, one of those, turned traitor and sold Jesus; another, denied him and cursed and swore; all returned to their nets; and Thomas was so far gone that he said he would not believe, unless "he should first thrust his hands into his side," while some in the churches in a short time were guilty of such abominations as were not known, the apostle Paul says, among the Gentiles. Speaking

of those in Asia, Jesus signifies to his servant John, that some were so wicked and corrupt, that unless they repented they should "be brought down to hell." To judge them then in this way would be wrong;—contrary to the word of God. I will show you the way to judge men by their fruits. If those principles they teach are bad; or men or women are bad who are living in accord with, and carrying out in their lives the principles taught, then it will prove the one bringing the message to be bad, and at the same time prove the message bad. The argument is often made that the Christian religion is bad because those professing Christianity are bad. This is not a correct premise. Before the conclusion follows, it must be further shown that, in bringing forth this bad fruit, they who call themselves Christians did these bad things by conforming to the principles and teachings of the Christian religion.

Now, in this discussion, from the first, my opponent has chosen to leave the arguments of the affirmative and follow his own course; and he has attempted to crush me under the weight of the stories he had at his command against the character of Mr. Smith. What a ridiculous position! If my claim is true it is true, and no number of alibi's could affect it gotten up on life or character.

But by taking this course he virtually admits the position of the affirmative to be unmovable; because if he could move me what is the use of his alibi? I am affirming and must make my case. He simply denies; he does not in the proposition set up a counter case, claim, or thing. And yet he has chosen to introduce the alibi of the old Spaulding Romance; (and romance it is), and to rely upon that, either as a counter proof sufficient, or as a means of prejudicing the people against an investigation of the facts. Whatever the object it matters not to me; but I take it that by so doing he has admitted as true the position of the plaintiff in the contest and now rests his case upon character, and the "Spaulding Romance."

Does he not know that his very act in doing this is in itself another evidence of the truth of the Book of Mormon? and in this making certain the application of

another part of the prophecy in Isaiah, 29th chapter, the conditions of which I claim are complete in the Book of Mormon. The book spoken of there to come forth is to be fought in such a way. If the opposition was from a different standpoint the prediction would be incomplete. The prophecy sets out sufficient to show that it might have been properly tried under the rule, for it is to contain the doctrine of Christ;—no mistaking this; verse 24: "They also that erred in spirit shall come to understanding, and they that murmured shall learn doctrine."

But notwithstanding this, it is shown conclusively in verses 15, 16, 20, and 21, that those who opposed the book would do so by turning things upside down;—reversing the order of trying things under God's law, and use works which were "in the dark;" "scorn" the claims made by the one bringing the book, and "watch for iniquity;"—try to find something against his character;—"make a man an offender for a word," "and lay a snare for him," for it was to be a work reproving the people for leaving the law; and finally, they were to "turn aside the just for a thing of nought."—Preferring to the great facts of God's law and the justice exemplified therein, those things that are of little account, a tissue and a refuge of lies as referred to in the fifteenth verse of the 28th chapter, or in other words the "Spaulding Story." Now, singular as it is, I have never met a man as yet, in the consideration of this question, who has not tried the book from this standpoint. It was said of Jesus that "he was numbered with the transgressors," to fulfill the prediction of the prophet, made long before; and if the certainty of agreement of prophecy and its fulfillment is such, that he who was the upright and true, the humble and meek, the forgiving and pure of the city of Nazareth, must be charged with disobedience to law, stirring up of sedition, and treason to the State, and suffer the final affliction of death between two thieves, why should I complain to suffer to the contest of lies, and ways that are dark, which the prophet speaks of as being brought to oppose at some day the Lord's work.

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We wish to call the attention to a fact strangely overlooked by former writers—that Spaulding wrote several manuscripts. Our reasons for such a position are: I. The length of time he spent in writing his book. He begun in 1809, and the manuscript was taken to Patterson's office in 1814. He spent five years on it. II. Mrs. S. Spaulding, his wife, Miss Spaulding, his daughter, and J. N. Miller, declare that he had many manuscripts. III. The witnesses in Coneaut, with one exception, describe only the Nephite portion, showing that he had only written that, when reading to them. The Zarahemlite and Jaredite portions were not written when he read to them. IV. Spaulding stated to J. N. Miller that he would lead a retired life in Pittsburgh, and re-write his manuscript. Miller is the only one who describes the Zarahemlite portion. He had added that to his second Mormon manuscript. V. Patterson told him to rewrite it and prepare it for press. Jas. Miller says he did, and left this copy with Patterson, and that it was this, or his third Mormon manuscript, that Rigdon stole. VI. The manuscript that Miss Spaulding read at the residence of her uncle, W. H. Sabin, was not large enough to constitute such a work as the publishers would publish. It was his first draft on his manuscript No. II. Mormon I. VII. The contradictions between these portions as we will show, prove that they were written in different installments, and added to each other. VIII. When Mrs. Harris destroyed 118 pages Rigdon was sent for and he replaced them from another Spaulding manuscript, one of the ones stolen by Smith from Mrs. Davidson's house in Hartwicke in 1827. IX. Even after he failed to get his manuscript published and the copy he prepared had been stolen by Rigdon, he continued to write on to the last. X. Spaulding's care in preserving his manuscript is seen in the fact that even the few leaves of his Roman manuscript were preserved, and found in his trunk in 1834.

This removes the quibbling of Mormons about Rigdon's copying so much manuscript. He did not, he stole it. Spaulding so declared in 1815-16. Rigdon showed the manuscript to Winters, and stated that it was the manuscript that Spaulding wrote—that Spaulding had left it at Pattersons—that he borrowed it—not copied it. Rigdon told Jefries he took the manuscript from the printing office. It settles also all quibbling about size of the manuscript Miss Spaulding read at her uncles. Rigdon had the one her father had prepared for press. She read the first draft or manuscript No. II Mormon manuscript No. I. It also puts an end to the three Id Josephh's talk that Spaulding's heirs had the

manuscript in their care all the time. It puts an end to the challenge of Mormons "Why did not the Spauldings bring out the manuscript and prove the theft and plagiarism by publishing the original manuscript?" Rigdon had stolen Mormon manuscript No. III that Spaulding had prepared for press, Smith, in 1827 had stolen other manuscripts.

Did Rigdon steal Spaulding's manuscript? We have proved that he was learning the tanner's trade in Pittsburg, when the manuscript was at Patterson's by Mrs. Echbaum. That he was intimate with Lambdin and was about the office so much that Engles the foreman complained of it. That he was much interested in the Spaulding manuscript that was a great curiosity in the office, by Mrs. Spaulding. That the manuscript was stolen and Spaulding blamed Rigdon, by Jas. Miller, McKee and Dr. Dodd. That Rigdon showed the manuscript to Dr. Winters in 1823 declaring it was Spaulding's manuscript, left with a printer, that he borrowed it, and told what it contained, by Dr. Winter. That he had it in 1826, and declared it would be a great thing some day, by his niece Mrs. Dunlap. We have proved that he knew of the publication of the Book of Mormon, long before it appeared, and described it, by D. Atwater, A. Bently, Alexander Campbell, Green and Dille. We have proved that he was often absent from home while it was being prepared for press, by Z. Randolph, and others. That he was seen at Smith's while it was being prepared for press, by Tucker, Mrs. Eaton and McCauley, Chase and Sanders. We have proved that he prepared his congregation for the reception of the book and his ideas, and that his adherants went into Mormonism. We will, when we come to analyze the Book of Mormon, prove that there are Rigdonisms on nearly every page, and several on many single pages. I do not know how a stronger case can be made.

The constant jabber of Mormons, calling on persons to tell when and how Rigdon came in contact with and obtained possession of the Spaulding manuscript, and when and how Rigdon and Smith came together, and concocted this scheme, and brought out this book, is an insult to common sense and every principle of law. If a man is arrested with stolen property in his possession, all the state has to do is to prove I. The rightful owner of the property. II. That it has been feloniously taken out of his possession. III. That it was found in the possession of the accused. That is sufficient to convict him of being a thief, or a receiver of stolen goods, that the law holds as guilty as the thief. The state does not have to prove that the accused stole the property. Having convicted him of having

stolen property in his possession, he has to prove that he came by it innocently, or be committed as thief or receiver of stolen goods. We have proved that Spaulding owned the Manuscript Found, that it was found in possession of Rigdon, that it was offered to the public as his own property by Imposter Joe. Unless Mormons can prove that Rigdon and Smith came by it innocently, they are convicted as thieves, or as receivers of stolen goods. As lawyers the three Id Joseph and his man Kelley ought to know this.

But we have gone far beyond what is necessary in order to convict Rigdon and Smith. Let me illustrate our work. Suppose that a man lives for years in Kirtland, who has a museum of rare relics. There are absolutely no duplicates of any of them. He is a sort of monomaniac over his museum, takes everybody to see it that he can in any way induce to look at it, and is constantly talking about it, and describing it. He moves away, and some years afterwards a couple of fellows come along and advertise a wonderful museum, that they claim an angel gave by miracle to one of them. People of Kirtland flock out to see this miraculous museum. No sooner do they cast eyes on it, than a shout goes up, "why this the collection of 'Old-come-to-pass,'" a nick-name they had given to their former neighbor. The two fellows are arrested for theft. The heirs of the old neighbor are looked up. They say the collection is in a certain trunk. When the trunk is examined it is found that not a single article of the collection is in it. The trial comes on. The former neighbors of the original owner come in and testify, describing the articles in the collection of their old neighbor, and describe nearly all the leading articles in the museum. The museum is placed before them. They pick out all the leading articles, but reject some, saying, "he did not have these." The thieves would go to the penitentiary, unless they could show that they came by them honestly.

But suppose the state proceeds to prove that the owner took his collection to a certain place to be prepared for exhibition. That one of the thieves was constantly around there, took great interest in them. That just before the owner's death, these relics disappeared, and that the owner and others blamed this fellow with stealing them. That a few years afterwards he showed them to persons saying that they were the deceased man's relics, that he had left to be prepared for exhibition, and that he had borrowed them from the one who was to prepare them for exhibition, in order to examine them. That he was seen with them in his possession and examining them years afterwards, declaring, "they would be a big thing some day." That soon afterwards he began to exhibit certain peculiar articles of his own manufacture, and to prophesy that an angel would give to the world a museum, with certain articles in it, describing the articles of the deceased

man. That he was seen in company with his confederate. That the confederate began to tell that an angel had given to him a museum of such articles, and in a short time the two began to exhibit the museum, containing the relics of the deceased, and the articles the first fellow had been exhibiting. The case would be made out as clearly as if a thousand men swore that they saw the theft.

We have proven that Solomon Spaulding exhibited for years, in Conneaut, and in other places, a cabinet of curiosities, that were absolutely nowhere else except in his Manuscript Found. That he was a sort of monomaniac over his Manuscript Found, forcing it on all he could get hold of, holding them like Coleridge's Ancient Mariner. That his mania had caused persons to nickname him, "Old come to pass." We have proved that when the Book of Mormon was exhibited in Conneaut, that those who had, through Spaulding's mania, been made familiar with his Manuscript Found, recognized the Manuscript Found in the Book of Mormon. Squire Wright shouting out, "Old come to pass has come to life." His brother arose and denounced the theft and fraud on the spot. His old neighbors sent a messenger to his widow, who sent them to the trunk, where the manuscript was supposed to be, and it was not in the trunk. It had been stolen. We have introduced the clear positive testimony of seventeen witnesses, who, in describing the Manuscript Found, give a better description of the Book of Mormon—the historic part—than the average Mormon preacher can give from memory. We have presented them the book of Mormon and they unite in picking out the historic portions as part of the Manuscript Found and in rejecting others as not in the Manuscript Found. We have proved that one of the accused, Rigdon, was around the place where the manuscript Spaulding had prepared for the press was last seen. That he took a deep interest in it. That Spaulding told James Miller and McKee and Dr. Dodd that his manuscript had been stolen and Rigdon was suspected of the theft. We have proved that Rigdon in 1822 or 3 showed the manuscript to Dr. Winters, stating that it was a manuscript that Spaulding a Presbyterian preacher had left with a printer, for publication, and that he had borrowed it from the printer to read as a curiosity. It was a Bible romance, purporting to be a history of the American Indians. That he told Jeffries he took it from the printing office and gave it to Smith to publish. That he spent so much time over it in 1826, as to cause his wife to threaten to burn it, to which he replied, "that it would be a great thing some day." We proved by Alexander Campbell, A. Bently, and D. Atwater that Rigdon years before the Book of Mormon appeared stated that such a book would appear, it was dug out of the ground, was engraved on gold plates, contained a history of the aborigines of this continent, gave the history of the peo-

ple who construed the antiquities of America, that it taught that the gospel was preached in America, in the first centuries of our era, as the Disciples were then preaching it on the Reserve. We have proved that Rigdon preached the religious portions, the part that our witnesses did not recognize as Spaulding's. We have proved that Rigdon was away from home during the time that Smith was working on his pretended plates. That he was seen with Smith. That right after he began to visit Smith the latter began to tell about finding the plates and began his pretended translation of them. We have made our case.

MORMON CHRONOLOGY.

- 1761—Solomon Spaulding was born in Ashford, Connecticut.
- 1785—Solomon Spaulding graduated with the degree of A. B. at Dartmouth College.
- 1787—Solomon Spaulding graduated in Divinity. He received the degree of A. M. from Dartmouth College.
- 1788—Solomon Spaulding preaches as Congregational preacher till compelled to stop by ill health, in 1800.
- 1793—Sidney Rigdon was born Feb., 19th near the village of Library, St. Clair township, Alleghany county, Pennsylvania.
- 1796—Joseph Smith, Sen., and Lucy Mack married in Tunbridge, Vermont.
- 1800—Solomon Spaulding moves to Cherry Valley, New York, and engages in merchandizing till 1805, and marries Matilda Sabin.
- 1805—Imposter Joe Smith born Dec. 23, in Sharon, Windsor county, Vermont.
- 1807—Solomon Spaulding having failed in business moves to Coneaut, Ohio, and engages in business.
- 1808—He becomes very much interested in the mounds around Coneaut, and has several opened. He begins a historical romance, assuming that their builders were the descendants of shipwrecked Romans. His Manuscript No. I. His Roman Manuscript.
- 1809—He abandons this idea as too near his own time and begins his Manuscript No. II. Mormon Manuscript No. I. He assumes that the aborigines of America were Israelites from Jerusalem. He fails in business and announces to his creditors, his purpose to publish his romance, as "Manuscript Found," and pay his debts.
- 1810-11-12—Spaulding continues to write on his romance, and to read to all that he can induce to listen to him. His monomania causes his neighbors to nick-name him "Old come to pass" on account of the absurd frequency of that expression in his manuscript. He begins Manuscript No. III, Mormon Manuscript No. II, adding the Zarahemla portion. He moves to Pittsburg to prepare his manuscript for publication.

A religious impostor in Vermont,

creates much excitement in the neighborhood of the Smiths. Mrs. Smith is very active in the excitement, and prophecies, that Joe, then a lad of seven, will be a prophet, and found a new religion. Joe is reared with that idea constantly before him. The family are all taught it.

- 1813-14—At the advice of Patterson, Spaulding prepares for press his Manuscript No. IV, Mormon Manuscript No. III. It is carried to Patterson's office for publication.

Sidney Rigdon is learning the tanners trade in Pittsburg. He is very intimate with Lambdin a leading employee of Patterson. He is around the office so much, that Engles, the foreman, complains of it. He takes great interest in Spaulding's manuscript.

Spaulding moves to Amity, Washington county, Pa., and his wife keeps tavern.

- 1815—The Smith's move to Palmyra, New York.

- 1816—Spaulding informs Jas. Miller, McKee and J. R. Dodd, that his manuscript has been stolen from Patterson's office, and that Rigdon is blamed with the theft. Spaulding died October 20th, 1818. His widow collects his papers that she can find and takes them with her, in a trunk, to the residence of his brother, W. H. Sabin, Onondaga county, New York.

- 1817—Sidney Rigdon joins the Baptist Church on Piney Fork of Peters' Creek, May 31st.

- 1819—The Smiths squat on a piece of land belonging to minors in Ontario County, New York. Rigdon studies theology with Rev. Clark of the Regular Baptist Church in Beaver County, Pa.

- 1819—Rigdon is licensed to preach by the Connequessing Baptist Church.

- 1820—Rigdon goes to Warren, Trumbull County, Ohio, where an uncle is a prominent member of the Baptist Church. He joins that church March 4th. He is ordained to preach by that church April 1st. Marries Phebe A. Brooks.

Mrs. Spaulding, Spaulding's widow, goes to Pomfret, Connecticut.

Rigdon preaches for the Baptist Church in Warren, and for others in the vicinity.

- 1821—Rigdon continues to preach for the Baptists in Warren. In this year, or in the year following, Mrs. Spaulding marries Mr. Davidson of Hartwick, Otsego County, New York, and goes there to live.

- 1822—Rigdon moves to Pittsburg. Is elected pastor of the First Baptist Church Jan. 28.

During this year or the year following, he shows to Dr. Winter, a prominent teacher in Pittsburg, a Baptist preacher, and an intimate acquaintance, Spaulding's Manuscript No. IV,

Mormon Manuscript No. III. He says: "It is a Bible romance, purporting to be a history of the American Indians, that a Presbyterian preacher named Spaulding wrote, and left with a printer for publication. I borrowed it to read through curiosity."

In digging a well for Willard Chase, Joseph Smith, senior, the father of Imposter Joe, found a stone of cloudy quartz, that singularly resembled a child's foot. Imposter Joe who was loafing around, stole it from Chase's children. This is the famous peep-stone of Imposter Joe, the Urim and Thummim of Mormonism.

Rigdon had stolen its Bible, now, Imposter Joe stole its Urim and Thummim.

1823—Rigdon preaches for the Baptist Church until Oct. 11th when he is excluded for doctrinal heresies. He goes to the Court House and preaches to his followers.

Imposter Joe begins his course as imposter. He pretends to witch for water with a witch hazel rod, and to find lost property and hidden treasures and mines with his stolen peep-stone by putting it into his hat and holding his face into his hat.

In September, while working for W. H. Sabin, where Miss Spaulding, Spaulding's daughter was living, with her father's papers in her care, Joseph Smith learns of the existence of the Spaulding manuscripts. This is the true interpretation of his wonderful vision of Sept. 23, 1823, when Moroni, now an angel, appears to him, and reveals to him the existence of the plates he—Moroni—had buried hundreds of years before, and lets Joe have a peep at them.

Joseph Smith manufactured that story twenty years afterwards in 1843. He told of no such vision then. The true interpretation is he learned of the Spaulding manuscript while working for Sabin in Sept. 1823.

1824—Mrs. Davidson has the trunk containing her husband's papers sent to her in Hartwicke, N. Y.

Rigdon preaches for his adherents until in the summer, in the Court House. He then quits preaching and works in a tannery, and begins revising his stolen manuscript. It was a period of great religious excitement and new parties were springing up continually. The excitement of the movement of the Campbells was beginning to be the chief topic in Western Pennsylvania. Rigdon had adopted some, but not all of their ideas. He saw he could not be a leader, in competition with them if he went into it. He conceived the idea of remodeling the Spaulding manuscript by interpolating portions of the Bible, and his own peculiar religious ideas, pretending that it was a record kept by the

Israelites, who came to America, just as the Bible was kept by Israelites in Asia, and was as much a revelation as the Bible.

He intended by such fraud to start a new religious movement with himself as prophet, and his stolen manuscript thus revised as its new revelation.

1825—Rigdon continues his revision of his stolen manuscript and works in the tannery.

Smith is in the height of his glory as imposter. He has a gang of loafing dupes and knaves digging through southern New York and northern Pennsylvania for buried treasures, mines of precious metals that he pretends to see through his stolen peep-stone. He extends his operations to Harmony, Pa. He makes the acquaintance of Emma Hale. Asks her hand in marriage. Is decidedly refused by her father on account of his bad character.

1826—In the latter part of winter Rigdon moves to Bainbridge, Geauga county, Ohio. He spent so much time on his stolen manuscript that his wife threatened to burn it. He replied; "that the manuscript would be a great thing some day."

Smith is in full blast as imposter. He extends his operations until the extreme parts are 150 miles apart. The doings of Smith and his gang, and the peep-stone of Smith are extensively commented on by the press of the region.

In June Rigdon preaches the funeral sermon of Warner Goodall in Mentor. He pleases the church, and it selects him as pastor and he becomes a Disciple preacher.

1827—Smith goes to Harmony, Pa., in the absence of Mr. Hale, runs off with his daughter and marries her in South Bainbridge, N. Y. The ceremony is performed by Tarbell, J. P., Jan. 18th.

Rigdon tells Darwin Atwater that a book will soon appear giving an account of the aborigines of this continent and the origin of American antiquities.

He tells A. Bently that a book was about to be published that was found engraved on plates of gold. A. Campbell testifies that he said also that it was dug out of the earth in New York. It contained an account of the aborigines of this continent. That it said that the gospel had been preached in America just as the disciples were then preaching it on the Reserve, during the first centuries of our era.

Rigdon preached during this and the three succeeding year, the peculiar ideas that are in the Book of Mormon. He indoctrinated all of his hearers, that he could, with these ideas, and prepared for the coming of his new revelation.

In the spring of 1827 a stranger was ob-

served at Smith's house. Shortly after he made his appearance, the Smiths began to tell of the golden bible.

People of Mentor began to notice that Rigdon was often absent from home for days, and no one knew where.

Spaulding had intended to assume that his romance was a translation of a manuscript found in the earth. From 1818 to 1827, the papers contained accounts of finding glyphs of metallic plates, covered with unknown characters. In the spring of 1827, a story was started that a book of such glyphs had been found in Canada, and that it was called a "Golden Bible."

Rigdon adopted this idea, and the scheme was concocted to pretend that Smith had found a book of gold plates called the "Golden Bible." Smith was to pretend to translate it with his peep stone, stolen from the Chases children. He was in reality to use Rigdon's revision of the manuscript he had stolen from Spaulding, and pretend that it was a translation of the plates that he pretended that he had found.

Smith informs Rigdon of the place where the rest of the Spaulding manuscripts could be found. The confederates dare not publish their fraud while they were in existence. In September, 1827, Smith was loafing around Mrs. Davidson's neighborhood, superintending a gang, digging for a silver mine, on the place of Stowell, and also a well or two were dug in the neighborhood.

September 22 he succeeded in stealing some of the Spaulding manuscripts. This is the true interpretation of his wonderful vision of September 21-22, 1827. They had now, they supposed, all the Spaulding's Mormon manuscripts in their possession, and they supposed all means of detection were destroyed.

Smith then began his pretended translation of his pretended plates.

In the fall Smith moved to Harmony, Pennsylvania, to his father-in-law. While on the road his goods were

searched twice for stolen property. His father's house was searched about the same time.

1828—Martha Spaulding, Spaulding's daughter, marries Dr. McKinstry and moves to Munson, Massachusetts to live

Rigdon makes a convert of P. P. Pratt, a teacher in Lorain county, Ohio, who begins to preach for the Disciples. He lets Pratt into his scheme, who goes into it and eventually becomes the Paul of Mormonism.

Smith begins to translate. Martin Harris is his scribe. In July Smith let Harris have 118 pages to take back to Manchester to use in making dupes and enlisting confederates in the fraud. Mrs. Harris who was bitterly opposed to the fraud, burned the 118 pages, without her husband's knowledge.

Great consternation ensues. Rigdon comes and gets the Spaulding manuscript that Smith had stolen and reconstructs from this the portion that had been burned.

Smith has a long revelation telling what had been done by malicious persons—telling what no one had done or dreamed of doing. Smith did not know what had been done, and the Mormon God concocts a plan to circumvent a scheme that had never been even dreamed of.

Smith returns to Waterloo, New York, in the fall. The angels plow seven acres of wheat and sow ten acres of plaster to enable Whitmer to go and move Smith.

(1829). In March Oliver Cowdery is made Smith's scribe. Rigdon comes and gives Smith what he has revised of the Spaulding manuscript, and translation proceeds.

May 5th, John the Baptist appears to Joseph and Oliver, and gives to them the keys of the first priesthood, etc. Smith has a cave dug in which to hold levees with angels.

Smith gives Harris a scrawl to take to Anthon in New York City. Harris returns and publishes a false statement about the interview.

Early in June the translation is completed. In about two months Oliver Cowdery, an inexperienced blacksmith, wrote out at least two thousand foolscap pages, or an average of over thirty pages per day.

MR. KELLEY'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I know you have been entertained with the story and the gossip that has been brought forward. The wonderful amount of testimony, too, that you have heard from those fourteen witnesses! Have you not been anxiously waiting here, and listening, and watching to have something read in the shape of evidence? Yet, you have not heard one single affidavit read, one single statement read, one single thing read that could with any show of truth be properly called evidence. It is the first time I ever heard a man get up and state what he had culled from statements, or purported affidavits, to an audience and ask them to take it as evidence, without hearing the entire statement of the party read, or if it is printed giving the reader the privilege of reading the entire evidence for himself. I will pick it out and select just what I want the audience to hear, and thus in fact stand as judge for the audience. That is the position of my friend before you. I will say, however, with regard to his story, (and he has made out his case he says,) he is done now: just understand that:—that it is, with one exception, the most singular thing that I ever saw or heard. There is one gotten up that is a fair parallel to it, however,—one just like it. I have it in a book in my house, and intended to have brought it over to-night and exhibited to you, but forgot it. It was published by Alexander Smythe in Chicago in 1880. Instead, however, of being against the Latter Day Saints, it is against the early, or former day saints. The author sets out by making the apostle Paul the hero of the Christian religion. He plays him as the master mind of the whole scheme transacted in Palestine. He concocted the plan in order to establish a church and found a new religion in the time in which he lived. As a starting point and for the purpose of awakening the people to the scheme, this man says, that Paul procured a poor crazy fanatic, called John the Baptist, and sent him into the wilderness of Judea and had him preach a while to tell them that one who was then standing in their midst would soon come, and he would be the Messiah and restore all things to them. After a while that one that was to be the Messiah is brought out to play his part, according to the *tale*. He was a relative of John the Baptist, he says. It happens, too, that the party mixed in a grain of truth here in order to deceive, as Christ was a relative. Then the story proceeds to the effect, that, after a while when the apostle Paul thought that he had used John the Baptist all he wanted to, he puts up a job on John and has Herod behead him. Then he has Jesus play the Messiah until the time that he thinks things are about ripe for to spring some great

excitement in the world. All the time this author cunningly represents the apostle as playing behind the scenes, until Jesus has made himself well known, then he foists some horrid stories upon the ears of the populace in Jerusalem against the Messiah, and just at a time when he is approaching the city, (Jesus not knowing anything about Paul's perfidy,) and the excited people rise and put him to death. The Apostle Paul then steals his body and makes away with it; so the story goes. And after he had done that he starts down to Damascus, and all of a sudden the apostle gets converted to the new religion by a great miracle, and goes back in order to make a great sensation in the world, telling his wonderful experience; and from that time becomes the "ringleader." You take that book, my friends, and read it, published in the nineteenth century, in the year 1880, and observe the things that it takes from the Bible, excerpting here and there, in order to make a show of truth, and notice the ingenuity with which the false statements are thrown in between, and then compare with his Spaulding story, and you will find that it is a far more plausible story than he has presented to you in trying to account for the origin of the Book of Mormon. But he has chosen in this discussion to rely upon as a defense, as I was just saying before my time was called, *the Spaulding story, and character*; either as a counter proof sufficient or as a means of prejudicing the people against an investigation of the facts. But whatever the object it matters not to me, for I shall canvass the story itself, and see what truth if any there is in it. Properly it does not belong to this question; as foreign to it in fact as were the stories and false charges of "deceiver," "gluttonous man," "wine bibber," &c., to ascertaining the truth of the mission of Jesus. Notwithstanding this, some want it examined, and I assure you it is but an easy task to drag it to the bottom.

How bad indeed according to my opponent's arraignment was this Smith crowd. The old man, the old lady, the boys and the girls. One would gather from his talk that they had been under the general espionage of the secret service department all along down the previous century. Yet, no crime was ever even charged against one of them, except in the old women's tales and gossip, spun by the pious (?) of the neighborhood. From before the time they left the State of Vermont they were thought to be squeamish. Yet, the old lady brought with her to New York State, a certificate of good standing in the Presbyterian church. Were Presbyterians, and especially those of the old New England stock, in those times, immoral, impious, and Sabbath breakers? In New York, their sons Hyrum and Sam-

uel and their daughter Sophronia also joined the Presbyterian church and were in good standing in that church during this time; yet they were *awful bad* folks. They quietly remained members of this body, which was considered one of the straightest sects, up to the year 1827, when they deliberately withdrew from it themselves because of their conversion, as they claimed, to the restored gospel. Joseph, an attentive listener at the Methodist church, and he is just about to be taken in as a member, when he happens to think that he will go and pray;—ask God what he shall do; for he is in a confusion of mind over what to do. My friends, have any of you ever been in such a state! and if so did you go to your heavenly Father to ask his advice?

Now this is the sum total of the crime of the fourteen-year-old boy at this time. He went and asked God for wisdom, and said the Lord spoke to him and told him what to do. It would never have been of note in the world about his asking, had he not stated that at the time he received an answer; and such an answer. What was it? "That the churches were not right." This was before Mr. Campbell ever left the Baptist church, sir, and while Charles and John Wesley were singing,

"Almighty God of love,
Set up the art active sign,
And summon whom thou dost approve
For messenger's divine.
From Abram's favored seed,
The new apostles choose;
Go, spread throughout the earth around,
The dead reviving news."

Was it any worse for young Joseph Smith to say these churches were wrong, and did not meet in full the measure of the Almighty than others? Ah! but he said God told him so, in answer to prayer. Well, did he never tell my friend anything in answer to prayer.

Answer me that, and do not forget it as you did at Wilber!! If Jesus or his messengers, did not tell him this, where did he get it? He was not the learned and scholarly man that you claim for Mr. Campbell; nor in a part of the world where he could gain from the wisdom of the Wesleys. Yet, he is the first of the age to come out boldly and frankly and say, "none of them are right." Not that they were wrong in all things, for he recognized that there was some good in each and all of them. But that none were all right—acknowledged of God. Sixty-three years have passed away and now who says it among the religious teachers? Mr. Campbell soon did; Walter Scott, Sidney Rigdon, Henry Ward Beecher, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Cheeney, Prof. Swing, W. H. H. Murry, and a host of others. And this, too, notwithstanding the great reformation wrought under Campbell. His might be termed the water reformation! Young Smith, as any young boy would have done under such circumstances, with confidence in his heart and faith in the justice of his cause, goes directly with his answer to his preacher, the pastor; states his case; and what would you have sup-

posed the reception under the circumstances, of a person of his age going to the pastor with the story, "The Lord showed me in the vision that the churches were all wrong." Now take the opposite view. Suppose the answer to Smith had been, You join the Methodist Church, (there was no Campbellite Church in the world to this time), as that is more acceptable to me than the Baptist or Presbyterian. Do you think the Methodist preacher would have called the boy a liar, and said he had no such vision? No, you all know, he would have put young Joseph at the head of the converts, and had him testify every night. It makes a big difference whose ox is gored sometimes.

Why I remember well last winter reading an account of a lady in the Methodist church in Coldwater, Michigan, who claimed to be actually healed by the power of faith in that church, and the church accepted it. While the Saints at the same place for the last twenty years had been affirming that God so wrought with them and that they had had many instances of such blessings, yet they were looked upon as fanatical, unorthodox, superstitious, because of this belief. Is it because it did not happen in our church that we are to say:—"Oh, it is all stuff; they are a set of fanatics." But there is another thing that young Smith said the angel told him, that is more remarkable, if made up, than the other; it was a prophecy:—"That his name should be both good and evil spoken of among all nations, kindreds, tongues and people." How did this young boy know that his name should be spoken of among all people, every nation;—by his friends as being a good man and by his enemies as being an evil man? The prophecy is clear and distinct, the fulfillment is complete—no one to gainsay it. The wonderful statement made by the then boy and the subsequent fulfillment should cause the most incredulous to stop and think before he condemns. How did he know this? Take the greatest villain on the earth or the most worthy man, are their names, even in this later time of the easy transmission of news, known among all nations, kindreds, tongues and peoples. Strike the heart of Africa and the Mohammedan country, and they have all heard of Smith, and they hold him in one relation or the other. But go to the heart of these same countries and they have not even heard of the terrible character that struck down our President, who, it seems, in his iniquity, would have been known all over the world if any one possibly could by this means. And yet this young boy stated early in 1823 that the angel said to him that his "Name should be both good and evil spoken of among all nations, kindreds, tongues and people. Can you point me to a prophecy in the Bible that has been more literally fulfilled?

Now I propose to examine my opponent's alibi, as he has rested his whole case upon that, and you watch and see if he is not driven from his "SPAULDING STORY" AND

CHARACTER!! I referred to the fact that this old falsehood was met and vanquished when it was first circulated in 1835 and 1836, and later in 1839 and 1840; but he replies that I must meet it here and not tell about what has been done. Very well, my affirmative arguments being in no way answered, I can well afford to meet it here; so now for the *Spaulding story* as a theory. Will you reply to my arguments upon this? We will see.

The following are the claims made for that:

First, That one Solomon Spaulding, a Presbyterian clergyman, about the year 1811, lived at Conneaut, Ohio, and being in poor health, for diversion in his invalid state, wrote a story and left it in manuscript form, which was like the present Book of Mormon, except as to errors.

Second, That from Conneaut, Ohio, he removed to Pittsburg, Pa., in 1812, and while there handed the manuscript of this story to a publisher by the name of Robert Patterson for examination and publication.

Third, That the manuscript instead of being published was returned to Mr. Spaulding, and in the year 1814 he left Pittsburg and went to Amity, Pa., where he died in the year 1816, when his effects, including the manuscript, fell into the hands of his widow.

Fourth, That at the time the manuscript was in the office of publisher Patterson, one Sidney Rigdon was engaged at, or in some way connected with said printing office, and in some way got the manuscript and purloined the same.

Fifth, That Sidney Rigdon at the time, knew of Joseph Smith and had opportunity to get this manuscript to him, and

Sixth, That Rigdon being a preacher at the time did this in order to start a new church and have a basis for his scheme.

Before, during this discussion, I showed by the illustration of "a chain of title" to property, if the chain was perfect in all its parts it would stand the test, but if faulty or disconnected by a single transfer it would not. In the examination of one's title if you are able to show that one link in the chain is not a true one, forged, or obtained through fraud, the whole thing is void. But in this pretentious claim of the *Spaulding Manuscript*, which he has set up, I am not only able to prove that one link is at fault, but that the entire chain is bad, and every link at fault; from the inception by Philaster Hulburt, who had been twice, as I have before shown, excommunicated from the Latter Day Saints for immoralities, to the conclusion of it as published and completed by Howe of Painsville, who had the Spaulding manuscript destroyed while in his hands. I enter upon the investigation with the hope that I shall have your candid and unbiased judgment in the consideration of the evidence.

First, did Spaulding ever write such a manuscript? I claim that he did not; and for proof of this refer you first to their own witnesses.

1. The manuscript Spaulding is said to have written was too meager a thing to in any sense compare with a manuscript that would make a book the size of the Book of Mormon.

2. The character of the "Manuscript Found," which is the one all rely upon as the romance, was entirely different to the Book of Mormon.

3. He was such an invalid at the time it is alleged he wrote his manuscript, that it would have been impossible for him considering his circumstances in life, together with his broken constitution, to have written such a manuscript had it been possible for any man of his own knowledge to write such a one as the Book of Mormon, which I deny.

Taking up the first reason it will at once be clear to you that a manuscript written in the English language, as they concede Spaulding's was, to contain the amount of matter that is included in the strictly historical part of the Book of Mormon, would cover at least fifteen hundred pages of foolscap paper. Was the "Manuscript Found" such? The statements of those who claim they saw the "Manuscript Found," place it beyond doubt that it was no such. Mrs. McKinstry, the daughter of Solomon Spaulding in her evidence says, that she, "Read the manuscript frequently when she was about twelve years of age, and that it was about one inch in thickness." She read it frequently, so it could not have been very large. Then their other trumped up witnesses all, or nearly all, say they heard it read. Henry Lake heard it read. John N. Miller heard it read from beginning to end. Aaron Wright heard Spaulding read it, etc. Mrs. Matilda Spaulding, wife of Solomon Spaulding, states in her testimony published in the Illinois Quincey *Whig*, that it was about a third as large as the Book of Mormon and that her daughter (Mrs. McKinstry) read it frequently. Hulburt who was commissioned by Henry Lake, John Miller, Aaron Wright, et al. (Braden's witnesses), to go and get the Spaulding writing, went and got it he says, and the only one in Spaulding's hand writing which the widow had. That he delivered it to E. D. Howe of Painsville, who was writing the book to break down the Mormons, and Howe says, page 288, of his book in describing it, that, "The trunk referred to by the widow was subsequently examined and found to contain only a single manuscript book in Spaulding's hand writing, containing about one quire of paper."

Then according to the description of the manuscript itself by those who actually saw it, it must have been a very small affair indeed in comparison to the historical portion of the Book of Mormon. In fact there was no comparison of the one, to the other, whatever.

But Howe goes further with his description and shows the style, subject, matter, history, and all different. This brings us to notice that the second proposition in my statement is true. This agrees with Mrs.

Spaulding's description of the "Manuscript Found." In the letter to the Boston *Recorder*, she says: "He (Mr. Spaulding) was enabled (while writing this manuscript) from his acquaintance with the classics and ancient history, to introduce many singular names which were particularly noticed by people and could readily be recognized by them." Page 43, Smucker against the Mormons.

Then in the same letter she says: "Mr Spaulding had a brother John Spaulding, residing in the place at the time, who was perfectly familiar with the work and *repeatedly heard the whole of it read.*" What an easy thing my audience for a man to read repeatedly, a manuscript of two thousand pages; besides it must have been the most enticing novel ever written. Just to think of *repeatedly* reading such a manuscript! Now I hope the friends won't be backward again about giving me their names for a copy of this enticing book, that can be had for only one dollar and a quarter. And thrown in this letter is Braden's theory that Mr Smith did all this copying, working, digging for money, traveling, studying, planning, delving,—what a lazy boy! in order to start a church. Ridiculous! Did you ever hear of such a theory? For men to work for years and years, and labor and hire men, and dig holes, and mine and sweat in order to get an excuse for starting a new church? Did not Mr. Campbell start a new church without any such an excuse? Did not Mr. Smith and Mr. Rigdon have as good a right to start a new church without all this as Mr. Campbell or Mr. Wesley or Mr. Luther or near a thousand others who have started new churches since the time of Christ? It seems to me that starting new churches is not confined simply to a few individuals; we have too many to admit of such an idea. And look everywhere you may and you cannot tell which is right unless you accept the doctrine which is taught in the New Testament, and abide by the rule, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." But my friend does not accept that doctrine.

Then again, "the old neighbors were enabled to identify it by reason of the names taken from the classical authors and ancient history." Were enabled to identify it by reason of these historical and classical names! Here you have set out by Mrs. Spaulding herself how they were enabled to identify the work. What name have they got? Why he found one the other night, I believe it was "Mormon." It was a Greek word. Will you show me the word "Mormon" in Greek as used in the Book of Mormon?

Mr. Braden: Yes sir.

Mr. Kelley: You say you will but you will never do it.

Mr. Braden: That is to be seen.

Mr. Kelley: There is such a term as *Mormo* that they think that the Greeks used just the same as we use the word "Mor-

mon." But to any person who will think a moment it is evident there is not and never was the slightest connection. The word *Mormo* was used to denote a hobgoblin, bug-bear, object of fright, etc. Mormon was simply a man's name as used in the Book of Mormon, the name of a place of pleasure, etc., and in no sense as the Greek word *Mormo* was used. The similarity of sound between the two when they are written in English argues nothing. I can show that words of similar sound, so far as that is concerned in different languages have no relation whatever either in derivation or meaning, and are never used by the people to indicate the same or similar things. That idea about the Greek word *Mormo* being the root of the word Mormon as found in this book is simply ridiculous. A thing gotten up by certain persons and tried to apply to the word as used in the Book of Mormon to deceive the ignorant. But I will see when Mr. Braden brings it.

But again: "Spaulding's manuscript represented an idolatrous people," they say. The Book of Mormon does not. The Spaulding "Manuscript Found" was delivered into the hands of this Dr P Hulburt who had got up all these lying affidavits, about Smith and the Book of Mormon and he takes it to Howe of Painsville, Ohio, the very place where they are trying to destroy the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. Howe because he was mad about his wife and sister joining the church, and Hulburt because he had been cut off from the church,—they take the manuscript under promise to Mrs. Davidson that they would publish and send her a copy and divide proceeds; and when she gets no returns she writes to them about it and they answer her. "It did not read like we expected and we did not use it." How about the manuscript now? Traced right into the hands of the bitterest opposers of the Book of Mormon by your own witnesses, and long after the publication of the Book of Mormon. This is the manuscript story which they are claiming was in the hand-writing of Solomon Spaulding who died before the publication of the Book of Mormon and whose hand writing could be identified by his manuscript sermons, as Mrs. Spaulding and Mrs. McKinstry testified;—and from such a manuscript as this ten words preserved in Mr. Solomon Spaulding's hand-writing would have been sufficient to have identified the two, if the Book of Mormon was the same, beyond all dispute whatever—and these opposers with their statements and affidavits in their hands, deliberately destroy the "Manuscript Found," which they got from Mrs. Spaulding (Davidson) and maliciously publish their statements. Here is "old come to pass," right in their own hands in the year 1834. Now who is the imposter; the deceiver? But further, when it is first published that Mrs. Spaulding (Davidson) claimed the Book of Mormon was a copy of the manuscript a gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Jesse Harper, visits at once Mrs. (Spaulding) Davidson, Mrs.

McKinstry, and Dr. Ely, in Massachusetts, and interviews these persons, and writes his account to the Quincy (Ill.) *Whig*, a bitter anti-Mormon journal, stating that in the interview he asked and received answers to the following questions, to wit:—

Q. "Have you read the Book of Mormon?"

A. I have read some of it.

Q. Does Mr. Spaulding's manuscript and the Book of Mormon agree?

A. I think some of the names are alike.

Q. Does the manuscript describe an idolatrous or a religious people?

A. An idolatrous people.

Q. Where is the manuscript?

A. Dr. P. Hulburt came here and took it, said he would get it printed and let me have one-half of the profits.

Q. Has Dr. Hulburt got the manuscript printed?

A. I have received a letter stating that it did not read as they expected and they should not print it.

Q. How large was the manuscript?

A. About one-third as large as the Book of Mormon."

(To Mrs. McKinstry.)

Q. "How old were you when your father wrote the manuscript?"

A. About five years of age.

Q. Did you ever read the manuscript?

A. When I was about twelve years of age I used to read it for a diversion.

Q. Did the manuscript describe an idolatrous or a religious people?

A. An idolatrous people.

Q. Does the manuscript and Book of Mormon agree?

A. I think some of the names agree.

Q. Are you certain that some of the names agree?

A. I am not.

Q. Have you ever read the Book of Mormon?

A. I have not."

Then the following interview with Mrs. McKinstry on April 4th, 1882, in Washington City:—

Q. "Mrs. McKinstry, have you the Manuscript Found, Mr. Solomon Spaulding is said to have written, in your possession?"

A. I have not.

Q. What became of it?

A. My Mother delivered it up for publication to a Mr. Hulburt who came to our house in Mass. for it, bearing letters of introduction from my uncle, a Mr. Sabine, a lawyer in New York State.

Q. Why do you not get the manuscript again?

A. I have sent for it but Hulburt claims he did not get any.

Q. Does Hulburt say he did not get any manuscript from your mother?

A. That is what he claims now.

Q. How do you account for the fact Mrs. McKinstry that your father, while being such a good man and a minister, should write such a bad book as the Book of Mormon?

A. Well we never could account for that.

Q. Could you identify the manuscript was it now produced?

A. I don't think I could.

Q. Have you any of the old writings and manuscripts of Mr. Spaulding?

A. Yes, I have some leaves of his sermons.

Q. And with these you think you could not identify the manuscript?

A. No, sir, I think not.

(Mrs. Col. Seaton, who is present at the interview.)

Why yes, mother, if you have his writing you ought to identify it.

Mrs. McKinstry: Well, perhaps I could.

Q. Was it written on common foolscap paper or the clergymen note paper?

A. It must have been written on foolscap as they had no clergymen note paper in those days.

Q. How do you come to remember any of the names that were in that manuscript?

A. Well, I suppose I should not, but Mr. Spaulding had a way of making a very fancy capital letter at the beginning of a chapter and I remembered the name Lehi, I think it was, from its being written this way."

That is the way she identified it—on account of the word Lehi beginning with a very fancy capital letter. Suppose instead of being Lehi the word had been Levi. Would not the capital letter have been just the same and might there not have been the same fancy about it? And still a different thing altogether. Instead of being Levi, suppose it had been Lincoln. There would have been the same fancy capital letter. But perhaps I ought to read the evidence without comment, and make my comment afterwards, so I return to that. The question is asked:—

Q. "When did you first think about the names in the Book of Mormon and the manuscript agreeing?"

A. My attention was first called to it by some parties who asked me if I did not remember it, and then I remembered that they were."

These parties were the old neighbors; Aaron Wright, Miller, etc.

Did you ever have a case in court, my friends? If so, did you ever know the man on the other side to go to certain parties and say, "Now, see here, you are a good friend of mine and I am in a little trouble and I guess you know something to help me out. Don't you remember that a certain fellow upon a certain day said a certain thing?—And I will tell you what it was now, and see if you don't remember it?" Why! there is so much evidence manufactured in this country in that way that corruption is beginning to rule inasmuch that it is thought that never in the history of the world before, did so much evil creep into courts of justice, by reason of the manufacturing of testimony and suborning of witnesses.

I again call your attention to the thought:—After her attention was called to it by these good, estimable, best citizens, etc., then she thought she remembered it.

Q. "Was you acquainted with Joseph Smith?"

A. No. I never heard tell of him till I heard of the Book of Mormon.

Q. Was Sidney Rigdon ever about your father's house?

A. No, I never saw him."

August, 1883, is another important interview.

I will give the evidence of Mr. Howe, but not claim it as evidence if my friend upon the other side of the question will put him on the stand here for cross-examination. I want you to listen to his examination. It is as follows:—

Q. "Mr. Howe, did Hulburt bring the manuscript to you he got of Mrs. (Spaulding) Davidson?"

A. Yes, he brought one; but it was not the one we wanted; it only told about some tribes of Indians and their wars along the lakes here and pretended to be the writing of some shipwrecked crew. It was the wars of the Winnebagoes, Chicagos or Niagaries, I believe.

Q. Why did you not publish it?

A. Because it did not do us any good."

Now, who has got the stolen property that he has made such a parade over? These other parties who are seeking for evidence in order to show that Mr. Smith has stolen property in his possession go and get the original manuscript—the manuscript in the handwriting of Solomon Spaulding—in the penmanship of Solomon Spaulding, and they bring it here to Painsville, Ohio, and it is traced into the hands of Mr. Howe and Mr. Hulburt, the ones that are determined to crush out the faith of the church:—And what do they do? Publish it? Keep it? Preserve it? Oh, no! "They did not use it." Why did they not use it? The reason is too evident to require naming. Ten words preserved in Mr. Spaulding's handwriting would have been sufficient to have identified the two if the Book of Mormon was the same. And these opposers, both sworn enemies of Mr. Smith and the Book of Mormon with their affidavits in their hands,

deliberately destroyed the "Manuscript Found," which they got from Mrs. (Spaulding) Davidson, and published their statements and affidavits, instead of the manuscript that they got. Mind you they got the "Manuscript Found," and the only one ever so called in fact, and I will show that they did. I know that Mr. Howe tried to make a dodge afterwards and say that Spaulding had another manuscript called the "Roman Manuscript," so my opponent says; but Mr. Howe last summer did not give it as the Roman Manuscript, and I am prepared to prove that he said it treated of some Indian wars along the lakes here, too. And prepared to prove it with such testimony as will impeach him, so that if he will put himself under oath, I can send him to the penitentiary of Ohio for it. I have asked you (Mr. Braden) to put him on the stand here for examination and you dare not. I make these statements fearlessly, because I want the truth of this; one witness that heard him make such statement is upon the stand here now.

Now, who is the imposter, the deceiver?

But I will continue with Mr. Howe's statement of last summer: "What do you know personally about the Book of Mormon and the Spaulding story being the same?"

A. I don't know anything.

Q. Why did you publish a work claiming that the Book of Mormon was the Spaulding Romance?

A. Because I could better believe that Spaulding wrote it than that Joe Smith saw an angel.

Q. Are those your grounds?

A. Yes, sir, they are; and I want you to understand that you can't cram the Book of Mormon down me."

No, sir! Not down him. He is on Mr. Braden's side.

Q. "Do you swallow the Bible?"

A. That is my business.

Q. Have you not published a pamphlet which does not endorse the Bible?

A. Yes, I have."

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is pretended that the plates were shown to three witnesses early in June, and shortly after to eight more. A contract is made with E. B. Grandin of Palmyra, to publish the book, Harris mortgages his farm to pay for printing, and in return has a monopoly of the new revelation, that is "the fullness of the gospel." He intends "to make money out of it even if it is a lie" he tells his wife.

The manuscript is carried to the printer with a great deal of tom foolery. Smith has two guards to protect his sacred person. The manuscript is to be seen only by the printer, and the elect. It is all to be taken out of the office each night by the elect.

Rigdon preaches more wildly than ever. Is absent from home much of his time. Some of his adherents in Kirtland adopt his community of goods, and organize a community, wash feet, etc.

1830—The Book of Mormon comes from the press in the latter part of the winter, with the name of Joseph Smith on it as "Auther and Proprietor." April 6th the first Mormon church is organized at Smith's in Manchester, N. Y. In June the first Mormon conference is held in Fayette, N. Y.

Rigdon attends for the last time the Disciple Association of Mahoning, held in Austintown. Here he makes his last effort to engraft his hobbies on to the movement of the Disciples. Campbell exposes their extravagant unscriptural character. Rigdon preaches his famous sermon on "King Ahasuerus' horse" and leaves the Disciples forever, utterly soured and disappointed. He remarks to Mr. Austin of Warren: "I have done as much for the Reformation as Campbell or Scott, yet they get all the glory."

He goes back to Mentor, and sends for Pratt, who comes through Mentor in August, and goes from Rigdon straight to Smith, thirty miles off all public thoroughfares, travels a great distance, and reaches Smith's Saturday night, just as meeting begins, is converted, on the spot, and made a preacher of Mormonism the next day.

In October, Pratt, Cowdry and Whitmer come to Mentor. Rigdon pretends to be ignorant of the whole affair, and to oppose it for a day or so, then is miraculously converted by a silly vision. In December he goes to Smith in New York, preaches the first and only Mormon sermon ever preached in Palmyra. Is recognized as the "mysterious stranger" who has been visiting Smith during the last two years.

Mrs. Davidson, Spaulding's wife and widow, goes to Munson, Massachusetts, to live with her daughter, Mrs. McKinstry. She left the trunk that contained her husband's papers, all that she had of them, in her possession, in the care of her brother-in-law, Jerome Clark, of Hartwicke, New York.

1831—Joseph and Sidney get a revelation that the Mormons should move to Kirtland, Ohio, which is to be theirs forever. May 17th the Elders were sent out by two June 7th the first endowment given. The Rigdonites all over the Western Reserve fall in with Mormonism, and the imposture is in full blast.

June 17th, in obedience to direct revelation, Joseph Smith and a party start for Western Missouri to locate "Zion." August 3rd Joseph locates the corner of the Temple of Zion, three hundred yards west of the Court House in Independence, Missouri. Floods of revelations are poured out. A city with golden streets, a Temple that never had been equalled, and other wonders were to spring up in that generation.

1832—February 16th, Rigdon and Smith have a sky-scraping revelation. Rigdon mounts "King Ahasuerus' horse" and cavorts miraculously and generally all over the universe. March 22, Rigdon and Smith are tarred and feathered in Hiram, Portage county, by persons that have been swindled by their lies and for Smith's amours.

Joseph Smith visits Missouri. It is high time. By their threats and boasts, the Mormons had aroused the Missourians. They were also in a general row among themselves, over Rigdon's pet idea—community of goods.

1833—March 8th. In order to keep Sidney quiet, who finds that Joseph Smith, whom he expected to use as his tool, has gobbled all the results of their fraud, Rigdon is made councillor with root and herb quack. F. G. Williams, and the first Presidency is organized. July 23, Joseph Smith lays the foundation of Kirtland Temple. Citizens of Missouri extort a promise from Mormons that half of them will leave before January 1st, 1834, the rest before April 1. October 30th Missourians destroy ten Mormon houses. Mormons kill two Missourians and shed the first blood in the war.

1834—Feb. 20th. Joseph Smith starts on a fool's crusade, with a band of men to Missouri. They find a skeleton in a mound in Pike county, Ills. Joseph

Smith has a grand old time revealing over it. This crusade which began and was carried on amid a flood of revelations so-called, and had been attended with suffering, sickness and death, ends in a fizzle in central Missouri. The fools that were not dead begged their way home.

Joseph Smith, whose head had been made giddy by his elevation from a loafing money hunter to that of a prophet, began to talk about the saints conquering the world, spoiling their enemies, ruling over the Gentiles, and announced that he would be the Mohammed of the century.

July 29th. Joseph Smith returns to Kirtland and finds the saints in a miscellaneous row. Sidney had just smashed things in his absence. He wanted the saints to build him as fine a house as the prophet had, and to give him a gold watch, and rig him up generally as fine as they had the prophet.

During this year a Mormon preacher had preached in Conneaut, Ohio, and read from the Book of Mormon. Solomon Spaulding's old acquaintances recognized his Manuscript Found. Squire Wright shouted out: "Old come to pass has come to life." There was great excitement over the discovery of the theft. D. P. Hurlbut who was getting up an expose of Mormonism, was sent by the citizens of Conneaut to Mrs. Davidson, to get the manuscript of her former husband, Solomon Spaulding. She gave Hurlbut an order authorizing him to go to Clark's, in Hartwicke, N. Y., where she left the trunk with her husband's papers, and get them.

Hurlbut gets a manuscript of the Manuscript Found, writes to Mrs. Davidson that he got it. He gives to those who sent him an entirely different manuscript. Lies and says that is all he obtained. He sells the manuscript of Manuscript Found to Mormons for \$400 and goes to western Ohio and buys a farm. Never answers the letters of Mrs. Davidson and her daughter in regard to the manuscript he obtained.

1835—Feb. 14. The first quorum of apostles were ordained in Kirtland, and Young and Kimball were among the holy number. Classes of instruction and schools of prophets were established. Orson Pratt invents a new celestial alphabet for the saints. Why did he not adopt the reformed Egyptian from Smith's plates? Mormons have a craze of studying Hebrew. What need was there for that among people who had the gift of tongues? Rigdon delivers six lectures on faith. All their sense and the scriptural ideas in them are what he heard among the Disciples. They are about the only sensible thing in Mormonism—that

is after Rigdon's Mormon stuff had been thrown out. Mormons have tried to rob Rigdon of the credit of being author of these lectures, and give it to Joseph Smith. Rigdon did the lion's work in bringing down the game and Joseph took the lion's share, and scarcely left to Rigdon the bones that the lion leaves for the jackal.

1836—Kirtland Temple finished at a cost of \$40,000, dedicated March 29. Smith pretends that he sees the house full of angels—that a pillar of fire was seen on the temple—that outsiders heard a great noise—that caused them to flock to the Temple. That the Mormons spoke with tongues. That Jesus, Moses, Elias, — who was he, — and Elijah appeared to him, gave him keys of priesthood, which had been promised years before.

June 29. The Mormons in Clay county, Missouri, are requested to move to Davis, Jackson, and Caldwell counties, because they had been impudent, domineering, and had encroached on the rights of the rest of the citizens. They wisely decided to move and do so, and are kindly treated by the Missourians.

1837—In January, Orson Hyde and Kimball are sent to England as missionaries.

In the spring the Mormon Wild Cat Bank is started in violation of law without a charter. The Mormons have a big hotel, tannery, mill, factory, big stores and big things generally. Smith and other leaders build fine houses, live like nabobs and dress like fops on other peoples' money and goods obtained by credit, fraud and rascality. Things are booming in Kirtland.

In November Joseph's Wild Cat Bank, his printing office, his big store, his mills, his big land speculation, blew up generally. Rigdon and Smith are fined one thousand dollars each for their swindling bank frauds. Printing office levied on and Smith declared insolvent with all his revelations.

The printing office sold. The Mormons burn the printing office and the Methodist church.

1838—January 12th, Smith and Rigdon light out in the night to escape the penitentiary for swindling and fraud.

They arrive in Missouri in March. They scatter the saints over several counties in order to obtain political ascendancy. The Missourians begin to be alarmed, when they see that the Mormons elect none but Mormons, and that their property and rights are taken from them, and Mormons will give them no protection.

Smith who had tried to seduce a woman in Pennsylvania, and who had much trouble in Kirtland about his intrigues with beautiful sisters, now began to tell his confidants that he had received

arevelation in favor of spiritual wifery, Rigdon's doctrine.

Rigdon, Smith, Cowdery and other leading Mormons had practised lewdness and adultery and Rigdon defended it with his spiritual wifery. Now Smith told his intimates that he had received a revelation sanctioning it. He did not reduce his revelation to writing but he practised its ideas more openly.

This was one objection that Missourians urged to Mormons. Their loose conduct and family relations and the illegitimate children among them.

July 4th. Rigdon delivers his bombastic harangue, that the Mormons call "Sidney's Salt Sermon." He mounts King Ahasuerus' horse and cavorts, breathing defiance and destruction to Missourians and apostates.

The Danite Band is organized with Smith's sanction and authority, under David Patton, one of the twelve apostles. Dr. Arvard, a leading Mormon, instructs them that it is their mission to defend Mormons in their crimes, by lying, stealing, perjury, profanity and murder.

Oliver Cowdery, Martin Harris and David Whitmer, the three witnesses charging with lying, stealing, counterfeiting and defaming Smith are cut off.

Orson Hyde, T. B. Marsh, W. W. Phelps and many other leading Mormons apostatize. They accuse the Mormons of stealing, murder and other crimes. They accuse Smith with planning and being active in the outrages of the Danites and the rest of the Mormons.

Sidney Rigdon and 84 other Mormons retort by accusing the apostates with many infamous crimes. Outsiders conclude that rogues have fallen out and decent people are learning the facts. That both sides tell the truth on each other.

Several quarrels occur between Missourians and Mormons. The Mormons steal eighty stand of arms at Richmond, Mo. They fire on the inhabitants at Crooked River, and kill several. The inhabitants return the fire and kill Patton, the Mormon Commander.

Sept 30. In retaliation for the murder of their companions, the militia massacre and outrage Mormons at Hahn's Mill.

The Mormons are driven out of Missouri. Are given homes, food, clothing and sympathy by the people of Illinois. This should be remembered. The citizens of the Western Reserve, Ohio, treated them kindly until Mormon conduct exasperated them beyond endurance.

The Missourians were glad to see their country settle up until Mormon outrages, insolence and crime enraged them. Then their conduct became outrageous, but Mormons began the trouble.

The people of Illinois were lavish in their kindness and favors. No emigrants were ever loaded with favors as were the Mormons by the people of Illinois.

Smith was arrested by the militia, who were determined to shoot him. He and leading Mormons handed over to civil authorities. They allow them to escape believing that to be the best way to get rid of them.

1839—March 25, Brigham Young and others relay the corner-stone of the Temple. The Elders cut off many that had been leading Mormons, for crimes they charged them with.

May 9. Smith goes to Commerce, Illinois. Dr. Galland gives him a great tract of land. Smith immediately gets a revelation that Zion is on his land. He calls the Mormons to his land, and sells to them what was given to him, and becomes uncommonly rich for that day and country.

September, Brigham Young and Kimball are sent to England. Orson Pratt does not go although revelation said he would.

October, Smith goes to Washington to get redress from the general government for wrongs to the Mormons in Missouri.

1840—April 21. The name of Commerce is changed by revelation to Nauvoo, which in Smith's reformed Egyptian means beautiful.

The Mormons began to build a temple at Nauvoo, although revelation had declared that a temple should be built in no other place than at Zion, near Independence, Mo.

October, Mormons petition for a charter. It is granted. They are given a charter granting them powers that no government but an absolute despotism exercises.

1841—February. The charter goes into operation. Nauvoo is organized an independent nation almost under it.

Nauvoo Legion is organized with Smith as Lieutenant General, and with as many Major Generals, Brigadier Generals and Colonels, as would have officered both armies in our civil war.

April 6. The corner-stone of Nauvoo Temple laid with great military parade, by Smith, although he had declared not ten years before that the only Temple that should be built and that speedily, was at Zion near independence, Mo.

1842—Smith sends his Danite assassin, Port Rockwell, as he said, "to fulfill prophecy" in assassinating Ex-Gov. Boggs of Missouri.

Smith and other leading Mormons practiced spiritual wifery still more openly. It leads to trouble between him and his wife. She drives his concubines out of the house.

1843—in January Smith uses Jacobs as a cat's-paw to try the mass of uninitia-

ted Mormons, in regard to polygamy. Smith and Jacobs select all passages of the Old Testament that refer to polygamy, and publish them in the "Wasp" a Nauvoo paper, with comments, and special pleading justifying polygamy. It creates great excitement among the Mormons, that are not admitted behind the curtain of its mysteries.

May 11, 1843, Smith sealed to Eliza Partridge, Emily Partridge, Maria Lawrence, and Sarah Lawrence, in the presence of Emma Smith, his wife, and Lovinia Smith his brother Hyram Smith's daughter, by James Adams a High Priest of Mormonism.

Smith hypocritically denied any connection with the doctrine avowed by Jacobs, and denounced it. But he had taught it to too many—had practiced it too long, and with too many—had sealed too many in polygamy, too many leading Mormons had practiced it too long, and too much for it to be concealed.

Too many others had learned of the practice and were eager to gratify their lusts as Smith had done, and as other leaders had done. Smith's wife and others had to be pacified and quieted.

July 12. Smith dictated to Wm. Clayton the infamy, that he blasphemously called "A Revelation in Regard to Celestial Marriage."

Joseph C. Kingsbury and N. K. Whitney took a copy of it. Then it was showed to Joseph's wife. The indignant and outraged wife denounced it as from hell and burned it.

Kimball, Hiram Smith, Hyde, and at last the Pratts accepted it.

August 12. The revelation is accepted and indorsed by the twelve in High Council.

1844—February. Smith announces himself as candidate for the Presidency of the United States, to the great delight of the Saints.

Trouble had been brewing between the Mormons and the people of Illinois, who received them so generously and kindly. The Mormons elect Mormons only to office in Hancock county. They had the entire control of all administration of justice in Nauvoo. The rights of citizens were outraged and they could get no redress. They lost property and traced it to Nauvoo, and their attempts to recover it only exposed them to danger in Nauvoo, and to retaliation and injury from the Mormons.

Mormons were insolent and tried to drive Gentiles out of the entire country that they had control of. The law and the rights of the others were trampled on by Mormons, until the outraged people of Illinois rose in arms in self-defense.

In addition to this the testimony of Higby, Martha Brotherton and scores

of others in regard to the pollutions of Smith and the leading Mormons in the Endowment Rooms, and their polygamy or spiritual wifery, increased the indignation of an incensed people.

April. Smith tries to seduce Nancy Rigdon the daughter of Sidney Rigdon the author of the doctrine of spiritual wifery—the wife of Wm. Law—the wife of Dr. Foster and others. The incensed husbands and fathers start a paper the "Nauvoo Expositor" to expose Smith and his confederates in their infamies.

June. The first number contained the affidavits of sixteen ladies of the highest standing in Nauvoo, testifying that Smith and his confederates in infamy, leading Mormons, had tried to seduce them into lewdness called spiritual wifery.

Smith gets his tools in the council to pronounce it a nuisance and orders its destruction. Law, Foster and others flee for their lives, Dr. Foster flees to Carthage for his life pursued by Danites.

He sues out a writ for Smith's arrest. Mormons prepare to resist. Smith refuses to obey the writ.

The State military forces propose to enter Nauvoo and take Smith. He flees. Marks and Smith's wife indignantly call him back.

Smith goes to Carthage declaring that his hellish spiritual wife doctrine had brought him into the condition in which he stood and would cost him his life.

The conscience-smitten guilty wretch meets his fate by assassination June 27, in Carthage jail.

* The mass of the Mormons follow the lead of the Twelve Apostles and that of Priapus Young and migrate to Utah.

Small bands follow the lead of Rigdon, Law, Cutler, Strang, and others during the years from 1844 to 1852.

1850—William Smith, brother of Joseph, calls a conference in Covington, Kentucky.

1852—June 1. A conference held in Beloit, Wis. through the efforts of J. W. Briggs.

In October a conference held in Lafayette county, Wisconsin.

1853—In January the Committee of Elders of the Josephites issue a manifesto to reject polygamy.

April 16. Conference in Lafayette county, Wisconsin. Nothing special seems to have been done.

1860—In April at the conference at Amboy, Illinois, Joseph Smith, son of the prophet—so called—took his father's place in that portion of the Mormons who called themselves; "The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints," who reject Priapus Young and his polygamy.

1860 to 1884--the record is merely a record of Conferences and no important or startling events are to be recorded.

Unless it be the visit of Joseph III to Utah and his discussion in his paper with the Brighamites over the issue "Was Joseph Smith II the author of polygamy, and the revelation in favor of so called celestial marriage, dated July 12, 1843.

In this discussion Joseph III comes out badly worsted. While one may sympathize with his desire to rescue his father's name from infamy, the facts of history are against him.

QUESTIONS FOR KELLEY.

I. Do you deny the clear and positive declaration of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Miss Martha Spaulding, John Spaulding, Mrs. John Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Smith, Wright, Howard, Cunningham, Joseph Miller, McKee, Dr. Dodd, Jackson, and Sidney Rigdon to Dr. Winter, that Solomon Spaulding wrote a historical romance in Bible style? If you do, on what ground do you deny it? Do you deny that the witnesses gave such testimony? Do you impeach the witnesses? Do you rebut the testimony.

II. Do you deny the statement of the witnesses concerning the plot of the romance? That it was precisely as they stated it, the plot in one other book, and only one other, the Book of Mormon?

III. Do you deny the positive statements of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Miss Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Smith, Wright, Howard, Cunningham, Jas. Miller, McKee, Dr. Dodd, Jackson and Rigdon to Winter, that it purported to be a veritable history of the aborigines of America?

IV. Do you deny the positive statements of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Miss Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Wright, Howard, Smith, Cunningham, that it attempted to account for the construction of the antiquities of America, by giving a veritable history of their construction?

V. Do you deny the statements of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Smith, J. N. Miller, Wright, Cunningham, Jackson, that it attempted to prove that the Israelites were the aborigines of America, by giving the history of such aborigines?

VI. Do you deny the statement of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Wright, Smith, and Jackson, that Spaulding gave an account of their leaving Jerusalem, to start their migration?

VII. Do you deny the statement of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, J. N. Miller, Smith and Jackson, that he delineated their journey by land and sea, until they reached America?

VIII. Do you deny the statement of Miss Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Smith, Cunningham, and Jackson that he represented Lehi and Nephi to be their leaders?

IX. Do you deny the statements of Mrs. J. Spaulding, J. Spaulding and Jackson,

that they quarreled and divided into two parties, the Nephites and Lamanites?

X. Do you deny the statements of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, and Jackson, that in the wars between the Nephites and Lamanites and between the parties into which these nations divided, there were awful slaughters, such as are unprecedented in any other wars?

XI. Do you deny the statements of J. Spaulding, and Mrs. J. Spaulding that they buried their dead after the awful slaughters in great heaps, which caused the mounds, found in America?

XII. Do you deny the statement of Mrs. S. Spaulding and Jackson that after these slaughters, persons who were sole survivors wrote a record of their people?

XIII. Do you deny the statement of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Lake, and Jackson that the survivors buried the records in the earth?

XIV. Do you deny the statement of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Lake and Cunningham, that this history was found in the earth, where it had been buried:

XV. Do you deny the statement of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, J. N. Miller, and Smith that it gave an account of the civilization, arts, sciences, laws and customs of the aborigines of America?

XVI. Do you deny the statement of J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Wright and Rigdon to Winters, that these aborigines were the ancestors of our present Indians?

XVII. Do you deny the statements of Miss Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Smith, Wright, J. N. Miller, Cunningham, and Jackson, that it contains the names Nephi, Lehi, Laban, Nephite, Lamanite, Mormon, Moroni, Zarahemla, etc.?

XVIII. Do you deny the statement that in every instance the names were the names of the same places and persons, with the same characteristics and history, as the names in the Book of Mormon?

XIX. Do you deny the statements of Mrs. S. Spaulding, Miss Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Lake, Jas. Miller, Smith, Cunningham, Jackson, and Rigdon to Winter, that it was written in scriptural style?

XX. Do you deny the statement of Mrs. S. Spaulding, J. Spaulding, Mrs. J. Spaulding, Jas. Miller, Lake, and Cunningham, that the manuscript was rendered absurd by its beginning nearly every sentence with: "And it came to pass," "Now it came to pass"?

XXI. Do you deny the statement of Jackson that Spaulding got the nick-name of "Old come to pass" from this absurdity?

XXII. Do you deny the statement of Smith that one party left Jerusalem to escape divine judgments about to fall on the Israelites?

XXIII. Do you deny the statement of J. N. Miller that one party landed at the Isthmus of Darien, and called the land of Zarahemla, and traveled across the continent to the northeast?

XXIV. Do you deny the statement of Jas.

Miller and McKee, that in a battle between the Amlicites and Lamanites the Amlicites marked their foreheads with red crosses to distinguish them from their enemies?

XXV. Do you deny the statement that the Spaulding manuscript could have been used for a pretended revelation, an addition to the Bible?

XXVI. Do you deny the fact that there never have been but two books, the Spaulding Manuscript Found and the Book of Mormon, that had these features, that ever had a single one of them? How do you account for the fact that these two books agree in all these great features, and in all particulars, except the religious portion, as accurately as any author can reproduce from memory his manuscript, and more accurately than most authors, with but very rare exception could reproduce their manuscript? Do you claim that by miracle Spaulding wrote exactly what Joseph Smith had given to him by the angel twenty years afterwards?

XXVII. Do you deny that when a Mormon preacher read to a Conneaut audience portions of the Book of Mormon, that Spaulding's old acquaintances recognized his Manuscript Found?

Do you deny that Mrs. Davidson declared as she gave the MS of the Manuscript Found to Mrs. George Clark to read that the Mormon Bible was almost a literal reproduction of that manuscript?

XXVIII. Do you deny that Spaulding in the seven years prepared several MS several drafts of the story? That as James Miller, Miss Spaulding and Rigdon declare that he prepared and sent to the printer for publication a copy of his story?

XXIX. Do you deny Mrs. Eichbaum's statement that Rigdon was intimate with Lambdin and hung around the office of Patterson, where Spaulding's MS was taken, until Engles, the foreman, complained of it?

XXX. Do you deny the statement of Mrs. S. Spaulding that he took great interest in the story?

XXXI. Do you deny the statement of Jas. Miller, Dr. Dodd and McKee that Spaulding said that his MS had been stolen and that Rigdon was blamed with the theft?

XXXII. Do you deny the statement of Dr. Winter that Rigdon showed him the MS in 1822 or '3 stating that it was a Bible romance, written by Spaulding, a Presbyterian preacher, and left by Spaulding at a printers, and that he had borrowed it, as a curiosity?

XXXIII. Do you deny Mrs. Dunlap's statement that her uncle Rigdon had the MS and spent so much time on it that his wife threatened to burn it, and he replied, "It will be a great thing some day."

Do you deny Jeffrie's statement that Rigdon told him that he took Spaulding's MS from the printers and gave it to Smith to publish?

XXXIV. Do you deny that Rigdon foretold the publication of the Book of Mormon years before it appeared, to A. Campbell, A. Bently and D. Atwater—that it was dug out of the earth, engraved on gold plates, was a history of the aborigines of this continent, gave a history of the origin of American antiquities—that it said that the gospel had been preached in America in the first century of our era just as the Disciples were then preaching it on the Reserve?

XXXV. Do you deny the positive statement of Z. Rudolph and other old acquaintances that Rigdon was frequently absent from home for weeks while the Book of Mormon was being prepared for the press, and gave no account of where he had been?

XXXVI. Do you deny the statement of old acquaintances and neighbors of the Smiths, Tucker, Mrs. Eaton, Chase, Sanders and McAuley that Rigdon was seen at Smith's residence before the Book of Mormon appeared?

XXXVII. Do you deny that Rigdon preached as his peculiar hobbies the peculiar features of the Book of Mormon, the community of goods, restoration of spiritual gifts, millennial ideas, his old baptistic opposition to secret societies, etc., as Green J. Rudolph, Dille and others state?

XXXVIII. Do you deny that the Book of Mormon approves of what Rigdon approved of before its appearance, and condemns what he condemned?

XXXIX. Do you deny that where he differs from the Disciples the Book of Mormon differs from them, and that it is peculiarly bitter on those points?

XL. Will you tell us: Did Rigdon by miracle preach the doctrines of the Book of Mormon before it appeared? Or did he interpolate his hobbies into the MS he had stolen from Spaulding, when he was preparing it to be used as a pretended revelation?

XLI. On what ground do you assail the evidence? Do you deny that the witnesses so testified? If so, specify what witness?

XLII. Do you assail their character or attempt to impeach them? If so, specify what witness? On what ground?

XLIII. Do you try to rebut their testimony? If so, what witness do you attack? What rebutting evidence or witnesses do you introduce?

XLIV. Do you attempt to show defects in their testimony? If so, what witness do you assail? What are the defects in the testimony of each?

Until Mormons answer these queries let them stop their brazen sneers at the "Spaulding story" that are almost idiotic in their lack of reason or argument. Kelly will not, dare not answer these queries. The Prophet, the three I'd Joseph dare not publish them in his paper and answer them in order one by one.

MR. KELLEY'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—In the concluding speech of my opponent on last evening he undertook to show you that he had been fair in reading from his papers as I have been in my argument. I claim that he ought to present in full his important statements and affidavits, especially so, since they ought to be in the argument if published, as they are not accessible to but few people; and that if the statements in full are presented I claim they bear the stamp of condemnation upon their face. To permit him to read a small portion here, and then run the entire thing in the book would not be fair either, as that would give him an undue advantage in space, (and time consequently) in the discussion. Besides, it would not be his matter in fact and I would have no opportunity of reviewing it here, and a statement or affidavit which he relies upon and wishes his hearers to, in making his affirmative statements good I claim he ought to introduce in full.

He turns around and says: "Kelley has done that all the time. Hasn't he read a bit here and another bit there from the Bible?" Now if I did that, without reading or introducing sometime the full connection, I did not do right. But I deny that I have scrapped in this manner. When I have read to you from the Bible I have read to you the full connection. But this is different from his affidavits or statements in more ways than one. All persons have the Bible at hand so that when a passage is cited they can turn and read for themselves. Again there is no contest on the Bible here. We have agreed that it is the standard of investigation, and I abide by it as heartily as he. Not so with his purported statements and affidavits.

They are not admitted, but absolutely denied, and to come then and stand the test as evidence they must appear in full, with time, place, circumstances, and reasons for making, etc. At best, they are such a doubtful class of proofs that the rules of evidence regard them with grave suspicion from any standpoint, and courts pay very little if any regard to them. They are not in their character to be considered in the nature of reliable evidence. Then we ought to have in this discussion a full, fair look at them. Last evening in my introduction of evidence I read several full statements. There were one or two statements of witnesses that I merely referred to, but not those upon any very important matter. I wish to state another thing before entering upon the argument. I have objected throughout this discussion to his manner of misrepresenting my views to the audience under the cloak of pretending to tell what I believe. Some of you may have thought that I was particular

about this and that it was simply because I claimed the right to represent my own belief and views and those of the Latter Day Saints that I have so strenuously objected. But this is not the fact. The real reason is, because I see my opponent is laboring under a mania. It is an old habit I find of Mr. Braden of misstating or at least of misunderstanding the views of others. He misjudges evidently others from reading their views. I have before me A. Wilford Hall's *Microcosm*, one of the ablest journals that is published in the United States; and the editor, A. Wilford Hall, Ph. B., in reviewing an article of Mr. Braden in the January number, 1884, says:—

"We simply state for President Braden's information that we never taught or thought of teaching any such doctrine as he has attributed to us. We never once intimated or even thought that matter was made out of spirit. We never thought of teaching that God took a portion of his spirit and condensed it into a material world. We never dreamt of teaching that there are but two substances in the universe, much less one, and that these two substances are spirit and matter. We hold, on the contrary, and distinctly teach that there are many essentially different substances in the universe under the general classification of material and immaterial entities, and that, spirit essence belongs among the immaterial substances of nature. How President Braden could deliberately assert and repeat it in different forms of expression about twenty times that we teach but one substance,—spirit,—and that matter came into existence by the condensation of spirit, is a mystery we leave the reader to solve."

Now, I read this to show you that sometimes he misapprehends and misstates other men's meaning, and I want him to be more careful when he undertakes to give my views to the audience, or be patient till I give them myself. If he does not, I shall bring some very serious things against him here, too.

When my time was called upon last evening I had just finished reading the statement of Mrs. Solomon Spaulding, her daughter Mrs. McKinstry, Mr. Howe, and a second account of Mrs. McKinstry, the only persons of whom we have any account who ever had knowledge sufficient to testify as to the character of the manuscript Mr. Spaulding wrote except Hulburt;—reading from the statements of the witnesses to show what kind of a manuscript, if any, Spaulding ever wrote. What do these witnesses' statements show as thus read, giving them full credit,—and they are all bitterly partizan and prejudiced against the Saints?

1. That the manuscript they claim Solomon Spaulding wrote was about one-third as large as the Book of Mormon.

2. That this manuscript contained many singular names from the classics and ancient history not one of which is common to the Book of Mormon, or in any way similar.

3. That the Spaulding manuscript treated of an idolatrous and not a religious people.

4. That it was a speculation as to the "ten tribes" having come to this country.

5. That neither of the persons who actually saw the Spaulding manuscript could identify a single word in it as being like the Book of Mormon.

6. That the manuscript, whatever it contained, they gave to Mr. Hulburt who gave it to Howe, these being the two who were trying to get up a work against the Mormons.

7. That afterwards Hulburt and Howe wrote back word that they did not use it because it did not read as they expected.

Now I will introduce Hulburt's statement as published by another enemy of the book, Mr. Patterson of Pittsburg. Hulburt writes:

"GIBSONBURG, OHIO., Aug. 19, 1879.

"I visited Mrs. Matilda (Spaulding) Davidson at Monson, Vass., in 1834, and never saw her afterwards. I then received from her a manuscript of her husband's which I did not read but brought home with me and immediately gave it to Mr. E. D. Howe, of Painesville, Ohio, who was then engaged in preparing his book, 'Mormonism Unveiled.' I do not know whether or not the document I received from Mrs. Davidson was Spaulding's 'Manuscript Found,' as I never read it; but whatever it was Mr. Howe received it under the condition on which I took it from Mrs. Davidson, to compare it with the Book of Mormon and then return it to her. I never received any other manuscript of Spaulding's from Mrs. Davidson or any one else. Of that manuscript I made no other use than to give it, with all my other documents connected with Mormonism, to Mr. Howe. I did not destroy the manuscript nor dispose of it to Joe Smith nor to any other person. No promise was made by me to Mrs. Davidson that she should receive any portion of profits arising from the publication of the manuscript if it should be published. All the affidavits procured by me for Mr. Howe's book, including all those from Palmyra, N. Y., were certainly genuine. D. P. HULBURT."

With this I refer you to the statement of Mr. Howe, Hulburt's partner in the business of publishing the story, as made by himself, see *Mormonism Unveiled*, page 288, as follows:

"The trunk referred to by the widow was subsequently examined, and found to contain only a single manuscript book in Spaulding's handwriting, containing about one quire of paper. This is a romance purporting to have been translated from the Latin, found on 24 rolls of parchment in a cave on the banks of Conneaut creek, but written in modern style, and giving a fabulous account of a ship's being driven upon the American coast while proceeding from Rome to Britain, a short time previous to the Christian era, this country then being inhabited by the Indians. This old manuscript has been shown to several of the foregoing witnesses who recognize it as Spaulding's, he having told them that he altered his first plan of writing, by going farther back with dates, and writing in the old scripture style, in order that it might appear more ancient. They say that it bears no resemblance to the 'Manuscript Found.'"

It was never taken back to Mrs. Spaulding, the widow, or to Mrs. McKinstry, the daughter, from whom it was obtained, and the only persons in existence competent of identifying the 'Manuscript Found,' but carried up to a few of the 'old neighbors,' who were at war with the Saints, and who said they heard the 'Manuscript Found,' read twenty-three years before, for identification.

They say, says Howe, it bears no resemblance to the manuscript. But it is evident that they lied, if they said so, for Howe who read it says:

"This is a Romance, purporting to have been translated from the Lat n, found on 24 rolls of parchment in a cave on the banks of Conneaut Creek, but written in modern

style, and giving a fabulous account of a ship's crew being driven upon the American coast while proceeding from Rome to Britain a short time previous to the Christian era, this country then being inhabited by the Indians."

"Found in a cave." This is the very manuscript remember, that they have claimed all the time that Spaulding wrote, traced right into Mr. Howe's hands—the one that was "found in a cave," so said. It proves itself to be the Manuscript Found, the very one they got, and the very one they made way with, as I will show you, lest it should spoil their little game.

The truth of the matter is very clear;—Hulburt and Howe in their madness had before this, skulked down to Conneaut, and over into Pennsylvania with statements for a few of these ready witnesses who were embittered against the Saints, (for a large number of people had accepted the faith about Conneaut, Mantua and other places, and thus made the sects rage), got the parties to sign their stuff which they had garbled from the Book of Mormon, and afterwards when they got the Spaulding manuscript they went back to see what the trouble was,—it did not read right. As might have been supposed the witnesses were caught; they could not deny that it was Spaulding's manuscript, too clear a case for that; Hulburt had been and got it right from the Mrs. Solomon (Spaulding) Davidson herself: What do they do? Invent another lie to get out of the first, by saying: "Spaulding told them that he had altered his first plan of writing by going farther back with dates, and writing in the old scripture style in order that it might appear more ancient." Did you ever!!! Right out of the book that Braden fats on!!! Spaulding is made to go to each one of these witnesses, or they come to him, that he may tell them he altered his first plan of writing and he a stranger to them as it were, for all the time he was in that part of the country was but two years. Well, had they known his first style? If so, why did they not state something about it before they were caught? And how came it that they never struck upon this modern style while they read the Spaulding manuscript so much, which they try to foist upon the world? A man that will take up and believe this contradictory and abominable stuff gotten up by a set of conspiring fanatics and tools more than three years after the publication and sale of a work they are trying by this very means to break down, and with that work right in their hands to draw their names from as admitted in their statements, see Wright's, Miller's, Lake's, etc., is doomed to hopelessly fall in with the class of people the apostle speaks of, as living in the last times when such a message of truth as the Book of Mormon contains should be presented to the people, who would oppose the work, the truth:—

"With all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish: because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. 2: 10, 11, 12.

Men must examine a message from the true standpoint, God's standard: "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." Don't break God's law by speaking mean and slanderous things against those who differ from you in religion; there is neither sense nor argument in it. "Speak evil of no one." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them;" and know assuredly, that, "whosoever transgresseth [this law] and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, he hath not God." So says the apostle John, and so say I! The Book of Mormon is presented to the world and claims to be the truth: it is presented to the people as such and demands a fair investigation. As in every age of the world when God has sent a message, Satan can't stand to see the word, the truth, take root in the heart; so he begins on stories, and character, manufacturing and multiplying scheme after scheme, falsehood after falsehood, until in this instance the Spaulding "Romance," came along, not even claiming to be a thing of truth, but a speculative lie,—theory; and the people who are too self-righteous and fanatical to believe the truth, at once drink in the theory of the "Romance."

The evidence from their own witnesses is complete in showing one thing, that is, that Spaulding never wrote an article of any kind that would in size, character, style, sense, taste, sentiment, or in any manner compare with the Book of Mormon. But how about "old come to pass," says one. Like the pretended remembrance of the names Lehi and Nephi, the false story of it was put into these witnesses' mouths and they thought it a smart thing to say; that is evident to a man who will think. Why should they so persistently call Spaulding "old come to pass?" Turn to the Bible, in almost every part it abounds with the expression. In some parts of St. Luke's gospel it is as frequent as in the Book of Mormon. How could it receive the title of "old come to pass," from singularity, when the expression was already a familiar one? Such a statement is only equaled by the brazenly one put into the mouth of Henry Lake of the Laban account. "I pointed out to him what I considered an inconsistency, which he promised to correct; but by referring to the Book of Mormon, I find to my surprise that it stands there just as read to me then." Did you ever hear the like my friends? Where is the inconsistency this wise man pointed out, who although he had not seen or heard anything in the Spaulding Romance in twenty years, pretends in twenty minutes reading to detect it by the same passages which Mr. Spaulding had read to him; only think, just read to him, more than 23 years before. Take another of Braden's witnesses, John N. Miller, the fellow who worked for Lake, another of their holy crowd. Twenty-two years passed away with no word from the manuscript, and then he remembers the names

Nephi, Lehi, Moroni, Zarahemla, (the entire book they have here; the first part, middle, and last part where the name Moroni is found) and he has the history so well that Braden says, "the average Mormon preacher," and I suppose he refers to me by this, "could not to-day give it better." No, sir! But this smart John Miller can give it from having read it in the old manuscript twenty years before. And Braden drinks it down! What a wonderful Miller this was! Can't you give us a further clue to his life and services to his country? But stop, my friends! He further testifies. Let me read:—"He (Spaulding) said that he designed it as a historical novel, and that in after years it would be believed by many people as much as the history of England." There! Can you beat that? And yet there is to be no more prophets! This is Braden's prophet. I might thus take up and show the duplicity, cheek, falsehood and spuriousness of every one of these, said to be statements, but I shall not so dispose of my time. They are all effectually, fully and completely set out and accounted for beyond a doubt by any man who wants the truth in another manner, and which I shall soon present you. I am asked to answer the question, How will you dispose of them? "Attack their character?" What! Don't he yet know me well enough to know, that I will not make of myself a bird of carrion to pass over all proper and respectable ways of testing a matter, to gather from the sepulchre of the dead and rotten? I too highly respect the Bible and the Christian religion, as well as myself, for this. If character is to be the test and that proven by one's enemies, our Bible is not worth a straw; the entire list of writers will go down in the mire. And should we test the issue of Bible writers on character by the admissions of friends, one half of our inspired men of the Bible would go down. No sir; I have from the first taken such grounds, that I could maintain my faith clear through, in the Bible as well as the Book of Mormon. Consistency is a jewel to be admired. Who is so blind as to not see that if character is to be the test, that is to try the faith of the Saints, and that character proven by their enemies, the same rule must be followed in trying others also. The position is more desperate than was entertained by ancient heathens. "The good that men do" says Mark Anthony over the dead body of Cæsar, "lives after them, the evil is oft interred with their bones; so let it be with Cæsar."

But Braden says, let us find some evil and perpetuate that. Character! What would he accept as good under his rule? Nobody ever lived of prominence in God's work who has not been slandered and berated. Doubtless many things, too, were true against the early Christians; they *were* true in part; so admitted in the Bible. But I am not a teacher of the doctrine of infallibility in mankind. I believe with Jesus that some are good, (except God), "no, not one." Now his long abuse and misrepresentations

sentation of the characters of Mr. Smith, Rigdon and others last evening is entirely foreign to the question under discussion. Suppose they did do wrong and many absurd and foolish things! what weight can that have in determining whether the part God is said to have done is wrong? Try this matter upon its merits. I do not, nor does the church of which Mr. Smith was under divine Providence the founder, claim for these men perfection. Many of the things that he stated about these men and what they did may be true; but as to the majority I am satisfied they are as false as hell itself. And the list which he calls his "Mormon Chronology," is dotted about occasionally with a fact, that he may thereby hide the deformity of a hydra-head, which he hopes to force upon the people. But his chronology as a whole is a brazen piece of deception and of false statements, drawn from such works as Howe, Tucker, &c. Suppose I take up Mitchell's history of the United States and read the infamous story recorded against the character of John Wesley in Georgia, charging a crime against that religious teacher more heinous than any ever made against Smith, how would it affect the Methodist religion? Suppose I take John Calvin, who permitted one of his own adherents to be burned at the stake because he differed with him on religion. Suppose I take the case of the great reformer Luther, and the noble Melancthon, and show that they consented to one of their members entering into polygamy, the great Luther actually performing the marriage ceremony! Shall I thrust it in the face of the Lutheran Church upon a trial of their faith? I know this was done by certain parties this last Fall upon the return of the 400th anniversary of the "Pious monk," but how despicably mean and spiteful it seemed to thinking men and women! The rule is wrong. We must get upon a higher plane. Who wants to take the office of "the accuser of the brethren?"—Gathering and sowing the evils spoken against men. Enter the mission of Satan in the world! No, sir; not me. Don't need to ask me, if I will try to hunt up your witnesses' character, unless I had those same witnesses where they could face the ones they are accusing, and they in turn could face their accusers. This is demanded in decency. Why! do you suppose if I was debating with an infidel I would rake up the past life of Col. Ingersoll? Is that what you call impeaching character? To go and rake up all you can find about a man and peddle it—send it forth—publish it. That is the way they slander men, but not the way they impeach them. Suppose an infidel should attack the character of the writers in the Bible in the same way, and they often do, would I then resort to such a course? No, sir. Such a contest would be decided upon the ground of who could get hold of and tell the biggest falsehood, and I would engage in no such littleness. But I have already devoted more time to this than it deserved. It has been because I

did not know but possibly some one present might think there was a little argument in such a tirade as we heard from the negative last night, and for that reason only, I have noticed it. As for myself I could listen for weeks at such abuse and villification if necessary with simply a sense of pity and shame for the one who spins it. But I shall now finish my review of the "Spaulding Romance," and every one of his witnesses' testimony, and then each evening I shall have new matters of evidence on the question under discussion, and many that have never been presented to any audience. Here I might ask the question, Do you still want proof that Spaulding never wrote a manuscript like the Book of Mormon, in any sense, or feature? The total basis for all of their huge stories and false statements about "Spaulding's manuscript," was this one thing:—Spaulding, who came to New Salem, now Conneaut, Ohio, and remained for about two years, first representing himself as a preacher, then a dealer in real estate, and thirdly undertook to erect a "forge," (in all of which he failed, and suddenly left, leaving his debts unpaid, so stated by their own witnesses), at one time during his stay at New Salem, told some parties that he had found an old manuscript in a cave on Conneaut creek, which gave an account of a long lost shipwrecked crew on the American coast, and it would be greatly interesting when published, and he would be able to make a raise of enough money to pay all his debts and be independent. He wanted a little more money out of them so he could go to Pittsburg and have it published. He roped in a few and left, but instead of getting up the startling publication, he stayed but a short time in Pittsburg and went to Washington county Pennsylvania, where he died in 1816. He never, however, reported to his creditors and they were left in the lurch, waiting for a check from the broken-down clergyman. Twenty-one years pass away, and no tidings. In the meantime the Book of Mormon is published and is making a great excitement in the world, and these duped creditors of Spaulding's begin to think of the startling shipwreck tale, of which Spaulding had told them he would make his fortune; and they got hold of a copy of the Book of Mormon and the base Hulburt, who had been cut off from the Church of the Latter Day Saints; got out their statements and sent Hulburt after the Spaulding manuscript. This they found carefully laid away in the trunk of Spaulding's widow, and it is brought back by them and put into the hands of Editor Howe, of Painesville, Ohio, who reads it and finds no resemblance whatever to the Book of Mormon. Howe says, page 258 of his book entitled "Mormonism Unveiled:" "This is a romance, purporting to have been translated from the Latin, found on twenty-four rolls of parchment, in a cave, on the banks of Conneaut creek, but written in modern style, and giving a fabulous account of a ship's being driven upon the American

coast while proceeding from Rome to Britain, a short time previous to the Christian era, this country then being inhabited by the Indians."

Here is the Spaulding tale in a nutshell! The whole thing entirely different from the Book of Mormon; the style, dates, names, peoples, and all. The whole thing as foreign to the Book of Mormon as heaven to hades, but it is the little nit from which the enemies of Mr. Smith hatched this terrible "Spaulding Story."

This is his alibi. How I ask you, does his evidence stand upon the first point? Did Solomon Spaulding ever write a manuscript like the manuscript of the Book of Mormon in any sense? I say the evidence from his own witnesses is against him and ask him to now meet the issue he has made.

But he does not only have to show this, but to show also:

2nd. That Rigdon and Smith in some way stole it and that Smith used it.

3d. That Rigdon knew of Smith and the Book of Mormon before the book was published in 1830, and was connected with the two in some way.

4th. That Parley P. Pratt did not bring a copy of this book and present it to Rigdon while Rigdon was a Disciple Preacher, and then and there in 1830, Rigdon first knew the contents of said book.

In beginning upon the second proposition, I am reminded of the story that is told of the absent juror. He had been subpoenaed to attend a session of court; but when the day arrived and court was called, he was not there; and the judge abruptly demanded to know the reason. The juror's friend arose and said there were several reasons. And proceeded to give them. The first is, he said, that the man is dead. There! that is enough, said the judge, you need not give any more.

Now it seems to me that if I have shown you clearly that Spaulding never wrote such a manuscript as the Book of Mormon, or one that had any resemblance to it, from their own witnesses, that ought to be enough on this; but lest some one may yet have a doubt I will produce some further evidence. First a letter from Sidney Rigdon to the editors of the Boston Journal.

"COMMERCE, May 27th, 1839.

MESSES. BARTLET AND SULLIVAN:—

There was no man by the name of Patterson, during my residence in Pittsburg, who had a printing office: what might have been before I lived there I know not. Mr. Rolert Patterson, I was told, had owned a printing office before I lived in that city, but had been unfortunate in business and failed before my residence there. This Mr. Patterson, who was a Presbyterian Preacher, I had a very slight acquaintance with during my residence in Pittsburg; he was then acting under an agency in the book and stationery business and was the owner of no property of any kind, printing office or anything else, during the time I resided in the city. If I were to say that I ever heard of the Rev. Solomon Spaulding and his wife, until Dr. P. Hulbert wrote his lie about me, I should be a liar like unto themselves."

Rigdon is emphatic, when he talks, you know, because many of you used to hear him talk.

"Why was not the testimony of Mr. Patterson obtained to give force to the shameful tale of lies? The only reason is, that he was not a fit tool for them to work with; he would not lie for them; for if he were called on, he would testify to what I have said. This Hulbert once belonged to the Methodist Church, but was excluded for immoralities. He afterwards imposed himself upon the church of Latter Day Saints, and was excluded for using obscene language to a young lady, a member of said church, who resented his insult with indignation, which became both her character and profession. After his exclusion he swore—for he was vilely profane—that he would have revenge, and commenced his work. He soon found assistance; a pious old deacon of the Campbellite church, by the name of Onis Clapp, and his two sons, Thomas W. Clapp, and Matthew S. Clapp, both Campbellite preachers, abetted and assisted by her Campbellite preacher, by the name of Adamson Peitly, Hulbert went to work catering lies for the company. Before he got through, his conduct became so scandalous that the company utterly refused to let him come go out with the lies he had collected, and he and his associates had made, and they substituted the name of E. D. Howe. The change, however, was not much better."

Then he refers in terms to Mrs. Matilda Davidson, but it is not material and I have not it copied in here. I will read it if necessary.

"A man of character would never have put his name to a work which Hulbert was concerned in. The tale in your paper is one hatched up by this gang from the time of their expulsion."

Respectfully,

S. RIGDON."

From the strong language of this letter it is easy to see that Mr. Rigdon had been maligning by the Campbellites, the people with whom he had formerly been connected—to such an extent that it was almost impossible to bear it any longer; and the reason of this was simply because he saw fit in the honesty of his heart, to step out and embrace what he believed to be a better and higher religion than was to be had by remaining with his Campbellite brethren. Hence it is, that when he speaks, it is with that sternness and force, that was a terror to his maligners.

Heretofore they have generally told about Rigdon working for Patterson, but Braden has seen this go to the wall once, as he did also his "woman preacher story," at Wilber, Neb., so he has deftly yelected it this time; that is better than no fairness; when you are driven clear to the wall drop it; and if he was not so eager to grab at something else he would improve in the world much better.

This letter of Rigdon's effectually shows that he never worked in a printing office in Pittsburg; that Patterson had no such office when he was there to his knowledge, and was not engaged in the business of printing; and, referring to Mr. Patterson, who was at the time a Presbyterian preacher, as a man who would corroborate this statement. Afterwards Patterson does corroborate it. Rigdon says, the first he ever knew of the Book of Mormon was in the year 1830, when a copy was handed him by a minister of the Latter Day Saints by the name of P. P. Pratt.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S NINTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mr. Kelley told you last night that Mrs. Smith, the mother of Joe Smith, and some other members of the family brought letters from a Presbyterian church in Vermont and joined the Presbyterian church in Manchester, New York. In the life of Joseph Smith by his mother she says she allowed herself to be baptized in Vermont, but refused to join any church; that she rejoiced when the Mormon church was started, that she then found a church that she could join. Not a Smith ever belonged to a church in Palmyra. Not a Smith ever belonged to the Presbyterian church in Manchester, for there was no Presbyterian church in Manchester until 31 years after the Smiths left Manchester; not one of the Smith family ever belonged to any church until Mormonism was started, for although very superstitious, they were noted for their neglect and disregard of the church and all things connected with religion. That statement of my opponent is one of those statements sometimes said to be made out of whole cloth. My opponent forgets that his talk here will be stereotyped into a book and will stand for generations when he makes such reckless misstatements as he did last night.

The reader will read in my argument that I introduced Priest's "Wonders" to show that the idea that the aborigines of America were Israelites was hundreds of years older than the Book of Mormon, and a widely believed theory, and that I said not a word on "mounds" or "antiquities" in connection with that book. He will then read Kelley's statement that I introduced it to off-set his argument on antiquities and ask himself. "What does the fellow mean by such reckless assertions?"

He will read my statement that if the Nephites were circumcised Israelites they belonged to the same fold as those Jesus was addressing and could not be the other sheep not of that fold; or if they had abandoned circumcision they were no longer Israelites and the prophecies Kelley quoted could not apply to them, and then read with amazement that I said or hinted that they were not circumcised. I never said so for there never were any Nephites to be circumcised. The reader will read Kelley's assertion that I introduced no witnesses, read no testimony, and then turn back and see in different type from my speeches the testimony of 29 witnesses—see that I read the testimony of some witnesses two or more times: that I had read more of Mrs. Davidson's testimony than he did: longer portions from several witnesses than he did from any that he introduced; I introduced and read testimony just as he did, and exclaim: "What can the fellow mean by such falsehoods?" He will read Kelley's assertion

that I said that Rigdon worked in Patterson's printing office at Pittsburg and turn back and read my statement that he did not work there but was in Pittsburg learning the tanners' trade and was in Patterson's office as a crony of Lambdin, one of the printers, and in that way learned of the existence of the Spaulding manuscript, which was attracting much notice in the office, and became much interested in it, and stole it, as is proved by witnesses, and exclaim: "Why, what does that fellow say by such reckless falsehoods?"

He will read my clear proof that Spaulding wrote several manuscripts of his Manuscript Found and then read with amazement Kelley's reckless assertion that he wrote but one. The manuscript described by Mrs. Spaulding was his first brief draft. It was this that John Spaulding read through; it was this that Mrs. McKinstrey read. The reader will read with amazement the objection that Spaulding's Manuscript Found represented the aborigines of America as idolaters, and the Book of Mormon represents them to be worshippers of the one God: when he remembers that I showed that Rigdon changed the manuscript when remodeling it to use as a pretended revelation. He will read with amazement Kelley's assertion that Hulburt obtained from Mrs. Davidson the manuscript of the Manuscript Found when she says she only gave him an order to examine a trunk hundreds of miles away in Hartwick, N. Y., to see if it was in the trunk. The reader will read with amazement Kelley's fabrication that Howe said that he received from Hurlbut a manuscript of the Manuscript Found. Howe distinctly and pointedly declares that he did not receive a manuscript of the Manuscript Found but the beginning pages of an entirely different manuscript—the manuscript of the first romance written by Spaulding, written before he began the Manuscript Found. In that first romance Spaulding assumed that the Indians round the Great Lakes were descendants of shipwrecked Romans. He abandoned this theory and began the Manuscript Found, in which he assumed the aborigines of America and the ancestors of all Indians were Israelites. Howe does not say that he received the Manuscript Found and that the Manuscript Found was not what he expected it to be as Kelly falsely asserts he says. He says that he did not receive the Manuscript Found but the manuscript of an earlier and entirely different story and the manuscript that he received was not what he expected, for it was not the manuscript of the Manuscript Found, which was what he expected to receive. Why did not he receive the manuscript of the Manuscript Found? "We will a tale unfold" that will explain that. In a letter written to J. E.

Gaston in 1842, Mrs. Davidson says that shortly after Hurlbut left Munson with the order from her to get the manuscript of the Manuscript Found from the trunk at Mr. Clark's at Hartwicke, N. Y., she received a letter from Hurlbut, in which he told her that he had obtained from the trunk what he had come for, the manuscript of the Manuscript Found, and that when he had taken it to the parties that sent him, and it had been used for the purpose for which they wanted it, that is published to expose the plagiarism of the Book of Mormon from it, he would return it to her.

Hurlbut came to the people at Conneaut and Howe, and lied, and said that the only manuscript he found was the part of the manuscript we have described above. Up to this time he had been very active in getting up the book Howe published; he had spent months and much money in collecting the evidence used in it: now he suddenly abandons all, takes no further part or interest in it and goes to Western Ohio and buys a farm; when, before he had not money enough to pay his traveling expenses. Mrs. Davidson, on reading Howe's book and Hurlbut's statement as given in it was amazed and wrote to him reminding him of what he had written to her and that the Clark's had written that he had got the manuscript of the Manuscript Found. She demanded that he return the manuscript to her. Her daughter also wrote repeatedly. The letters were sent to persons who wrote that they handed them to Hurlbut. He never answered one of them. The Rev. J. A. Clark published in the "Episcopal Recorder" that the Mormons in Missouri said they paid Howe \$400.00 for the manuscript. The Rev. Storrs in a letter published in "Gleanings by the Way" states that Hurlbut boasted that he made \$400.00 out of the manuscript. He sold it to the Mormons in Kirtland. These charges Hurlbut never met, but laid under them till his death. This answers the demand why the Spauldings did not publish the manuscript of the Manuscript Found and expose the fraud. That is the very thing they tried to do, but the agent by whom they sent the manuscript to Howe, the publisher, betrayed them and sold it to the Mormons. Hurlbut's false and contradictory statements and absurd stories to Mr. Patterson in 1880 proved that he was guilty of what he was charged with and was trying to lie out of it.

The reader will read with amazement if not too much disgusted at its stillness the attacks on Hurlbut's character by Kelley and ask what has the character of the scribe who collected the evidence to do with the truthfulness of the statements of the witnesses? He will read in the same way the statements over which Kelley so idiotically makes such great eyes and mouths that Howe said that personally he knew nothing about the facts stated by the witnesses whose testimony he published and ask what odds does it make if the lawyer does not know personally the facts his witnesses state? Kelley asks why is not Zebulon

Randolph here? Kelley has quoted Howe, Mrs. McKinstrey and several others why are not they here? Why does he not have them here instead of telling us what he says they told him and by the way Mr. Howe contradicts flatly Mr. Kelley's statement in his case. His silly objection puts out of court all his own witnesses. Has not Kelley sense enough to see that in such objections he puts a club in my hands with which I can beat out his own brains if he has any? He asks what is the connection between Mrs. Dunlap's statement that Rigdon spent so much time over a certain manuscript, and Rigdon's authorship of the Book of Mormon? The intelligent reader will see the connection when he reads evidence that Rigdon stole the Spaulding manuscript: that he had it in his possession before this time and that he also stated to two witnesses that he also obtained the Spaulding manuscript from the printing office and told one of them that he gave it to Smith to publish as the Book of Mormon. Placed between such evidence Mrs. Dunlap's evidence is another link in a chain Mormons cannot break. He asks what relevance in the statement of Zebulon Rudolph and old citizens of Mentor that Rigdon was absent from home for weeks at a time and no one knew where during the three years that preceded the appearance of the Book of Mormon? When taken in connection with the testimony that he was seen at Smith's during the same time as stated by Case, Saunders, Tucker, McAuley and Mrs. Eaton the reader will see the force of the evidence.

Such, ladies and gentlemen, is the attack on our array of testimony; reckless falsifying of evidence, reckless fabrications of what has no proof, and indeed is flatly contradicted by the evidence and weak pettyfogging. I confess I have been amazed at the weakness of the reply. Is that the best that the chosen representative of Mormonism with all its inspiration, spiritual gifts, illumination and revelations, can do?

I have presented the evidence of 29 witnesses. Has he attempted to prove that they did not testify? No. That they are wanting in truthfulness? No. Has he attempted to rebut their evidence? No. He has falsified their statements, misrepresented them, fabricated rebutting evidence, playing false witness and pettyfogger at the same time. Such is the great Mormon Champion's attacks on the Spaulding story. If my opponent would present one quarter of the evidence I have presented to prove his right to an estate it would be given him.

Kelley denies that there is such a Greek word as "Mormon." Donnegan gives the following Mormon (anglicized Mormon) "A female spectre, a phantom." Other lexicons give the word and define it "a hobgoblin, a bugbear." Spaulding from his knowledge of Greek used the word as significant of the character of his fabrication. Smith and Rigdon were too ignorant to know the irony there was in the word and published to the world their new translation as the "Book

of Mormon" — "Book of Phantom, of Hobgoblin, of Bugbear," the most appropriate title for the fraud and the evil work it has done among fools. But think of Israelites over in America who did not know there were such beings as the Greeks in existence, using pure Greek names! My opponent betrays his ignorance when he asserts that the Greek word is "Mormou" or "Mormoun." He evidently mistook "Nu," the Greek N. for U. which corresponds to the Greek Upsilon. Mormon must belong to the Reformed Egyptian of Joe Smith and his disciple Kelley. Alma is a pure Latin word. Nephi is a Greek word. Israelites in America using Greek and Latin words!

ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF MORMON.

Having given the history of the origin of the Book of Mormon we shall now analyze the book itself. We have already described what the work purports to be. It was given to the world in the following manner:—Joe Smith asserts that an angel revealed to him the existence and location of certain plates engraved with certain characters; that he obtained these plates and that by inspiration, the miraculous power of God, he translated them. These plates had been buried by Moroni about 1400 years before Smith obtained them. They contained an abridgment that Moroni and his father had made by inspiration of the history of the aborigines of America. This abridgment was based on an immense library of plates written by inspired men during the period of over 4,000 years, beginning with Jared's brother, who was contemporary with the building of the Tower of Babel. Mormons defend this claim in three ways: first, by an appeal to the external evidences, the affidavits of the eleven witnesses; second, that the utterances of the Book of Mormon agree with the teachings of the Bible and are good; third, by a most vindictive, malicious, infidel attack on the Bible when the absurdities of the Book of Mormon are exposed. The first line of proof displays some craft. They parade the eleven witnesses. If we impeach these witnesses as we can and shall do, they can raise the cry of persecution and attempt to rouse sympathy. We shall not be deterred from duty by any such cry. As they have introduced the witnesses and staked all on their testimony, we shall impeach them. In reply to the second line of proof we shall show that all that is good in the Book of Mormon is feloniously stolen from the Bible, and is good because it is the teaching of the Bible and not because it was given by inspiration in the Book of Mormon. Because a counterfeit resembles the genuine it is no proof that it is genuine, but that it imitates the genuine in order to deceive, and because a book pretending to be inspired resembles one that is inspired, it is no proof that the first is inspired, but that the counterfeit imitates the inspired book in order to deceive. Counterfeits imitate every feature of the genuine if they can. Hypocrites and imposters imitate every feature and senti-

ment of the good and true. Some of the most infamous hypocrites have imitated, copied and uttered, the best sentiments that have ever been uttered. The discourses and writings of the most infamous characters that have ever lived have contained the very best of truth and goodness and often not a word but what is true and good. The devil can transform himself into an angel of light, and talk as much truth and goodness as an angel of light. Because he talks as perfect truth and goodness as an angel of light does not prove that he is an angel of light. If the Mormon plea that we must accept a man as a good man because he talks so, be true; there can be no means of detecting hypocrites and an imposter, for does not he talk all right? If the devil repeats to us the doctrines of Christ and the truth we must accept him as perfectly good and declare that he has the Father and the Son and is inspired, if he asserts that he is. This claim, the pet argument of Mormonism, is the most ineffable balderdash that I have ever met.

The Mormons reverse the line of argument. They absurdly assert that the claims, the pretensions of a book should determine the character of the book. Common sense declares that we should carefully investigate the character of the book to determine whether these claims be true. They claim that we should accept their book as divine because its author claims to be a prophet, and eleven men assert that he is inspired. Common sense says accept a man as a prophet because the contents of his book prove him to be a prophet. The one sole argument of the Mormon is a constant jabber of one passage. "He that hath the Doctrine of Christ hath the Father and the Son;" that is, he must be a child of God a good man, and inspired, if he claims to be inspired. Imposter Joe presents to us in his book the Doctrine of the Christ, and although we show that every word that is good was stolen from the Bible, we must believe that he has the Father and the Son that he is a good man; that he is inspired because he says he is, and that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin because imposter Joe says so. The devil presents to us a book that contains the doctrine of the Christ stolen from the Bible. According to Mormon logic, because he has the doctrine of the Christ, no matter how obtained, no matter what his character may be, no matter what his motive may be, in presenting it, the devil has the Father and the Son, is a child of God, and if he says that he is inspired we must believe him and accept his book as of Divine origin.

When we remember that every good thing in the Book of Mormon is stolen from the Bible, the absurdity of the claim that because the truths of the Bible are in the possession of these thieves therefore they are inspired and their book of Divine origin can hardly be appreciated. To claim that the thieves were good men is an insult to common sense, but to claim that they were inspired of God in the theft, because they

stole the Divine utterances of the Bible and mendaciously presented them to the world as their own inspired utterances is idiocy that is almost sublime in its magnitude. Priapus Young presents us the unvarnished Mormon argument when he declares

"The Doctrine the Prophet Joseph teaches is all I care about. Bring anything against that if you can. As for anything else I don't care if the Prophet Joseph acted like the devil. He brought forth a doctrine that will save us if we will abide by it. He may have got drunk every day of his life, slept with his neighbor's wife every night, ran horses and gambled every day; I care nothing about that, for I never embrace any man in my faith. The doctrine the Prophet Joseph produced will save you and me, and the whole world." If you can find any fault with his doctrine, find it."

Kelley is not as frank and as honest as Priapus Young, but that is what he means when he jabbers "He that hath the Doctrine of the Christ hath the Father and the Son."

We will admit this much. If the doctrine in the Book of Mormon be true we should accept it as truth, because it is truth. But that does not prove that Joseph Smith was even a good man, for the Devil can utter truth. It does not prove that his book is true in its historic statements, nor that it is what it claims to be—a history of the aborigines of America; for the biggest fraud ever concocted may contain good doctrines, stolen from the Bible or other sources. If Joseph Smith was a good man, his assertion that he was inspired, even if his doctrine were true, would not necessarily be true; for many a good man has been deceived and thought he was inspired when he was not and that his talk was revelation when it was not. This whole line of argument is the most absurd and idiotic that has ever been presented to a thinking people. There are several queries to be settled. Even if the moral and religious ideas of the Book of Mormon be true, who presents it to us, a good being or an evil one? Is it presented honestly or hypocritically? Is it genuine or counterfeit that has stolen the features of the genuine in order to deceive. If it claims inspiration, is the one claiming inspiration one that would be chosen of God as a medium for inspiration? Is he honest or is he hypocritical? If honest, sincere and good was he mistaken or is his claim true? Then what is the character of the proposed revelation?

The third line of argument is not only maliciously hostile to the Bible but is a gross fallacy. If Mormons could prove every word of the Bible to be false and that the Bible had every fault that we find with the Book of Mormon, it would only overthrow the Bible. It would not establish the divine origin of the Book of Mormon. Proving that Webster's dictionary is full of faults does not prove that a book that contains those faults is correct, but on the contrary, it destroys Webster as authority. When the vile character of Joe Smith and the founders of Mormonism is exposed Mormons point to the character of Baalam, Saul, King of Israel, Jonah, and Caiphas.

If they are willing to place Imposter Joe in the same category as Baalam with his greed of gain and evil character, Saul with his murderous hatred and vile character, Jonah with his rebellious wicked character, Caiphas with his murderous sectarian hatred of Jesus, we will remind them that though God did, in the dark surroundings of those days use those persons for certain unimportant purposes, he did not make them founders of dispensations, much less the last one, and the one that is, the fulness of the Gospel. For such purposes he chose a Noah, an Abraham, a Moses, an Elijah, a Paul, and a Jesus the Son of God.

If the Mormon points to the sins and errors of Noah, Lot, Abraham, and others that were children of God, or inspired according to the Bible, when we point out the sins of Joe Smith and the founders of Mormonism we wish to remind him that Noah's drunkenness was accidental and the Bible does not say it was repeated. There is not one particle of proof that Noah knew what would be the effects of fermented grape juice until he was made drunk by it, or that he ever repeated the act. Lot's incest was not voluntary; there is not one scrap of evidence that Lot was inspired; the Bible does not say that he ever was. Abraham's acts were the sins of his age; his polygamy was rather the act of Sarah and in accordance with the custom of the day than a wilful sin of Abraham. There is no proof that Abraham knew that he was doing wrong. The sins of Isaac and Jacob were the sins of their times, resulting from the evil advice of others. David's sins were the sins of his age; he was terribly punished for them. Solomon was not a child of God or inspired after he sinned. Paul's sins were those of honest bigotry; he was a grand character, honest and manly even in his persecution. Peter's sins were those of cowardice and disappointment, inasmuch as the Messiah did not act as he expected he would. These persons repented. Their sins were the sins of their age. They were in advance of their age. They were great characters notwithstanding their sins. In the case of Joe Smith we have one who tells us that he examined all religious parties. He found that all had apostatized. None were good enough for Joe. He was the chosen instrument of heaven to found a purer system than the world had ever seen. He can not be placed on a level with Noah, Abraham, David, or Paul and their surroundings. He came after eighteen hundred years of progress under the gospel of Christ. He appeared in the purest Christian surroundings of this century. He was to give to the world a religion that stood related to apostolic Christianity as that stood related to Judaism, "the fullness of the gospel."

His system was to be as much above his surroundings as Christianity was to its surroundings when it appeared. God in selecting Noah, Abraham, Moses, Elijah, John the Baptist and Paul, selected the grandest characters in their age. He did

this in the dark surroundings of former dispensations. What would he do in selecting a person for a mission that Smith pretended was committed to him, and in the surroundings in which Smith appeared Smith should be as much superior to Noah, Moses and Paul as his surroundings were superior to theirs, and his mission higher than theirs. The Book of Mormon should be as much superior to the Bible as the New Testament was to the Old Testament. Its inspired author, its surroundings should be as much superior. That is what Mormons claim for it.

This argument of Mormonism is merely the silly retort of the sneaking boy who when caught in lying or theft and exposed, hangs his head and mutters, "Well I don't care, you're another." It is as full of infidelity as Ingersoll's attacks on the Bible. Unable to lift their contemptible false prophet to the skies, the level of the Sons of God, they would, with the malice of fiends, drag the angels of religion down to his vile level. When we expose the ignorance, the illiteracy, the contradictions of their vile imposture, the Book of Mormon, they assail with all the malignity of infidelity the character of the Bible. If their foul imposture is exposed, they strive with the malice of Infidel hate to befoul the Bible by loading it with the same faults. When we expose Impostor Joe's blasphemous interpolations and change of the text of the Bible, we are treated to a malicious re-hash of old exploded infidel attacks on the authenticity and genuineness of the Bible; we have a malicious infidel attempt to drag the Bible down so low that Impostor Joe's corruptions of it will be of no more consequence than changing one of the thousand versions of nursery tales. We have in Mormon writings, in the preface to a pretended inspired translation of the Bible as malicious infidelity as can be found in Ingersoll's writings. In the defense of Impostor Joe and his illiterate blundering frauds can be found as cowardly malicious attacks on the Bible, Bible characters as can be found in any infidel production. It is time that the sheep's clothing was stripped off of this imposture that claims to be the fullness of the Gospel of Christ, but shows its hatred of the Bible when its real character is exposed. Judging from its attacks on the Bible, the purity of its text, the proofs of its origin, the character of its prophets, and the literary character of the Bible, Mormonism is the vilest system of infidelity extant, for it is the most hypocritical. Pretending to restore the Bible in its purity, Christianity in its primitive power, it bedaubes in its slanderous assaults the Bible as a book, its evidences, its literary character, the character of its prophets, and tries to drag them to a level with Joe Smith and his frauds. As the Book of Mormon is so largely stolen from the Bible, the Mormon in his infidel attacks destroys his own book when he destroys the Bible. It is not enough that the Book of Mormon be as good as the Bible, it must be far better. The same cir-

cumstances cannot be urged in its defense that can be urged in defense of the Bible. But few of the writers of the Bible tell us they were inspired, the writers and speakers of the Book of Mormon are constantly telling us that the Spirit of the Lord has told them that it is talking through them. There is scarcely one that does not inform us of his inspiration. Not only so but these inspired persons were inspired above all writers and speakers of the Bible except the apostles of Christ after the day of Pentecost. The Holy Spirit was not given in the name of Jesus and in all his fullness until that time, but Lehi and Nephi, the first writers and speakers of the Book of Mormon, had the Holy Spirit in the name of Jesus 600 years before Jesus came, as fully and completely as Paul. They had revelations 600 years before Christ that were as perfect and complete as any given to the apostles, in fact more complete. The apostles did not settle by revelation every subject of religious controversy of the nineteenth century as positively and completely and dogmatically as any controversialist could do it. The inspired men of the Book of Mormon did so and were inspired far beyond the apostles.

But few of the Bible writers were told to write what they wrote; nearly every writer of the Book of Mormon writes in obedience to a personal divine command. But few of the writers of the Bible were cautioned to take steps, very careful precautions to preserve what they had written; nearly all of the writers of the Book of Mormon were so warned and commanded. We have no instances of men being inspired to revise and correct the books of the Bible; such was constantly the case with the Book of Mormon. Not a particle of the Bible was preserved by miracle; each and every portion of the Book of Mormon and the authorities on which it is based were so preserved. Again, the Book of Mormon stands related to the New Testament as the New does to the Old: it contains the "fullness of the Gospel," or which the New Testament is but an outline. There were churches and all the teachings of Christ among the Nephites for hundreds of years before Christ as perfect as ever existed among the Israelites after he came, and of course the revelations to such a highly favored people must have been as much more perfect and complete. The Israelites in the old continent had only vague outlines of the gospel in their revelations. The Nephites had the Gospel as perfect as the Apostles had it. The Israelite prophets had to study what their own utterances meant. The Nephites had all the words, acts and teachings of Christ and his Apostles in the very language of Christ and his Apostles. The Nephites enjoyed for hundreds of years "the fullness of the Gospel," while the Israelites on the old continent were in the darkness of its dim twilight. The writers, speakers and actors of the Book of Mormon ought to excel those of the Bible as much as their condition excelled that of the writers and speakers of the Bible.

MR. KELLEY'S TENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—When my time was called I had just read the statement from their own history with regard to Mr. Rigdon, and made a few hurried comments upon the same and passed to a review of his work as a minister to the time when Mr. Pratt called upon him with the Book of Mormon.

Up to this time Rigdon had been an enthusiastic and constant laborer in the "Reform Movement," as it was then called, as is fully set out in the history of the Disciples themselves, and his time so occupied in his ministerial labors that it was not possible for him to have left his work and duties to visit Smith who at this time lived, by the nearest way of travel, 250 miles distant in the uncultivated interior of the State of New York, and when there were no pleasant and easy lines of travel as now. The Disciple, (Campbellite) history sets forth, that Rigdon was their standing minister for the year 1825, at Bainbridge, Ohio, for the year 1826 at Mentor and Bainbridge, for the year 1827 at Mantua; for the year 1828, at Mentor, and this year is the time when he met Alexander Campbell at Warren, Ohio, at their assembly, where the famous passage at arms took place between Campbell and Rigdon of which so much has been said. The next year, 1829, Rigdon continued the work in Mentor, and at Euclid, and founded the church in Perry, Ohio, Aug. 7th. The next year, 1830, he continued as their minister, (and the ablest of them all,) at Mentor, Euclid, Kirtland, and occasionally at Hiram, Mantua, Perry, and Painesville, and using the words of their own history, which shows a disposition to kemean him all possible, because he made up his mind the Disciples did not have the truth, he is shown to be the leader of them. It says

Sidney Rigdon was an orator of no inconsiderable ability. In person, he was tall medium height, rotund in form, of countenance, while speaking, open and winning, with a little cast of melancholy. His action was graceful, his language copious, fluent in utterance, with articulation clear and musical.

Oh! This is the pompous old Rigdon that Braden is talking about is it? This is the fellow from whose crown Bro Scott plucked a feather, and pulled off of Ahasueras' horse. Here Rigdon is traced by their own history till October, 1830, where he is found as a live worker for the "Reform Movement," as they called it, when three of our ministers open up meetings in the district of Rigdon's charge and for the first time he meets the expounders of the gospel of Christ in its fullness, and also has an opportunity of reading that same gospel as contained in the Book of Mormon.

What does he do? Like my friend Mr. Braden here, he makes opposition with all his great eloquence and powers, contesting the "New religion," as they called it, at ev-

ery step, till every argument was taken from him, when from the honesty of his heart and desire for truth rather than error, he accepted the faith, was publicly with his wife, then and there baptised, preferring to endure the reproaches of Christ for a season by accepting the full and complete gospel, rather than to reject and retain his popularity in the world. Was he the "ignoramus," my audience, Braden has made him out to be? Many of you knew him! After this he ceases preaching and goes to work, and in a few months he goes to New York State and for the first time in his life sees and makes the acquaintance of Joseph Smith. In this connection I introduce the affidavit of Mrs. Katherine Salisbury:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, } ss.
Kendall County

I, Katherine Salisbury, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am a resident of the State of Illinois, and have been for forty years last past; that I will be 68 years of age July 28th, 1881.

That I am a daughter of Joseph Smith, Sen., and a sister to Joseph Smith, Jr., the translator of the Book of Mormon. That at the time the said book was published, I was seventeen years of age; that at the time of the publication of said book my brother, Joseph Smith, Jr., lived in the family of my father, in the town of Manchester, Ontario County, New York, and that he had all of his life to this time made his home with the family.

That at the time, and for years prior thereto, I lived in and was a member of such family, and personally knowing to the things transacted in said family, and those who visited at my father's house, and the friends of the family, and the friends and acquaintances of my brother Joseph Smith, Jr., who visited at or came to my father's house.

That prior to the latter part of the year A. D. 1830, there was no person who visited with, or was an acquaintance of, or called upon the said family or any member thereof to my knowledge, by the name of Sidney Rigdon; nor was such person known to the family, or any member thereof, to my knowledge, until the last part of the year A. D. 1830, or the first part of the year 1831, and some time after the organization of the Church of Jesus Christ by Joseph Smith, Jr., and several months after the publication of the Book of Mormon.

That I remember the time when Sidney Rigdon came to my father's place, and that it was after the removal of my father from Waterloo, N. Y., to Kirtland, Ohio. That this was in the year 1831, and some months after the publication of the Book of Mormon, and fully one year after the Church was organized, as before stated herein.

That I make this statement not on account of fear, favor or hope of reward of any kind, but simply that the truth may be known

with reference to said matter, and that the foregoing statements made by me are true, as I verily believe.

KATHERINE SALISBURY.

Sworn to before me, and subscribed in my presence, by the said Catherine Salisbury, this 15th day of April, A. D. 1881.

J. H. JENKS, Notary Public."

P. P. Pratt, in the city of New York, at the time this Spaulding story first came out, gives his testimony and knowledge of the matter for publication in a letter to the *New Era*, N. Y. He says:

"I myself had the happiness to present it" (the Book of Mormon), to him" (Rigdon), in person." "He was much surprised, and it was with much persuasion and argument that he was prevailed upon to read it, and after he had read it, he had a great struggle of mind before he fully believed and embraced it."

The idea has been thrown out to the world that Sidney Rigdon drank right into the faith of the Saints, without an effort to disprove it. This is far from the truth, as the witnesses upon both sides testify. There is absolutely no contradiction of this by any reliable testimony upon either side. Does not this evidence then completely break every link in the cunning device gotten up and peddled out as the "Spaulding romance?"

1. The only witnesses well enough conversant with the manuscript to testify show it was entirely different from and not sufficient by hundreds of pages to make the Book of Mormon.

2. It was not in Pittsburg when Rigdon was there, and Rigdon never got or saw it.

3. Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon never met until near two years after the book was in press and a year after publication.

4. The persons who had the manuscript in their possession and claimed that their affidavits were true, were the very ones who destroyed the manuscript lest it destroy their affidavits.

5. In the very places where they say Spaulding's manuscript was best known is where the Saints gathered many converts and were the most successful in disproving these stories.

But he says, "what about the evidence of John Spaulding, where he arose after the reading of the book in the meeting and denounced it." This is what I say about it. It bears the stamp of falsehood upon its face and in this:—It was the statement in a meeting held by a Mormon woman preacher, who read the book, they say. The church in the first place never had a woman preacher. I deny that there ever was such a preacher. Yet this is the basis for the story that they arose and denounced it. See Smucker page 43, History of the Mormons.

2. John Spaulding, nor no other Spaulding, ever arose in any meeting of the Saints and made any such a claim. It would never have been done without the Minister reporting it to the society and none was ever

so made. John Spaulding never placed himself where he could be cross-examined on this matter, and none of their other pretended witnesses, not one. But Mr. Braden has already taken a course in which he abandons his claim of Rigdon's connection at Pittsburg, and wants to show that Smith stole the manuscript and went to Ohio, and roped Rigdon in. Smith he says, worked for Sabine in 1823 or 1824, and this is when the second revelation came out. He had access to the Spaulding story. Ah! but he is caught here again. Mrs. Spaulding and her daughter were at Sabine's till 1820, when Mrs. Spaulding got married to Davidson.

Then they leave and order their trunk sent to Jerome Clark, New York, for safe keeping, from which place she afterwards got it and the contents were all right so she says, including the manuscript.

What is the insinuation here—that Smith either stole the manuscript and copied it himself, or else during the time he was working for Sabine he went to Ohio and gave it to Rigdon. But Smith was no scribe so that would not do and there was no chance for him to get to Ohio, if he worked for Sabine. Why! a man who can believe such a yarn as that, it seems to me, ought to believe most anything. Gulliver's travels, Robinson Crusoe and all. They have not the first fact to base the story upon. Smith did not work for Sabine as they claim in 1823 or 1824. He was then a boy in Wayne county, New York, at least 50 miles from where Sabine lived. Then, canvass for a moment the weight there is in the claim that the Histories, Encyclopedias, Theological Dictionaries, etc., state it was the Spaulding Romance.

This is like his testimony on the Polygamy question over at Wilber. Most all of these works give both sides of the question—set out Smith's claim, and then set out his enemies' claim. Now if the fact that one being in these works makes it true, it will equally follow with the other. None of them claim that there are sufficient facts to sustain the Spaulding romance as to justify them in refusing a word from the friends of the Book of Mormon. If these works have found facts to settle it for the side of the romance, what is the use of our debating? Why not send this audience a book that will settle the question and let them read for themselves! Don't forget also, that in the most of those same works there is such a prejudiced account as to many of the different religious bodies, that very few of the denominations are satisfied that they have justice done them, the Disciples with the others.

I will now call your attention to some proofs with regard to this matter of what Smith did, how these stories were started about him and Rigdon, etc. Also to some things that have been referred to by my opponent. Taking up the testimony of Mr. Saunders first. I read you a published interview of March 5th, 1881, Saints' Herald, page 165, as follows:

Entering upon conversation with reference to our business, Mr. Saunders at once said: "Well you have come to a poor place to find out anything. I don't know anything against these men myself," (Evidently judging that we wanted to get something against them only).

Q. Were you acquainted with them Mr. Saunders?

A. Yes sir; I knew all of the Smith family well; there were six boys; Alvin, Hyrum, Joseph, Harrison, William and Carlos, and there were two girls; the old man was a cooper; they have all worked for me many a day; they were very good people; Young Joe, (as we called him then), has worked for me, and he was a good worker; they all were. I did not consider them good managers about business, but they were poor people; the old man had a large family.

Q. In what respect did they differ from other people if at all?

A. I never noticed that they were different from other neighbors; they were the best family in the neighborhood in case of sickness; one was at my house nearly all the time when my father died; I always thought them honest; they were owing me some money when they left here; that is the old man and Hyrum did, and Martin Harris. One of them came back in about a year and paid me.

Q. How were they as to habits of drinking and getting drunk?

A. Everybody drank a little in those days and the Smiths with the rest; they never got drunk to my knowledge?

Q. What kind of a man was Martin Harris?

A. He was an honorable man. Martin Harris was one of the first men in the town.

Q. How well did you know young Joseph Smith?

A. Oh! just as well as one could very well; he has worked for me many a time, and been about my place a great deal. He stopped with me many a time, when through here, after they went west to Kirtland; he was always a gentleman when about my place.

Q. What did you know about his finding that book, or the plates in the hill over there?

A. He always claimed that he saw the angel and received the book; but I don't know anything about it. Have seen it, but never read it as I know of; didn't care anything about it.

Q. Well you seem to differ a little from a good many of the stories told about these people.

A. I have told you just what I know about them, and you will have to go somewhere else for a different story."

I claim your attention next while I read the statements of J. H. Gilbert taken down as he made them and afterwards published and furnished him. He is asked first the question: "What did you know about the Smiths, Mr. Gilbert?" and answers:

I knew nothing myself; have seen Joseph Smith a few times, but not acquainted with

him. Saw Hyrum quite often. I am the party that set the type from the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon.

Q. Did you change any part of it when you were setting the type?

A. No, sir; we never changed it at all.

Q. Why did you not change it and correct it?

A. Because they would not allow us to; they were very particular about that. We never changed it in the least. Oh well, there might have been one or two words that I changed the spelling of; I believe I did change the spelling of one, and perhaps two; but no more.

Q. Did you set all the type, or did some one help you?

A. I did the whole of it myself, and helped to read the proof, too; there was no one who worked at that but myself. Did you ever see one of the first copies? I have one here that was never bound. Mr. Grandin the printer gave it to me. If you ever saw a Book of Mormon you will see that they changed it afterwards.

Q. They did! well let us see your copy; that is a good point. How is it changed now?

A. I will show you (bringing out his copy). Here on the first page it says (reading) "Joseph Smith, Jr., author and proprietor." Afterwards they left that out, and only claimed that Joseph Smith translated it.

Q. Well, did they claim anything else than that he was the translator when they brought the manuscript to you?

A. Oh, no; they claimed that he was translating it by means of some instruments that he got at the same time that he did the plates, and that the Lord helped him.

Q. Was he educated, do you know?

A. Oh, not at all then; but I understand that afterwards he made great advancement, and was quite a scholar and orator.

Q. How do you account for the production of the Book of Mormon, Mr. Gilbert, then, if Joseph Smith was so illiterate?

A. Well, that is the difficult question. It must have been from the Spaulding romance—you have heard of it, I suppose. The parties here, then, never could have been the authors of it, certainly. I have been for the last forty-five or fifty years trying to get the key to that thing; but we have never been able to make the connection yet. For some years past I have been corresponding with a person in Salt Lake by the name of Cobb, who is getting out a work against the Mormons; but we have never been able to find what we wanted.

Q. If you could connect Sidney Rigdon with Smith some way you could get up a theory?

A. Yes; that is just where the trouble lies; the manuscript was put into our hands in August, 1829, and all printed by March, 1830, and we cannot find that Rigdon was ever about here or in this State until some time in the fall of 1830. But I think I have got a way out of the difficulty now. A fellow that used to be here by the name of

Saunders, Lorenzo Saunders, was back here some time ago, and I was asking him about it. At first he said he did not remember of seeing Rigdon until after 1830 sometime; but after studying it over a while he said it seemed to him that one time he was over to Smith's and that there was a stranger there he never saw before, and that they said it was Rigdon. I told him about Cobb, of Utah, and asked him if he would send Cobb his affidavit that he saw Rigdon before the book was published, if he (Cobb) would write to him; he finally said he would, and I wrote to Cobb about it, and gave Saunders' address, and after a long time I got a letter from him saying he had written three letters to Saunders and could get no answer. I then sat down and wrote Saunders a letter myself reminding him of his promise; and wrote to Cobb also about it; and after a long time Cobb wrote me again, that Saunders had written to him, but I have never learned how satisfactory it was, or whether he made the affidavit or not.

Q. Is that Saunders a brother of the Saunders living down here, Orlando Saunders?

A. Yes, sir; they are brothers.

Q. Is he older or younger?

A. Younger; about fifteen years younger.

Q. Then he must have been quite young before the Book of Mormon was published?

A. Yes, he was young.

Q. This Saunders down here don't talk like a great many people; he seems to think the Smiths were very good people: we have been there to-day.

A. Oh I don't think the Smiths were as bad as people let on for. Now Tucker in his work told too many big things: nobody could believe his stories.

Q. What kind of a man was Martin Harris?

A. He was a very honest farmer but very superstitious.

Q. What was he before his name was connected with the Book of Mormon?

A. Not anything I believe. He was a kind of skeptic.

Q. What do you mean by his being superstitious? Was he religious?

A. Well, I don't know about that: but he pretended to see things.

Q. What do you think of the Book of Mormon as a book; you are well posted in it?

A. Oh, there is nothing taught in the book but what is good; there is no denying that; it is the claim of *being from God that I strike at.*

Q. Well, is it any more wonderful than that God gave the Bible?

A. No, not a bit, and there is a good deal more evidence to show that that is divine than there is for some of the books in the Bible. Why, it is all nonsense to think that Moses wrote some of the books attributed to him in the Bible.

Q. Then you don't believe the fish story, either, Mr. Gilbert?

A. No, nor that Jonah swallowed the whale.

Q. How about Samson catching the three hundred foxes and the firebrands?

A. Yes; that is a good one; you fellows will do.

Q. Much obliged, Mr. Gilbert.

A. You are quite welcome; I wish I could give you more than I have."

Next I refer you to the statements made by three of the Jackaways at Palmyra, especially to show you about the stories of money digging, how they started, &c.; and that they had no foundation in fact. The following among other questions were asked these parties:

Q. "Where was Joe when he was translating his book?

A. At home; it was translated in the farm house.

Q. Mr. Gilbert across here, said it was done in a cave; now you don't agree. What does Tucker say? (reading Tucker.)

A. They all differ. Now Tucker has a statement from Willard Chase in his book, and Chase said Tucker never called on him at all to find out what he knew.

Lady.—Yes; I have heard Willard Chase say Tucker never even asked him for what he knew, and Chase lived next door to him, too. Chase is now dead.

Q. Well, did you ever see Hulburt or Howe, who published a work against the Mormons?

A. Yes; Hulburt came around first, I believe, soon after the thing started, and they had gone to Kirtland, Ohio, trying to find things against them, and there have been a good many around trying to connect Sidney Rigdon with them."

Q. "How far did you live from town when the Smiths were in this country?"

A. One-half mile south of Palmyra.

Q. Were you acquainted with Joseph Smith and his early followers?

A. Yes, I knew them; seen them a many a time—old Joe and young Joe.

Q. How far did you live from them?

A. It was about a mile.

Q. You know about their digging for money, so Mr. Gilbert said; he sent us to you.

A. Oh, yes; I can show you the places now there are three places over there where they dug.

Q. Well, we want to see them. Did you help them dig?

A. No. I never helped them.

Q. Well, you saw them digging?

A. No; I never saw them digging.

Q. How do you know they dug the holes you refer to?

A. I don't know they dug them, but the holes are there.

Q. Did anybody else dig for money at that time there?

A. I believe there were some others that dug, but I did not see them.

Q. Do you know any of them?

A. I only know one now; he lives up at Canandaigua."

I next introduce the evidence of Dr. John Stafford, of Rochester, N. Y., son of William Stafford, made so conspicuous by

Tucker in his work against the Mormons. In answer to a question as to the character of Joseph Smith, Dr. Stafford said:

"He was a real clever boy. What Tucker said about them was false, absolutely.

Q. What about that black sheep your father let them have?"

A. I have heard that story, but don't think my father was there at the time they say Smith got the sheep. I don't know anything about it.

Q. You were living at home at the time, and it seems you ought to know if they got a sheep, or stole one from your father?"

A. They never stole one, I am sure; they may have got one some time.

Q. Well, doctor, you know pretty well whether that story is true or not that Tucker tells. What do you think of it?"

A. I don't think it is true. I would have heard more about it if it had been true. I lived a mile from Smith's. I am 76 years old. They were peaceable among themselves. The old woman had a great deal of faith that their children were going to do something great. Joe was illiterate. After they began to have school at their house he improved greatly.

Q. Did they have a school at their house?"

A. Yes, sir; they had school in their house and studied the Bible.

Q. Who was their teacher?"

A. They did not have any teacher; they taught themselves.

Q. Did you know Oliver Cowdery?"

A. Yes; he taught school on the Canandaigua Road, where the stone school house now stands, just three and a half miles from Palmyra. Cowdery was a man of good character."

Thomas Taylor at Manchester said when interrogated about Mr. Smith and family as follows:

"Yes; I knew them very well; they were nice men, too; the only trouble was they were ahead of the people, and the people as in every such case, turned out to abuse them because they had the manhood to stand for their own convictions.

Q. What did the Smith's do that the people abused them so?"

A. They did not do anything. Why! these rascals at one time took Joseph Smith and ducked him in the pond that you see over there, just because he preached what he believed and for nothing else. And if Jesus Christ had been there they would have done the same to him. Now I don't believe like he did; but every man has a right to his religious opinions, and to advocate his views too; if people don't like it, let them come out and meet him on the stand and show his error. Smith was always ready to exchange views with the best men they had.

Q. Why didn't they like Smith?"

A. To tell the truth, there was something about him they could not understand; some how he knew more than they did, and it made them mad.

Q. But a good many tell terrible stories

about them being low people, rogues and liars, and such things. How is that?"

A. Oh! they are a set of liars. I have had a home here, and been here, except when on business, all my life—ever since I came to this country, and I know these fellows; and they make these lies on Smith because they love a lie better than the truth. I can take you to a great many old settlers who will substantiate what I say, and if you want to go, come to my place across the way, and I'll go with you.

Q. That is very kind Mr. Taylor; but we are first going to see these fellows, who, so rumor says, know so much against him?"

A. All right; but you will find they don't know anything against those men when you put them down to it; they could never sustain anything against Smith."

I have read you the foregoing interviews for the reason that they were taken down as they came from the lips of the parties and may be relied upon. To my knowledge there has never been a single contradiction of one of these statements by a single one of the parties whose testimony I have just read except Gilbert's, and at the proper time if the question is raised I will examine his.

This thing which they got up about the Saints is an entire fraud, and I will prove it by comparing the work, that from which my opponent draws his testimony, this Howe and Hulburt history, with our works, and show you that they have deliberately *garbled and falsified, and most mischievously perverted our works.*

Where our works are plain and distinct, they have, in order to make them ridiculous, taken out words and clauses, taken out entire sentences, to present the teaching as bad. Yet, this is the book that he has commended to you and been reading his statements and affidavits from. I will show you further in the discussion that what are called affidavits or statements of John Spaulding and Martha Spaulding were never made by them, and that in fact he has no such; and if I don't prove all of this, then I want you to denounce me before this audience.

Mr. Braden: Why, you are getting excited, my friend.

Mr. Kelley: Not at all, not at all, Bro. Braden. I am emphatic and positive in my positions, and if you have any evidence, bring it on.

Entering upon an examination of this work of Hulburt and Howe, I cite you first some of their *false representations and spurious quotations*, contrasting what they pretended to quote from our works with the true reading.

1. Howe, page 27 says:—"He represents Nephi as making plates in the wilderness with no ore."

Book of Mormon, Palmyra Edition, page 43, shows the plates were made after the people arrived upon this continent, and after they had found ore with many other things.

2. Howe, same page, "Has a command-

ment from the Lord to make plates for the special purpose of making a record of his own ministry and his own people."

Book of Mormon, page 17: "I have received a commandment from the Lord that I should make these plates for the special purpose that there should be an account engraven of the ministry of my people."

3. Howe again: "Our hero introduces himself as a minister."

Book of Mormon, page 17: "And now I, Nephi, proceed to give an account upon these plates and of my proceedings and my reign and ministry."

4. Howe, page 32: "It brought them all safely on the borders of the Red sea, with the exception of Ishmael."

Book of Mormon, page 42: "And we did sojourn for the space of many years, yea, even eight years, in the wilderness. And we did come to the land which we called bountiful, because of its much fruit. And we beheld the sea, which we called Iream-tum, which being interpreted is many waters." Notice—There is no Red sea about it.

5. Howe, page 35: "Whether the ship was propelled by oars, or oy a current, or by the wind, or by the power of the spindle, we cannot inform our readers, for it is not stated."

Book of Mormon, page 48: "And it came to pass that after we had all gone down into the ship and taken with us our provisions and things which had been commanded us, we did put forth into the sea, and were driven forth before the wind towards the promised land."

6. Take another specimen of his professed truths: Howe, page 38, states that there is an exact copy of the 48th and 49th chapters of Isaiah to be found in the Book of Mormon; and that they are introduced with the same words that commence the chapter in the Bible, intending thereby to show that they were copied from the Bible after it was divided into chapters and verses. This is wilfully false; for on comparison, it is found that the wording of the prophecy is different in its very introduction, and there are numerous differences between the two books, in words, sentences and verses. Neither can one tell where the division for a new chapter should be made in the reading of the Book of Mormon, save by noting the last word found in the 48th chapter of Isaiah, until he gets to the close of the 49th chapter, where the subject of these two chapters ends, and a new subject is introduced, and there the writer of the Book of Mormon left off writing. The claim is false, and made obviously to deceive. They are not alike, as claimed by Howe. Book of Mormon, page 52 to 56.

7. Again Howe says, page 42: "The Nephites warred with each other until they exterminated the whole race except three, who were immortalized."

Book of Mormon, pp. 493 to 496: "Yea, even all my people, save it were those twenty and four who were with me, and also a few who had escaped into the south countries,

and a few who had dissented over unto the Lamanites, had fallen and their flesh and bones and blood lay upon the face of the earth."

8. By way of an argument it is again stated: Howe, page 44. "The Book of Mormon is hard to understand."

"Would it not be reasonable to conclude that any book whose author was the Holy Ghost, would be clear and perfect in all its parts—so plain that the wayfaring man need not err."

I suggest that Mr. Braden try John's Revelation by this rule, and see how long he can endorse his backer Howe. But I proceed with the contrast.

9. Howe, page 52: "We are likewise told in the same discourse that the plates or book would be sealed up, and should finally be found by an unlearned man, who should see them, and show them to three others."

Here is found the great bugbear, sought to be kept before the people to deceive. How different, however, it is from the true reading.

Book of Mormon, page 110:

"Wherefore, at that day when the book shall be delivered unto the man of whom I have spoken, the book shall be hid from the eyes of the world, that the eyes of none shall behold it, save it be that three witnesses shall behold it, by the power of God, besides him to whom the book shall be delivered, and they shall testify to the truth of the book and the things therein. And there is none others which shall view it, save it be according to the will of God, to bear testimony of his word unto the children of men."

10. Another illustration, Howe, p. 65:

"And if Christ had not risen from the dead or have broken the bonds of death, that the grave should have no victory, and that death should have no sting, there could have been no resurrection."

He endeavors to prove by the tense of the verb here, that it was written after the crucifixion of Christ, and to deceive quotes only a part of the text.

Book of Mormon, page 169: "And now if Christ had not come into the world, speaking of things to come as though they had already come," &c. This he deftly leaves out. But again,

11. Howe, pp. 68, 69: Mosiah causes all records to be revised, and "transcribes" the plates of brass brought out from Jerusalem."

Book of Mormon, page 216:

"Now King Mosiah had no one to confer the kingdom upon, for there was not any of his sons which would accept the kingdom; therefore he took the records which were engraven upon the plates of brass, and also the plates of Nephi, and all the things which he had kept and preserved according to the commandments of God, and after having translated and caused to be written the records which were on the plates of gold, which had been found by the people of Limhi, which was delivered to him by the hand of Limhi, and this he did because of the great anxiety of his people, for they were desirous beyond measure, to know concerning those people which had been destroyed. And now he translated them by means of those two stones which were fastened into the two rims of a bow."

12. Howe, page 77:

"Smith used a stone in a hat for the purpose of translating the plates. The spectacles (Urim and Thummim) and plates were found together, but were taken from him and hid up again before he had translated one word, and he has never seen them since."

"This is Smith's own story."

The following is the account by Mr. Smith himself:

"I copied a considerable number of them, and by means of the *Urim and Thummim* I translated some of them, which I did between the time I arrived at the house of my wife's father, in the month of December, 1827, and the February following."

Again, see his own history by himself:

"By the wisdom of God they (the plates *Urim and Thummim* and breast-plate,) remained safe in my hands until I had accomplished by them what was required at my hand, when according to arrangements the messenger called for them; I delivered them up to him and he has them in his charge until this day, being the second day of May, 1838."—*Pearl of Great Price*, page 44.

See also Cowdery's statement:

"Day after day I continued, uninterrupted, to write from his mouth, as he translated with the *Urim and Thummim*, or, as the Nephites would have said, Interpreters, the history or record called the Book of Mormon." Ibid. page 46.

13. Here is still another glaring perversion and misrepresentation. Howe, page 89: "The whole record being handed down and altered according to our manner of speech."

Book of Mormon, page 538: "And now we have written this record according to our knowledge in the *characters*, which are called among us reformed Egyptian, being handed down and altered by us according to our manner of speech."

The writer says the *characters* which they used in writing had been changed; Howe says, the record was changed.

14. Again, Howe, page 90: "God marched before them in a cloud."

Book of Mormon, pp. 541, 542, and 48: "The Lord did *go before them*, and talked to them while he stood in a cloud, and gave directions whither they should travel."

15. Howe, page 90: "They make a hole in the top to admit air and one in the bottom to admit water; in each hole was put a molten stone, which when touched by the finger of Jesus became as transparent as any glass and gave them light under the mountain waves. Two of these stones were sealed up with the plates according to a prediction before Abraham was born.

"Thou shalt make a hole in the top there-

of and in the bottom thereof, and when thou shalt suffer for air, thou shalt unstop the hole thereof and receive air. And if it so be that water come in upon thee thou shalt stop the hole."

"And he did put forth the stones into the vessels which are prepared, *one in each end thereof*."

Howe, page 90: "The Lord commanded him that he should seal up the two stones which he had received and show them not." Not a word about Abraham.

16. Howe, page 124: "Even their wine they used for communion they were ordered to make from cider and other materials."

Book of Covenants, page 102: "You shall not purchase wine, neither strong drink from your enemies, wherefore you shall partake of none save it is made new among you."

Nothing about cider and other materials as said by Howe.

17. Again, Howe, page 129: "If thou lovest me, thou shalt serve me and keep my commandments; and behold thou shalt consecrate *all thy properties, that which thou hast*, unto me, with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken."

The true reading of the Book of Covenants, page 143: "If thou lovest me, thou shalt serve me and keep all my commandments. And behold, *thou wilt remember the poor*, and consecrate *of thy properties* for their support, that which *thou hast* to impart *unto them*, with a covenant and a deed which cannot be broken; and inasmuch as you impart of your substance *unto the poor*, ye will do it *unto me*."

Howe says, "Thou shalt consecrate *all thy properties, that which thou hast*, unto me." The truth is they were required to consecrate of their properties that which they were able to donate for that purpose; and the promise was, "inasmuch as ye impart of your substance unto the poor, ye will do it unto me."

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S TENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The Books of the Bible were written on papyrus, parchment, perishable material; and they had to be copied and revised to preserve them; and this was done by uninspired men liable to err. The Book of Mormon was engraved by inspired men, on plates, imperishable material, and needed no copying. If the Bible was revised or arranged, it was done by uninspired men. The Book of Mormon was revised, abridged, by inspired men. The manuscripts of the Bible were written, preserved, and handled by uninspired men. The plates of the Book of Mormon were engraved, preserved and handled by inspired men. The Bible has come down to us without any miracle in its production, except in the inspiration of its inspired men. The Book of Mormon was written by miracle, preserved by miracle, its existence revealed to Smith by miracle.

Our translation as made by uninspired men. They had to determine which of the various readings is the true one, which of the various meanings of Greek and Hebrew words is the right one in each passage, then the meaning of the passage, from the meaning and use of its words, its context, its grammatical structure, and this was the work of uninspired learning. But Smith had to compare no various readings. He had the exact words, that the inspired Mormon engraved. He did not have to search lexicons, and grammars for meanings and uses of words. He looked into his interpreter and God himself by miracle caused the word to appear before Smith's vision. If there is any mistake God made it—not Smith. The only chance for error was that Smith could not read the word correctly, or that his scribe did not understand the word as Smith gave it to him; but as Smith was inspired he could make no mistakes and as Cowdrey was directly called and qualified, according to the revelation in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, he could make no mistake. We can see how mental peculiarities and lack of education could affect the writers of the Bible, and understand that they should appear in the books of the Bible; but Smith's illiteracy, his mental peculiarities, and style, ought not, could not, appear in the Book of Mormon, for God, by miracle, placed the word before Smith, and all Smith did was to read it and repeat it to Cowdrey, and all Cowdrey did was to write it. Smith and Cowdrey had no more to do with the words, style, truth, literary character, of the Book of Mormon, than a speaking trumpet, or a telephone, or phonograph have with what a man utters through them.

The angel Moroni declares in the inspired preface, which is a direct revelation from the angel God authorized to give this revelation to the world, that it is "written by

"way of commandment and by the spirit of "prophecy and revelation, written and sealed, and hid up by the command and inspiration of God; to come forth by the inspiration and power of God; and the interpretation (by Smith) was by the gift of God." It was all done by inspiration, by God himself. Not only so, but the three witnesses testify "We know that the records have been translated by the gift and power of "God for his voice declared it unto us, "wherefore we know of a certainty that the "word, the Book of Mormon is true." Why? Because God's voice declared that it was true.

The only opportunity there is for human error in the Book of Mormon, is in typographical errors, and there can be none of these, for it was proofread by inspired men; and the caveat that it is pretended Moroni issued in the preface "If there be fault it be the mistake of men," is a deliberate lie, since God inspired the speakers, actors, and writers, as fully as he did the apostles, since he inspired and superintended all copying, since he gave every word himself, by direct miracle in the translation, as Moroni himself tells us in the same preface, since he said, with his own voice, to the three witnesses that the translation was his own work; and that the Book is true. There can be no mistake of man, for man had no more to do with it than a telephone has with what it utters. The statement of Moroni is as remarkable for its morality as for its grammar "If there be fault it be the mistake of men." The Almighty, in his last and most perfect revelation, sends out faults, a bundle of falsehoods with the truth that he gave to the world word by word by Joe; and which he commanded the three witnesses, with his own voice, to declare all nations and tongues to be true.

We are now ready to examine this revelation we affirm:

1. That God would not give, in so wonderful and entirely miraculous a manner, a book that did not commend itself to the common sense and reason of men, as worthy of him, and divine.

2. He would give it in a manner worthy of himself and such a miraculously given book.

3. The person through whom it was given would be worthy of such a wonderful mission.

4. The surroundings should be worthy of such a work.

5. Its utterances should agree with all established truths.

6. They should agree with other revelations in the Bible.

7. They should agree with other revelations in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants and all other revelations of Joseph Smith, or any other inspired men.

8. They should agree with the inspired translation of Joseph Smith.

9. They should agree with themselves.

10. They should be as much superior to the Bible, as their origin was superior to the origin of the Bible.

The first edition of the Book of Mormon had on the title page written by inspiration, "Joseph Smith jr., Author and Proprietor." Joe's egotism led him to tell the truth, a part of the truth, for he did not give credit to Spaulding and Rigdon, but he fearfully contradicted the declaration of inspiration, in the Book which declares that Mormon and Moroni are the authors. Inspired Joe noticed this contradiction and corrected it in all later editions. According to this inspired title page, Jehovah gave, in the most miraculous manner possible, a revelation higher and better than all he had ever given before for the salvation of the human race and constituted ignorant, lazy, loafing, lying, drinking, swearing, lewd, fortune-telling, money-hunting Joe Smith its sole proprietor and sole sharer of its profits. He gave to Imposter Joe, under the seal of R. R. Lansing, District Clerk of Northern New York, the sole right to vend this revelation that is the fulness of the Gospel.

In the introduction to the first edition it seems that the Mormon God had not found out what Lucy Harris did with the 116 pages that she burned. The Mormon God issues a long manifesto to guard against a trick that no one ever dreamt of trying. The Mormon God undertakes to circumvent any persons trying a trick that never was imagined, by telling Joe to publish a deliberate lie. He is to translate the plates of Nephi, until he comes to the same event as the one with which the translation from the plates of Lehi in the stolen pages ended, and finish with the plates of Lehi. He then is to publish the whole as a translation of the plates of Nephi, and tell a lie. How did Joe know when he reached that point, as he did not have the plates? Why could not the Mormon God re-translate from the plates of Lehi, as well as translate from the plates of Nephi, since he had both? The truth is that Lucy Harris burnt the 116 pages of Spaulding's Mormon Manuscript No. III., and that much was gone beyond recovery. Rigdon had to re-model a portion of Mormon Manuscript No. II. to take the place of what had been burnt.

We will now begin our analysis of the matter in the book itself. On page 1, Nephi, an Israelite born and reared in Jerusalem, as his fathers before him had been for generations, tells us that he writes his record in the language of his fathers, which consists of the learning of the Jews and the language of the Egyptians. There are four ridiculous blunders in these few words. I. The writer evidently meant to imitate Stephen, who says "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." He gets it the learning of the Jews, when they were inferior to the Egyptians in learning. He meant, perhaps, the learning of the

Egyptians. II. The term Jew is not in the original of the Bible. It is an English nickname, just as "Yank" is a nickname for Yankee. The term Judahite or Judean was not national, the name of a people till after the return from captivity. III. The preposterous idea that an Israelite raised in Jerusalem, where only the Hebrew was spoken—whose fathers had lived in Jerusalem, where only the Hebrew was spoken—could say that the language of his fathers was Egyptian, a language that the Israelites abhorred, as they did everything Egyptian. The superstitious reverence of the Israelites for the Hebrew is well known; yet the language of Nephi, Hebrew of Hebrews, was Egyptian. IV. The idea that Jehovah spoke to an Israelite in Egyptian, when he never used in his revelations to them any language but the Hebrew. It also contains a falsehood, for Nephi's fathers were not Jews, but Mannassehites; the learning of his fathers was not that of the Jews.

We could drop the Book of Mormon right here. None but an ignoramus like Rigdon, an ignoramus in biblical literature, would have committed four such blunders as those we have given. No Israelite ever did. On the succeeding pages, from 2 to 9, we are told that Lehi was compelled by persecution to flee from Jerusalem, leaving everything behind, and taking nothing but his family, some tents and provisions. By command of the Lord Nephi is seen returning to Jerusalem to obtain certain plates in the possession of his kinsman Laban. Nephi offers Laban his father's property for the plates. Laban refuses, and drives Nephi and his brothers out, taking their property by violence. Nephi returns, makes Laban drunk, murders him, lies to his servants gets the plates and returns to his father, who has a shouting time over the results of murder and lying. This account is full of absurdities and contradictions. I. It asserts that the writing material of the Israelites was metallic plates. They used papyrus, tanned leather, parchment, vellum, linen smeared with gum, tablets smeared with wax, but never used metallic plates. We read of metallic plates but once in the Bible—in the Book of Job, who was not an Israelite, and nearly 1,000 years before this time. II. The idea that God approved of Nephi's making Laban drunk, murdering him, lying to his servants, and robbing him of his property. III. On page 8 we have a talk of a Church and Brethren 600 years before Christ. Sidney Rigdon's gross ignorance is manifest in such a blunder. Let us see what these five men carried away: (A.) The books of Moses on metallic plates. (B.) The records of the Jews from the beginning. That is, all who spoke Hebrew were called Jews, from the beginning. As well say that all who spoke English were called Yanks from the beginning. This would take an enormous pile of plates. (C.) The writings of all of the prophets and writers of Israel from the beginning. All the Old Testament written before Zedekiah. All

the books it mentions that were used in writing the Books of Kings and Chronicles. All the works of the prophets mentioned in the Book of Mormon, but not mentioned in the Bible. Doubtless many prophetic writings never mentioned. (D.) Genealogical tables from Joseph to Laban. All this voluminous literature, which would have made a wagon-load if on parchment, was engraved on plates and not on papyrus, the only material then in use, and was carried off by five men, who were dodging round to save their lives, when it must have required a caravan of teams to have hauled it. This rigmarole represents copies of the Pentateuch and the Scriptures as being common, well known, in open use with their tables of genealogy. Not a hundred years before they were almost unknown; and in the days of Zedekiah's father so little were they known that reading a copy found by accident revolutionized the nation. This enormous load of plates was carried by Lehi in all his journeyings. Laban's sword was steel, when it is a notorious fact that the Israelites knew nothing of steel for hundreds of years afterwards. Who but as ignorant a person as Rigdon would have perpetrated all these blunders? When Lehi saw that caravan-load of plates, gotten by making the owner drunk, by murder, robbery and lying, he reveals and prophecies that these plates of Laban shall go forth to all nations. As not a single plate of Laban has ever gone forth to anybody, the Mormon God was mistaken when he inspired Lehi with that prophecy.

On page 14 we have a beginning of a series of violations of the most positive requirements of the law of God. Manassehites begin offering sacrifices in flagrant violation of the law of God. On page 16 the Mormon God commands Nephi to make plates to receive the record of the ministry of his people. Although Lehi had brought with them only tents and provisions, Nephi digs ore, smelts it, casts plates, makes tools to do all this, and engraves on them in a wilderness where a dozen persons are alone with only tents and provisions. From page 17 to page 32 Rigdon makes Nephi and Lehi talk like preachers of the nineteenth century. They foretell the history of John the Baptist, Mary the mother of Jesus, and the ministry of Jesus, giving the names of persons and places with great minuteness; also what they should do and say. The prophets of Israel never did any such prophesying. They rarely give names of persons or places, and never foretell the exact language persons will use. Rigdon makes Nephi and Lehi discourse like Disciple preachers. They discuss all the leading topics of the gospel as Disciple preachers do, and discuss many themes of modern theology. They plagiarize Paul's parable of the olive tree. Lehi declares he has the Holy Spirit in the name of Christ and through faith in Christ 600 years before Christ came. Rigdon airs one of his hobbies that he retained from the Baptists and in which he differed from the Disciples. John tells us

that the Holy Spirit was not given in that way till after Jesus was glorified. Jesus declares that the Holy Spirit would not be given in his name till after his ascension, but Lehi knew better than Paul and Jesus. Paul declares that these gospel themes were mysteries until the apostles of Jesus revealed them. Paul was mistaken, for Rigdon tells us that Lehi and Nephi knew all about them 600 years before Paul lived. Not only so, but God revealed to Lehi and Nephi far more than he ever did to the apostles of Jesus. He revealed to them all about the Romish Apostacy, its errors and crimes, the peculiar doctrine of Luther's reformation, settles several questions of modern theology, and always in harmony with Rigdon's ideas.

One of the most monstrous absurdities in the Book of Mormon is the Liahoni, Lehi's brass director or compass. We are told that Lehi had given to him by miracle, direct from the workshop of the Mormon God doubtless—a brass ball of curious workmanship. The reader will admit that it was of most curious workmanship when he hears it described, "and it was of fine brass, and within the ball were two spindles, and one pointed out the way we should go in the wilderness." How could they see the two spindles inside of a hollow brass globe? "One pointed the way they should go." Of what use was the other? It pointed the way they should not go, I suppose. Page 36: "These spindles (inside of a brass globe) worked according to the faith of the possessor." If they worked as the possessor wanted them to point, of what use were they? How did they see how they pointed if they were inside of a brass globe? By faith and the power of God I suppose, as Imposter Joe saw the translation of the Book of Mormon in the crown of his old hat as he was peering into his stolen peep-stone; but as the possessor knew they pointed the direction he wanted them to point, it did not make any odds whether he saw them or not. "On these spindles was written"—on two fine spindles inside of a brass globe where nobody could see—"a new writing." It must have been an extensive writing that was all on two fine spindles. "Plain to be read." Yes it must have been very plain on two fine spindles and inside of a brass globe where nobody could see, "and it gave us instructions concerning the ways of the Lord," all on two fine spindles and inside of a brass globe where nobody could see; "and it was written and changed from time to time"—yes all on two fine spindles or needles inside of a brass globe where nobody could see it. Then Sidney remarks with exceedingunction, "Thus we see that the Lord accomplishes great things by small means." Yea, verily, Sidney; and when the Lord gave the fulness of the gospel to the world through such a lying, extravagant ignoramus as you, in such balderdash as the above he accomplished the greatest work with the smallest means ever tried.

Next Nephi is told to build a ship and

showed in a vision where to find material. Lehi left Jerusalem with nothing but tents and provisions, for he fled for his life and is away in a wilderness and without tools. Nephi alone, for the rest opposed and ridiculed him, and there were only 15 men and women in all, digs ore, builds furnaces, forges and machine shops, smelts ore, casts implements, forges, tools, "every tree to cut down," cuts the trees and builds the ship "all his own self," as the boy boasted he accomplished his task. But then Nephi tells us that he did not construct it after the fashion of men, but after a manner that the Lord showed him. I am so glad that he told us that, or we might not have believed his story. I suppose the Lord's plan or patent on ships don't require any work. What a pity that he did not leave the plan, by which one man can, all by his own self, do the work of hundreds and in next to no time. If it be said that this was done by miracle, then what need of Nephi's doing anything? Why was not the ship furnished ready made, like Lehi's wonderful brass compass?

Lehi and his host set sail in this wonderful ship made after the Lord's plan. Notwithstanding this wonderful series of miracles that Nephi had worked before their eyes, Nephi's brethren rebel and bind him, and "lo and behold," to use the celestial language of this Divine translation of Reformed Egyptian, the wonderful brass compass gets balky and refuses to work, and the rebels know not whither to steer the ship, "inasmuch that there arose a great storm, yea, a great and terrible tempest." Awful, Sydney! perfectly awful! Now whether the tempest so great and terrible, was caused by the compass ceasing to work, or by their not knowing which way to steer, is not plain, but the language declares "it was one or tother." The ship is driven back; now if they did not know which way they were going how did they know whether it was driven back, or forward, or sideways. Nephi is released and the compass points—the way they should go? No, the way Nephi wants it to point. That compass was as valuable as the California hog scales. It is said that out there they used to lay a rail across a log, put the hog on one end and a pile of stones on the other, until they balanced, and then guess at the weight of the stones.

If it be said that Nephi knew what course they ought to go, then of what use was the compass to him? If the compass showed him, how did he know when it ceased to work? And how did it show him when he made it point the way that he wanted it to point? That compass was as serviceable to Nephi as the man's snuffers who snuffed the candle with his fingers and put the snuff into the snuffers. Finally they reach the land of promise, and they find in the wilderness both the "cow" and the "ox." Now here is a miracle which ends all cavil as to the divine origin of the Book of Mormon. Cow and ox cannot mean two different species of animals, and as one is suffi-

cient to designate the genus *bos*, *ox* means the male upon which an operation has been performed to change him from a bull into an ox. Now, as man had not been in this land, we have the blasphemous ludicrous insinuation that the miraculous power of the Almighty had been exerted to change these animals from bulls into oxen to prepare them for Nephi's use. Now we know of a certainty, Sidney, that the Book of Mormon is of Divine origin. While they were in the wilderness before building the ship Nephi was told to make brass plates. One of two things is certain, either he had to dig up copper and zinc, smelt them and manufacture brass plates, and that without tools to do it, for they had fled from Jerusalem with nothing but tents and provisions, or he wrote on nothing or made the plates out of nothing.

On landing in America, the Mormon God is so careful about having Impostor Joe get these plates that he orders Nephi to make some more plates—gold, silver and copper are mentioned, but no zinc; but Nephi has got used to making things out of nothing, and it was no trick at all for him to make copper without zinc, build furnaces, work mines and make machine shops without tools, and nothing to do it with.

On page 44 it is declared that the darkness at the death of our Saviour should cover the whole earth and last three days. The Bible says it was only over the land in which he was crucified, and was only three hours; but hyfalutin spread-eagle Sidney never did things by halves; he had it over the whole earth and three whole days—none of your cheap little miracles for Sidney; they might do for the Bible, but they won't answer for miracles in the "Fullness of the Gospel."

On page 56, Lehi, in a sermon, quotes whole sentences of Paul's writings more than 600 years before Paul wrote:—"By the law no flesh is justified. He offereth himself a sacrifice for sins which layeth down his life according to the flesh and taketh it up according to the spirit that he may bring to pass the resurrection of the dead being the first to rise." Which shall we believe, that an Israelite in the wilds of America quoted Paul's language, whole sentences, 600 years before Paul was born, or that the Disciple preacher Rigdon interpolated Paul's language into the romance he stole from Spaulding when he was remodelling it to be used as a pretended new revelation?

From pages 59 to 60 is a pretended prophecy of the Patriarch Joseph concerning Impostor Joe. "He is a choice seer." Verily he was! He shall bring forth the Nephite Word of God. He will be of the seed of the Patriarch Joseph, the Son of Jacob. His name shall be Joseph. His father's name shall be Joseph. Now here is a dilemma. The Nephites were all exterminated; the only descendants of Lehi and Joseph in America are the Lamanites. They were cursed with a skin of blackness and became

Indians. Did Imposter Joe come from the Nephites that have not existed for 1400 years, or from the Indians? Of what tribe is he the "big injun?" Perhaps he is one of the three Nephites that never died. The Patriarch Joseph prophesied of Sidney Rigdon also. The Lord was to raise up of the fruit of the loins of the Patriarch Joseph a spokesman for that seer. Again we are in trouble. Did Sidney Rigdon come from the Nephites that have been exterminated 1400 years, or is he "Big Injun" of some tribe of Lamanites? Perhaps he is one of the Nephites that never died, and Imposter Joe's father, who was of the seed of Joseph, was the third. Is this prophecy or is it a fraud of Sidney Rigdon?

Page 62 we have a long soliloquy that Nephi engraved on the plates made up of patches of the Psalms and Jeremiah badly put together. Then Nephi marches off into the wilderness with all of the company except two sinners, Laman and Lemuel, and their rebellious seed, who remain behind and are cursed with a skin of blackness and became Lamanites—Indians. Nephi and his company, however, keep the law of the Lord according to the statutes of Moses. We shall see how well they do it. Now we encounter a blunder that is sufficient to brand the Book of Mormon as the most blunderingly constructed fraud, the most transparent lie ever told.

The largest estimate that we can possibly put on this company, will not make it more than ten married couples—all of whom, except Lehi, are married after leaving Jerusalem; yet, already they are divided into two nations, and Nephi teaches one of these mighty rations how to make weapons and defend themselves against the mighty nation of Lamanites, two men, two women, and their children born during twenty years. This mighty nation of Nephites composed of not more than eight adults, four men and four women, and their children born during twenty years, erect in the wilderness of America a temple like unto the temple of Solomon; they work in iron these eight men and women, erect furnaces, forges and machine shops, work in copper and gold, yes, and in brass and steel, which Mormon inspiration tells us are native ores. The origin of the American Indians has puzzled all ethnologists; but Sidney Rigdon explains the whole matter. To prevent the Nephites from mixing with the wicked Lamanites, the Lord wrought a stupendous miracle—he cursed the Lamanites with a skin of blackness. There now you have a great scientific problem solved by inspiration. I commend this wonderful scientific explanation to Kelley as the crowning evidence of the Divine origin of the Book of Mormon.

After asserting that they kept the commandments of God, according to the law of Moses, Nephi coolly tells us that they erected a temple in America instead of at Jerusalem—consecrated priests out of the tribe of Manasseh instead of Levi. And these usurper priests offered sacrifices in the

wilderness of America instead of at Jerusalem in a temple built in violation of God's law. God blessed these sacrilegious violators of his law far above the most favorite obedient Israelite in Palestine, revealed to them the Gospel, and conferred on them its blessings as fully as on the most favored apostles of Christ 600 years before Christ came. God terribly punished Korah, Dathan and Abiram for violating his law, though they did not violate it as flagrantly as did these Nephites, and placed far above all mankind these sacrilegious Nephites who trampled nearly every precept under foot. These Nephites preached the Gospel of Christ as clearly as Sidney Rigdon could preach it, and as he preached it; and enjoyed every blessing of the Gospel as fully as Rigdon could, yet Nephi declares that "notwithstanding we believe in Christ, we obey the law of Moses." What a falsehood, for he tells us they violated all its great principles and "look steadfastly unto Christ until the law be fulfilled." The law was to prepare a way for the knowledge of Christ, and then became useless having fulfilled its purpose. The Nephites obeyed the law for 600 years after they knew all about the Gospel, and obeyed it when the law was useless to them, and they could not obey it for they were obeying the Gospel. This blundering, unscriptural introduction of the Gospel 600 years before Christ who alone was to reveal and introduce it, is in flat contradiction of every idea of God's word. But Rigdon was bound to have his Nephites far greater fellows than their brethren in Palestine, even if he did contradict God's word in doing it.

The Nephites who violate God's law far excel Jeremiah, Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel in prophesying. They quote whole chapters of the Old Testament, whole paragraphs and sentences of the New, quoting the exact language hundreds of years before the ones who uttered it lived. "They that are filthy are filthy still. They shall go away into everlasting punishment. He commandeth all men that they must repent. Where there is no law there is no punishment, and where there is no punishment there is no condemnation." These are a few of scores of instances that could be cited. Who is such a sodden idiot as to believe that men in America preached all the doctrine of Christ and his apostles 600 years before they uttered it, in the exact words in which they uttered it, rather than that Sidney Rigdon interpolated these quotations into the manuscript he had stolen from Spaulding when he was remodeling it to make a "big thing of it" as a new revelation?

It is perhaps necessary that we repeat our answer to our opponent's endless talk about American antiquities. We will concede that if he can prove that Joseph Smith gave to the world a single fact or truth regarding American antiquities or archeology or the history of the aborigines of America that was not known before his day, or that scientific research has discovered since his

day, that he was inspired and the Book of Mormon is of Divine origin. Our opponent cannot ask more than that of us. Will he meet the issue and prove that Joseph Smith has done so? We have proved that from the days of Cortez and Pizarro until Solomon Spaulding, scores of writers had published every idea in regard to American antiquities to be found in the Book of Mormon—that more than a score of such publications were issued during the lifetime of Solomon Spaulding in the United States—that Spaulding was well versed in these theories and an earnest advocate of them—that where the works of his day were correct his ideas in the Book of Mormon are correct—where they were in error his ideas in the Book of Mormon are erroneous.

My opponent tries hard to make something out of the fact that Priest published his works after Spaulding's death, and the last work after the Book of Mormon was published. Unfortunately for his effort, the authorities that Priest quotes in both works were published before Spaulding died and some of them before Smith was born. I defy my opponent to name a single idea in the Book of Mormon in regard to American antiquities that was not published before Spaulding wrote his Manuscript Found and most of them before Spaulding was born. They had been published in the United States and were the belief of most preachers in New England and the Middle States when Spaulding wrote his Manuscript Found. Sir Walter Scott wrote his historical novels and incorporated into them certain facts of Scotch antiquities, archæology and Scotch history. His novels agree with the results of scientific research into Scotch antiquities to a vastly greater extent than the Book of Mormon agrees with the results of scientific research into American antiquities. Not only so but they contain innumerable facts of Scotch History, many accurate pictures of persons well known in Scotch History and innumerable incidents in their

lives. The Book of Mormon does nothing of the kind: not a historic incident or character in it can be found outside of the Book of Mormon except what it plagiarizes from the Bible. Now to argue as Mr. Kelley does that the Book of Mormon is true, a veritable history, and of Divine origin because it harmonizes with certain ideas in regard to American antiquities that had been current in the United States before its author was born is infinitely more absurd than it would be to claim that all of Scott's historical novels were true, veritable histories, and of Divine origin, for they contain vastly more concerning Scotch antiquities that is true than the Book of Mormon contained concerning American Antiquities; and they contain almost innumerable facts of Scotch history, multitudes of real historic characters, with accurate descriptions of them and innumerable facts from their lives, while the Book of Mormon does not contain a single historic fact or character or incident. All that part of it is pure fabrication. Its history is as pure fabrication as Gulliver's travels or Baron Munchausen's Tales. The truth is simply this that as Scott incorporated certain facts of Scotch antiquities that were known in his day into his historic romances, so Spaulding incorporated into his historic romance the Manuscript Found certain ideas in regard to American antiquities that were current in his day. But Spaulding was not nearly as accurate as Scott and did not incorporate into his romance one hundredth part as much truth as Scott did. If Spaulding was inspired and the Book of Mormon stolen from him a revelation Scott was an hundred fold more inspired. Until my opponent clearly proves that there is a single fact or truth in the Book of Mormon that was not well known before it appeared and his archæological argument for its divine origin is colossal in its impudence and absurdity.

MR. KELLEY'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—There are but two more evenings upon this question. [The original agreement was for eight sessions, but after this evening was extended to ten.] I am glad again of this privilege of standing before you to advocate the divine sanction claimed for the Book of Mormon, because I think it is God's truth; I not only think it is true, but I am confident—I know that it is as claimed. I do not give you my personal knowledge, however, that you may take it for evidence in this discussion; but I offer you the knowledge from God's word, and if that is in accordance with my positions, I wish you to take that.

This evening I shall first take up and conclude my review of the kind of evidence Mr Braden has offered you to prove his case, and asked you to rely upon, viz: through the book of witness, (he says lawyer), Howe.

Don't deceive yourselves, my friends, by imagining that he is a lawyer. I have never known a lawyer yet, who would deliberately publish for truth what purported to be extracts from the works of a body of people in order to bemean them, and to accomplish this end would publish garbled, wicked and lying statements. I have known of many low and mean things resorted to by priests and people in order to try to make the Saints out monsters of crime and iniquity, but not many so brazen and impudent as to deliberately pretend to make a quotation from their books and then corrupt it, in order to keep it from knocking in the head their malicious scheme.

When I concluded last evening I was contrasting Howe's spurious quotations with the genuine, on the charge that he was trying to make out, that the early authorities of the church were after the people's property.

Howe, as I was before reading, pretends to quote: "Thou shalt consecrate all thy properties, that which thou hast, unto me." Page 129.

The true reading is, and I read from the first publication of the Book of Covenants, here in Kirtland, published five years before Mr. Howe's work: "Thou shalt remember the poor and consecrate of thy properties for their support, that which thou hast to impart unto them." Sec. 13, par. 8.

18. Again, Howe says: "He (the bishop) shall appoint every man a steward over his own property."

Here Howe, to carry out the evil purpose of misleading the reader, misquotes and makes the bishop appoint a steward for every man.

The record is: "Every man shall be made accountable unto me [Christ], a steward over his own property."

In the record a man is made a steward

over his own by Christ, and is held responsible by Christ the head of the Church, and to no one else.

19. Again, Howe: "He that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out, and shall not receive again that which he has consecrated unto me; for it shall come to pass, I will consecrate the riches of the Gentiles unto my people which are of the house of Israel."

Here he wants to prove the lying assertions so often made that the Saints expected to get other people's property. A false assertion, as I have before stated.

Hear the record upon this: "He that sinneth and repenteth not shall be cast out of the church, and shall not receive again that which he has consecrated unto the poor and needy of my church, or in other words, unto me; for as much as ye do it unto the least of these ye do it unto me; for I will consecrate of the riches of *those who embrace my gospel* among the Gentiles, unto the poor of my people who are of the house of Israel."

Then is there any foundation for the assertion that has often been thrown to the world by these perverters of our faith, that we expected to consecrate of the property of the Gentiles? It is so represented by those who have perverted the faith, and have garbled it, in order to misrepresent us to the world.

The rule laid down and the notice given as to getting back donations of property made, is precisely according to the law of the land, and differs as to other denominations in this: The Saints are plainly told before giving they cannot expect to get their properties back if they should at some future time be severed from the church; on the ground that it will have likely been disposed of, for the purposes for which it was given, to wit: the poor and needy. Thus every man is put fully upon his guard when the gift is sought that he may not be deceived. Whereas, in other churches they take the monies without ever hinting that they can't get them back if the donors are cast out afterwards. And because they have not been given back when asked afterwards, I have known, and doubtless all of you have, a large number of law-suits against other churches to reclaim such properties and donations, on the ground of bad faith. The custom of the Saints is fairer and less likely to deceive than any other church with which I am acquainted. The people are fairly and fully notified before they give to the church that they cannot get anything back that they give to the poor or for the good of the church. But are you notified by anybody else in that way? Notice is fairly given that a man shall account unto him (Christ) and render in the final day of summons

as to the stewardship over his own property.

Every man was recognized a steward over his own property, to do as he pleased with it. But Mr. Howe makes it read the bishop appointed men stewards over the property of others. Mr. Howe says, "that after the bishop received the property of the church, that it cannot be taken from the church." The revelation says, that while men are acting as stewards over their own property, and shall see fit to consecrate "of them" unto the "poor" etc., and the bishop shall receive "testimonies" concerning the consecration of the properties of the church, they cannot be taken from the church. The revelation leaves every man free to do as he pleases with his properties; to be his own "steward," to give to the poor as he may feel prompted; but when once given, it cannot be withdrawn; while Mr. Howe teaches that the bishop appointed men stewards over their own property and that they were required to consecrate "all of their properties," etc. Do you discover a disposition here to be fair, or present only facts?

20. Continuing upon page 130, Howe in order to make his case out against the Saints, attacks with the same wicked and vehement spirit Jesus and the early Christians. He says: "If Smith and all his witnesses were to now come forward and say that his pretensions were a wicked deception, they (the Saints), would not believe a word of it—because [they claim] the Spirit had shown that it was true." "Here," he says, "Is the sure refuge, the fast hold of every imposter. This something which is the Spirit or Holy Spirit, has been the standing, unequivocal, incontrovertible and true witness for at least twenty-four false Messiahs, for Mohammed who is considered the prince of imposters, and for nearly fifty others who have come with pretended commission from heaven."

Here is fairly shown the grand sequel of Howe's bitterness against the Saints: They claim that there is such a thing as "*the Spirit*" or "*the Holy Spirit*," and whoever in the world's history according to Howe, has made such a claim, was a deceiver and an "imposter." How do you like your witness now who attacks the Savior, Christ, as vehemently as he does the Book of Mormon?

21. Again, says Howe: "His [Smith's] predictions are always found far off equivocal, and ambiguous, and always relate to some events which everyone supposes to be quite probable." Then he goes on to falsify as to what some of these prophecies were as has been proved was the manner of his other g-bling. But let us examine Smith's statements and show the roguery of the assertions:

1. That his "name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindreds and tongues; or that it should be both good and evil spoken of among all people."

Is there anything ambiguous or equivocal about that?

And again, page 105, Book of Mormon; "And because my words shall hiss forth, many of the Gentiles shall say, A Bible, a Bible, we have got a Bible and there cannot be any more Bible." What do you see equivocal or ambiguous about this? The Book of Mormon was published to the world under the title of the Book of Mormon. The title of Bible is not by it, nor by its friends, ever been claimed for it; neither by them the term used for the plates from which it was translated. Yet, the prediction is a literally true one; it is far and near, by the enemies of the Saints, called a Bible, and perhaps there never was more than a dozen, if even so many as two, Campbellite preachers in the state of Ohio, who did not thus in calling it the Mormon Bible contribute to the truth of the prophecy in regard to it, at the same time they misrepresented the people and denounced the whole thing as false. This prophecy was given or the statement made by Joseph Smith two years before the book was published and sent to the public, that when the book should go to the world the people would say, "A Bible." What do you see equivocal or ambiguous about this?

Another one, Book of Mormon page 496: "And it [the book] shall come [forth to the world], in a day when the blood of the Saints shall cry unto the Lord because of secret combinations and the works of darkness." Where is the ambiguity here? How did Mr. Smith know, or how could he foresee, except by the illuminating light of heaven, that in this land with a constitutional guarantee of religious freedom, his people should be slain by wicked hands; that men who had warred for freedom in the great revolution should be hewn to the ground by religious bigots without mercy; that men, women and innocent children should be butchered without mercy; and finally that a state should be permitted to rob thousands of its citizens, and banish them as exiles, to die upon other territories through the hardships and rigors of a fearful winter. Aggressors did you say? Turn to the official address of Major-General Clark of the forces that were sent to aid the mob in Missouri when the Saints were defending their homes and their wives and children against the efforts of the grandest set of rascals the world ever saw, to drive them from the state, and then say aggressors if you dare! Says he, to as faithful and true men and women as ever graced God's earth, as good and noble citizens, and as loyally patriotic as the Republic ever produced, as they were then deprived of the comforts of their hearth and homes: and encamped upon the bleak prairies of north Missouri:

"It now devolves upon you to fulfill the treaty that you have entered into, the leading items of which I now lay before you. The first of these you have already complied with, which is that you deliver up your leading men to be tried according to law. Second, that you deliver up your arms—this has been attended to. The third is that you sign over your properties to defray the expenses of this war—this you have also done. Another thing yet remains for you to comply with—that is that you leave the State forthwith; and whatever your feelings concerning this affair, *whatever your innocence, it is nothing to me.*"

Can you point to a grander outrage in all the annals of the world's history than this against a people? "Whatever your innocence, it is nothing to me." You shall not even be permitted while you are in the midst of the mobocrats to retain the arms with which you could defend yourselves from their vengeance of death. No, like them of old they cry out, "Crucify him! Crucify him! But release unto us Barrabas," the robber.

I could mention the relatives who have been in the halls of Congress of men who were hewn down there, and as able men as there are in America to-day, if I would take up my time to do so. And yet, such actions are defended here by a pious-minded, high-toned elder of the Campbellite Church. Ladies and gentlemen, I begin to see why it was that when they could not cope with Mr. Smith and Rigdon over at Hiram, in argument, they "got rid of them" by the old way of applying the argument of "tar and geese feathers."

But let me tell you here and now, that if ever in my life-work I shall meet with such a case of rapine and oppression, or unlawful vengeance against any people of any denomination, or any party, whether Christian or infidel, I shall not fail to exert every power within me to protest against it; and it is a cardinal principle of the faith of the Saints, and ever has been, that they should be as ready to stand for and defend the rights and privileges of others as themselves. I know how Col. Lovejoy and an associate was shot down in the streets of Alton, Ill., because he dared to express his political opinions and stand for the principle of the freedom of the press in this country; and it was a like evil and cowardly crew that has been defended in this controversy by the negative, who destroyed men and women for religious opinions' sake. But to return to the examination of Howe, as a witness (lawyer), and the Spaulding romance.

The prophecies he says are so ambiguous. Take another, same page: "It shall come to pass in a day when there shall be heard of fires and tempests [tempest is a violent wind as the now familiar cyclone], and vapors of smoke in foreign lands [like to the great disturbance of the earthquake last fall, which the scientific say so filled the atmosphere of the world that it has occasioned the crimson red phenomena of the sun's appearance], and there shall also be heard of wars and rumors of wars, and earthquakes in diverse places: yea, and it shall come in a day when there shall be great pollutions upon the face of the earth; there shall be murders and robberies and lyings and deceivings, and whoredoms, and all manner of abominations, when there shall be many who will say, do this, or do that, and it mattereth not for the Lord will uphold such at the last day."

I could in this manner read to you the entire hour, of the certain, unmistakable and definite prophecies in this book, many of which have already had a complete and

literal fulfillment. Why is it, then, that this deceiving work of Mr. Howe is sent forth to the world? No wonder he don't want to put Mr. Howe upon the stand for examination. I will ask him where he got his compilation from, and if he did not know he was misrepresenting the faith of this people. I have met many men in my time who could stand up and with all the powers of dissimulation of innocence and modesty tell to others what I believed; pretend to give my belief from the Bible and other books, when there was not a shadow of truth in what they were saying.

Turning over the book I shall pass at this time the terrible mess set out in the letters of Ezra Booth, and notice the pretended affidavits of Peter Ingersol, Wm. Stafford, Barton Stafford, purporting to be signed before a judge of the Court of Wayne county N. Y., Thomas P. Baldwin, which upon the face is shown to be a humbug, for there is not one in due form of law had the officer properly signed, and had there been such; but upon diligent inquiry I failed to find that even the officer existed as such. Having my doubts aroused as to the matter through an article in the Chicago Inter-Ocean a short time ago, I wrote to the clerk of the courts of Wayne county, N. Y., and received the following reply:

"OFFICE OF THE CLERK OF WAYNE CO., N. Y. JOHN MCGONIGAL, CLERK. LYONS, N. Y., Feb'y 1st '84.
E. L. KELLEY, Esq., Dear Sir:—Yours of the 31st instant duly received, and in reply will say that I have looked for the name of Thomas P. Baldwin as an officer in the county and fail to find his name at all. Looked back to the time the county was organized, (1829).
Very Respectfully,
JOHN MCGONIGAL.

Again, not quite satisfied, thinking perhaps he might be mistaken, I wrote to him again, asking him who was the County Judge in 1833, when these purported affidavits of Mr. Howe say that they were signed by Thos. P. Baldwin County Judge. He answers me February 7th, 1884:

"In reply to my favor of the 6th ult., will say that David Arne, Jr., was County Judge in 1833."
Very Respectfully,
JOHN MCGONIGAL.

[Since the conclusion of the debate of this proposition, the clerk has written to Mr. Braden stating that he overlooked the officer when examining the records at my request. And upon this I claim nothing upon the point that Baldwin was not a Judge.—KELLEY.]

Do you blame me, then, ladies and gentlemen, for stating before you I cannot take as evidence anything that has passed through such hands as Mr. Hulburt and Howe, unless I have the original statement to compare, or it can be proven outside in some way that these statements that he has been referring to—but never reading in full to you—are unaltered and genuine? Here is where he gets his John Spaulding, Martha Spaulding, Henry Lake, John Miller, Aaron Wright, Oliver Smith and Nahum Howard. Do you want me to swallow their contradictory, self-accusing, wholly improbable, malicious falsehoods, rather than accept the truth of God? Could any-

thing pure and immaculate have passed through that sewer of filth and come out worthy of the palate of decent men and women? Answer for yourselves. But I proceed further with the examination. I now call your attention to the letter of Mrs. Matilda Davidson, another of his witnesses, to a Boston newspaper and published May, 1839, this a person too, better informed upon these matters, who had a better opportunity to be so than all the others he has referred to; and she also manifests a terrible feeling against the people that I represent. She says, "That any sane person should rank it higher than any other merely human composition is a matter of the greatest astonishment, yet it is received as divine by some who dwell in enlightened New England, and even by those who have sustained the character of devoted 'Christians.'" Yes, and right here I might say, that when I traveled through "enlightened New England" but about four months ago, I found many churches of the same people, and hundreds of good, faithful, God-fearing and worshiping men and women in them, all the way from Providence, R. I., to Addison, Me. But she continues, and I read extracts, for the letter is very long and in great part but conclusions which are in no sense evidence, and which would not interest you: "It [the manuscript] claims to have been written by one of the lost nations and to have been recovered from the earth." [Got out of the cave on Conneaut Creek], "and assumed the title of 'Manuscript Found.' Assumed it? How? By writing its own title on its back? No, certainly not? Evidently by these parties who we next hear about whom Spaulding told that "he got it out of a cave on Conneaut Creek." "The neighbors would often inquire how Mr. Spaulding progressed in deciphering the manuscript, [Translating from the Latin as he claimed,] "and when he had a sufficient portion prepared he would inform them and they would assemble and hear it read. He was enabled from his acquaintance with the classics and ancient history, to introduce many singular names, which were particularly noticed by the people, and could be easily recognized by them."

"Mr. Spaulding had a brother John Spaulding, who repeatedly heard the whole of it read."—Repeatedly heard the whole of it read, which abounded in "names from the classics and ancient history."

Ah! yes; here it is identified beyond a doubt; the same old scrap of forty or fifty pages that was said to have been found in a cave, and which she gave to Hulburt, who gave it to Howe, who destroyed it, lest it destroy the affidavits he and Hulburt had gotten up. Howe now says Hulburt wrote the affidavits. But she proceeds:

"He, Mr. Spaulding, exhibited his manuscript [same one] to Mr. Patterson, (at Pittsburgh,) who was very much pleased with it, and borrowed it for perusal. He retained it for a long time, and informed Mr. Spaulding that if he would make out a

title page and preface, he would publish it, and it might be a source of profit. This Mr. Spaulding refused to do." Refused to make out a title page and to have it published for profit, although Braden's witnesses make out that he was to pay his debts out of this. Spaulding did not go back and pay his debts, as Smith and Harris did with Saunders in New York. No; he was a pious Presbyterian minister. But she continues:

"At length the manuscript was returned to its author, and soon after we removed to Amity, Washington county, Pa., where Mr. Spaulding deceased in 1816."

Notice, that she says that they went to Amity, Pa., where he died in 1816. Left Pittsburg, then, before Sidney Rigdon was ever there according to their own testimony.

"The manuscript then fell into my hands," she says, "and was carefully preserved."

Did I not tell you I would expose the fraud by witnesses that were from the other side? But again:

"It has frequently been examined by my daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, of Munson, Mass, [the same whose testimony I have before introduced in this discussion], with whom I now reside, and by other friends."

Again: "A woman preacher appointed a meeting there [at New Salem], and in the meeting read and repeated copious extracts from the Book of Mormon." "Mr. John Spaulding was present. His grief found vent in a flood of tears, [Here is where these witnesses bring the lachrymose John in,] and he arose on the spot and expressed to the meeting his sorrow and regret that the writings of his deceased brother should be used for a purpose so vile and shocking.

Oh, how his feelings were hurt!

"The excitement in New Salem became so great that the inhabitants had a meeting and deputed Dr. Philastus Hulburt, one of their number, [yes, one of their number, citizens of Kirtland; but the same who had been banished from our society for an insult to one of your lady citizens], "to repair to this place and to obtain from me the original manuscript of Mr. Spaulding for the purpose of comparing it with the Mormon Bible, to satisfy their own minds"—[Remember, they were not satisfied before]—"and to prevent their friends from embracing an error so delusive. This was the year 1834. Dr. Hulburt brought with him an introduction and request for the manuscript, which was signed by Messrs. Henry Lake, Aaron Wright and others.

I am reading from her letter all the time. "Henry Lake, Aaron Wright and others." Who are these Henry Lake, Aaron Wright and others that send a letter to Mrs. (Spaulding) Davidson for the purpose of getting the manuscript? The same ones that he pointed out as the best men, or among the best citizens, of Geauga county,—"old Geauga county!" Wondered if I would say anything against them! Not personally against their character. I do not assail men in that way. Don't have to, these men.

These are the same parties whom he has introduced as witnesses from Howe.

"Thus an historical romance, with the addition of a few pious expressions and extracts from the sacred scriptures (Ah! Smith and Rigdon did not put them in then, they were in the original), has been construed into a new Bible and palmed off upon a company of poor deluded fanatics as divine. I have given this brief narration that this work of deep deception and wickedness may be searched to the foundation, and the authors exposed to the contempt and execration they so justly deserve.

MATILDA DAVIDSON."

My friends, are you still wanting evidence as to where the Manuscript Found went? Positively and certainly traced into the ranks of its friends, and with this in the hand-writing of Solomon Spaulding, who was dead before the Book of Mormon was published, ten identical words and expressions of which, as I have before stated, would have been sufficient to have identified it if there was any such thing written as these witnesses tell about, and yet they destroy the manuscript and publish their lying statements. What do they do? Send Hulburt back to tell Mrs. Davidson she gave him the wrong manuscript and to get the right one? Oh no! she never hears of them until she writes to know what they did with it, and Howe and Hulburt write back word, "It did not read as we expected, and so we did not use it." Nor do they in this letter to her ask if she did not have another manuscript or extra original leaves of the "Manuscript Found" which their witnesses had sworn to. Had the one sent been another than the true one, ten chances to one it would have been similar in words, phrases, and often sentences, to any other Spaulding ever wrote, had another been written by him, and a few words in his hand-writing would have fully tested the matter. But no, they destroy it. The only

first evidence under the sun to detect the fraud, if there was a fraud, and this right in the hands of the lawyer, Braden's lawyer!! A man who will, after he has all of the facts before him, believe such a story as this, must be ready to gulp down the most egregious tale that it is possible for the most depraved and licentious to weave and concoct against an innocent and God-fearing people.

I might further call your attention to the fact that aside from these contradictions by Mrs. (Solomon Spaulding) Davidson of the statements of John and Martha Spaulding, relatives, neither of their purported statements bear any date, time or place of making, or by whom made; that they are quoted from something else and not the original statement as they show upon their face, and in such a way as to neither make John, Martha or any one else responsible for them. This is the testimony he so pompously thrust in my face the other evening; the best he has. How do you like to swallow it, my friends?

The publication by Howe of these purported statements and garbled extracts from our works in his History of Mormonism, shows that the enemies of the Book of Mormon had nothing of truth to sustain their wicked attempt to overthrow it, or they would have used it. It shows, too, that the term falsifier is a tame enough word to apply to any one so base as to falsify a people's faith by such great garbling and trickery, and present it to the world for truth; and shows further the kind of company one is liable to be found in if he essays to peddle such stuff in order to destroy the character of honest men.

All of the statements he has referred to have now been examined except those of Mr. Campbell and Adamson Bentley--this Bentley the one Rigdon referred to in his letter that I read on last evening to you.

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I will notice first a misstatement made by my opponent Saturday night. I said on Friday night, after reading a series of questions, that I would have them copied in type-writing and give them to my opponent. I did so before noon on Saturday, and he had them in his possession eight or nine hours before the debate began on Saturday night. He has had them in his possession ever since, and has them now. Yet he said Saturday night that he did not have them. If he claims that he referred to another portion of my speeches, I remind him that he has had everything that he has asked of me. I think that after giving him my speeches to examine at his leisure, and prepare himself to reply to them—a thing no other opponent would do—I deserve at least fair treatment, and should not have false statements made about me. When the reader reads in Kelley's speeches that I did not give names, and that I gave persons testimony in my own words; and then turns back and reads the names of the 29 witnesses and their testimony in different type from the rest of the matter, and in their own words *verbatim*, he will see to what desperate straits my opponent must be driven, when he will make such reckless assertions. His desperation can be seen in his pettyfogging and misrepresentation.

He repeats the statement that we have exposed several times, that the manuscript of Spaulding's Manuscript Found was brought to Howe. He says that Howe and Hulburt skulked over to Conneaut and got witnesses to sign what they wrote. The truth is, a Mormon preacher visited Conneaut and preached his first sermon and read extracts from the Book of Mormon. John Spaulding and others arose and exposed the theft of the Manuscript Found. It was in a meeting of citizens of Conneaut and not in a Mormon church meeting. It was a Mormon preacher, and not a woman preacher. That is a misprint in Schmucker's book—as other books, that I have, show. This detection of the theft was published in the papers. Hulburt heard of it. He went to Conneaut, and such men as Judge Wright, Lake, a leading business man, and others of the best citizens of Conneaut wrote out their statements and gave them to him. There never was a number of affidavits more marked with independence and individuality. Contrast them with the joint statements of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon written out by Imposter Joe and signed by his confederates. Contrast their courteous testimony with Rigdon's blackguardism, the worst of which Kelley dared not read.

He says they never mentioned the Roman manuscript until Hulburt brought it from

Hartwick. No, nor did they mention Spaulding's sermons, and the stories he wrote for his children. There was no occasion for so doing until it was presented to them. He assails Miller's recollection of names. Readers of the debate will decide whether Miller's clear, rational and straightforward story is reasonable or not. I asked him whether he impeached the character of witnesses for truth and veracity, and he affected a holy horror of the thought, that is ridiculous, after his assaults on Howe and Hulburt. He, with a silliness that is idiotic, denies that Spaulding wrote the manuscript of the Manuscript Found, in the face of the clear testimony of 17 witnesses, one of whom is Rigdon himself. He blunders over Smith's working for Sabine. He says Mrs. Spaulding and her daughter left Sabine's in 1820, and that the trunk was taken from Sabine's in 1820. In 1820 Mrs. Spaulding left Sabine's, leaving her daughter with the trunk in her care at Sabine's, and went to Connecticut. Some time afterwards she married Mr. Davidson in Pomfret, Connecticut. Some time after this she returned to Hartwick, N. Y., to live. Some time after this she sent for the trunk. It was years after 1820, and it may not have been until near the marriage of her daughter to Dr. McKinstrey in 1828, that she sent for the trunk. Miss Spaulding was married at her uncle's in 1828, and afterwards went to Munson, Mass. Mrs. McKinstrey positively says that Smith worked for her uncle while she was there with the trunk in her care; and that ends all Kelley's impudent denials.

He reads Rigdon's denial. Of course a man who would steal would lie in order to lie out of it. Criminals are not allowed to swear themselves clear. The same is true of Pratt his confederate. Kelley deliberately falsifies my statements. I did not say that Smith stole the manuscript and brought it to Rigdon in Ohio. I said Rigdon stole the manuscript Spaulding prepared for press, remodeled it to suit his purpose and took it to Smith in New York. Then Smith informed Rigdon of the rest of the manuscripts in the possession of one who had been Spaulding's wife, and stole all of them that he could, to prevent detection of the fraud, and exposure of the cheat. He says that Tucker did not see Willard Chase before publishing his statements. Wonderful! Tucker used an affidavit that Chase had sworn to, when the events were fresh in his memory, and I quoted the same affidavit, and not from Tucker. I will attend to David Whitmer's testimony in good time. What bearing has his attack on Howe's analysis of the Book of Mormon, on the truthfulness of the testimony of the witnesses and other parts of Howe's book. He reads an affidavit from Mrs. Salisbury, Joe Smith's sister. In order

to make out that she must have known it, if Rigdon visited Smith, she said that Joe lived at their father's from 1827 to 1830, and while he was translating the plates, and translated them at their father's Lucy Smith, her mother, Joe Smith, David Whitmer, P. P. Pratt and others say that Joe moved to Pennsylvania, over one hundred miles away, in the fall of 1827; and Lucy Smith says that Joe took the horse and wagon of one who came to move him to Pennsylvania, to get the plates. He went right after finding the plates and before any translation, to Pennsylvania Mrs. Smith and Whitmer and Joe and others say he returned to New York after wheat sowing in 1828. He was in Pennsylvania a year. Whitmer says he returned to Whitmer's father's and finished the translation. Mrs. Smith says he lived away from home, and that the plates were shown to the three witnesses away in another neighborhood. None of the translating was done at Joe's father's. Joe was not at his father's, but over one hundred miles away, for over a year, and was in another neighborhood, and not at his father's during the rest of the time. If Mrs. Salisbury lied, as we have proved she did, in saying that Joe was at their fathers, when he was not there, she would lie in saying Rigdon was not there, when he was. Tucker, Mrs. Eaton, McAuley, Chase and Saunders say that he was there, and some say at least eighteen months before the Book appeared. Finally we have a long reading from the *Saint's Herald* of June 1881. In the *Weekly News*, of Cadillac, Mich., of April 6th, 1880, the Rev. C. C. Thorne, of Manchester, N. Y., published an article asserting that old acquaintances of Joe Smith, in Manchester, N. Y. made these statements:

"I knew Joe Smith, personally to some extent, saw him frequently, knew well his reputation, he was always 'drinking fellow, and loose in his habits in every way.' Danford Booth—'Smith's reputation was bad. I was acquainted with Oliver Cowdrey. He was a low pettifogger, the cat's paw of the Smiths to do their dirty work.' Orrin Reed—'I knew the Smiths but did not associate with them for they were too low to associate with. There was no truth in them. Their aim was to get in where they could get property. They broke up homes in that way. Smith had no regular business. He had frequent revelations.' Wm. Bryant.

In the spring of 1881, one quiet Lord's day morning, several old people in Manchester were interviewed by a couple of Danites. They did not tell their names or business; said it was no matter. They asked questions about the Smiths, and treated these old people as an impudent lawyer treats witnesses he wants to bulldoze. Several of these old people indignantly refused to talk to them after they had insulted them.

June 1st, 1881, an article appeared in the *Saints' Herald*, signed by one of these Danites. It was read to you by the other Danite Saturday night. It asserts that Mr. Thorne did not talk with some of the parties he mentioned in his article, and lied about what others said. Mr. Thorne had taken and placed on file in Canandaigua,

Ontario Co., N. Y., in the County Clerk's office, these affidavits:

'Danford Booth, of the town of Manchester and county of Ontario, N. Y., being duly affirmed, deposes. He has read the article in the *Cadillac Weekly News* of April 6th, 1880, respecting 'Cowdrey and the 'Smith family,' over the signature of C. C. Thorne. 'The interview therein mentioned between deponent and Thorne did take place. The matters therein set forth, alleged to have been stated by the deponent to Thorne, were so stated by deponent to Thorne. He has read also in a paper called the *Saint's Herald*, of June 1st, 1881, an article purporting to give what was said in an interview between W. H. Kelly and 'another party and the deponent, in which it is stated that deponent informed said parties that deponent and Thorne never had an interview as alleged by Thorne. Deponent declares that he did not so inform said parties, and that he has no recollection of such a question being asked him by them.

(Signed) DANFORD BOOTH.

"Sworn to and subscribed before me, July 1st, 1881.

(Signed) N. K. COLE, J. P."

"Orrin Reed, of the township of Manchester, county of Ontario, N. Y., being duly affirmed, deposes: His age is 77. He was born in the town of Farmington, about four miles from what is called 'Mormon Hill.' During the last 46 years he has resided in the town of Manchester, and in the same school district in which Joseph Smith and family, of Mormon notoriety, resided, and three-fourths of a mile from 'Mormon Hill.' He has read an article published in the *Cadillac News* of April 6th, 1880, respecting 'Cowdrey and the Smith family,' over the signature of C. C. Thorne. The matters therein set forth and alleged to have been stated by deponent to Thorne were so stated by deponent, at the time and in the manner stated in said published article.

(Signed) ORRIN REED.

"Affirmed and subscribed before me June 29th, 1881.

(Signed) N. K. COLE, J. P."

"Amanda Reed, being duly affirmed, deposes: She is the wife of Orrin Reed. She heard the conversation between her husband and C. C. Thorne. The statement made in the article published by Thorne in the *Cadillac News*, of April 6th, 1880, respecting Cowdrey and the Smith family, were in fact so made. The language employed by her husband was substantially as therein stated.

(Signed) AMANDA REED."

Affirmed and subscribed as above.

"John H. Gilbert, of the town of Palmyra, Wayne county, N. Y., being duly sworn, deposes: That in the article published in the *Saint's Herald*, at Plano, Ill., June 1st, 1881, over the signature of W. H. Kelly, purporting to give an interview with the deponent on 'Mormonism,' the deponent is grossly misrepresented in almost every particular. Words are put in the mouth of the deponent that he never uttered. The pretended answers to questions that the deponent did answer, are totally at variance with the answers that the deponent really gave. The deponent believes that such misrepresentation was done designedly.

(Signed) JOHN H. GILBERT.

"Sworn to and subscribed before me July 12th, 1881.

"M. C. FINLEY, J. P."

The originals are on file in the Clerk's office in Canandaigua, Ontario County, New York. I object to Mr. Kelley's playing pettifogger and witness any more in this case. I have impeached the witness. When we come to introduce witnesses on the character of the Smiths, I shall not allow the impeached witness to testify. Readers can see how much dependence can be placed on his statements concerning what Howe and Mrs. McKinstrey said. I could read a letter from Howe, if necessary, denying his statements.

We will now resume our analysis of the Book of Mormon. Nephi follows Lehi, quoting 13 chapters of Isaiah, and he explains its fulfillment in the ministry of Christ, as only Sidney Rigdon, with the New Testament open before him, could do it. He uses the exact language of Christ and his apostles, 600 years before they

uttered it. We have 20 pages of Rigdon's preaching, and in it he tells us that these plates shall be hid up and found by "an unlearned man," and shown to "three witnesses;" not thirteen remember as Mormons now tell us and then hid up again. Rigdon's Nephites know all about the Gospel, and obey it, and still obey the law of Moses, while they are trampling it under foot, and are blessed of God, above all that have ever lived, while violating his law; and he would fain have us believe that God revealed the entire Gospel to them, in violation of every principle of the Bible. This absurd, unscriptural, blundering fraud is the "Fulness of the Gospel."

On page 118 King Jacob tells us that a hundredth part of the wars, contentions and exploits of the Nephites could not be engraved on his plates. About forty years before this, six women left Jerusalem—but one was then married. Their posterity, in about forty years, have divided into two nations, and one nation has built a temple like Solomon's, built cities, and even the inspired Jacob can not engrave one hundredth part of their exploits on his plates. Sidney never did things by halves when he mounted King Abasuerus' horse.

On page 119 King Jacob, *alias* Sidney, preaches, and has a perfect knowledge of the atonement and modern theological speculations concerning it, and the resurrection and the world to come. The Apostle Paul declares that these things were mysteries, hidden from even the angels, until revealed to the world by the apostles of Christ. Poor Paul did not know what the Lord had done for the ancestors of Imposter Joe, and manuscript-stealing Sidney in the wilds of America, 600 years before his day; although they habitually trampled under foot nearly every precept of his law. King Jacob, *alias* Sidney, now gives a parable from the Mormon prophet Zenos. The terse, beautiful parables of our Savior concerning the unfruitful tree, the husbandman and his vineyard, and Paul's parable of the olive tree, that would cover not a page of the Book of Mormon, are diluted, caricatured, and mixed and spread over eight pages, as only hifaluting Sidney could do it. In his awkward attempts to imitate the authorized version in style, he begins thirty sentences on these 8 pages with "and it came to pass," thirty-one with "Behold," "Beheld" and "Beholdst" occur nearly a score of times each. "Wherefore" and "thereof" nearly as many times. These cant words of the writer compose a large portion of the parable from Zenos. An eccentric, illiterate character, popularly called Lord Timothy Dexter, wrote a book and compelled the printer to print it exactly as he wrote it. There was not a capital letter, nor a mark of punctuation, nor any division of matter into paragraphs or sentences in it. The book was eagerly bought up as a curiosity. In printing a second edition Dexter stated in an appendix that some had found fault with his book, because there were no capitals or punctuation marks in it; and for

their benefit he added the appendix. Then followed many pages, some covered with capital letters, in all conceivable styles, each style having several lines given to it. Then followed whole pages of commas, then semi colons, until every conceivable printers' mark was printed in this way. The author remarked at the close that each reader might take as many and such capital letters and punctuation marks, as he pleased, and place them to suit himself. I would advise the printers of the Book of Mormon to print several thousands of "And it came to pass"—"Behold"—"Wherefore"—"Therefore"—"Thereof" and other cant words, and let readers do, as Lord Timothy Dexter advised his readers to do, select such cant words as they pleased, and as many as they pleased, and place them where they pleased.

Let us quote a sentence or two of this "Fulness of the Gospel," that is to the New Testament as the New is to the Old.

"And it came to pass that he pruned it, and digged 'about it and nourished it according to his word' (nourishing a tree according to the word) 'And it came to pass that after many days it began to put forth somewhat, a tender little branches.'"

Who doubts that it took inspiration to bring forth that sentence? Again,

"Ye shall clear away the branches which bring forth bitter fruit, according to the strength of the 'good, and the size of the reof, and ye shall not clear the 'bad thereof, all at once, lest the roots thereof be too 'strong for the graft thereof, and the graft thereof 'perish."

As Imposter Joe declares in his revelations about stores and land offices "Lo here is wisdom." The wisdom of God is manifest in such stuff as that, doubtless! Who dares to doubt that it took the highest display of inspiration ever made among men to indite such twaddle as that? Seriously is it not transcendent blasphemy to even suggest that Jehovah inspired a man to steal the sublime parables of the Son of God, and the Great Apostle to the Gentiles, hundreds of years before they were uttered, and to torture their terse and beautiful language into such balderdash as that, then inspired another to engrave it on plates which he preserved miraculously, and then sent an angel to Imposter Joe to tell him where the plates containing such stuff were to be found, and put the climax to this series of miracles, by doling out to Imposter Joe, as he peeped through his his stolen peep stone into the crown of his old hat, this gibberish, word by word, so precious was this "fulness of the Gospel," the power of God unto Salvation?

In the next chapter Jacob explains this wonderful parable of the Mormon prophet Zenos, in what would be a good Disciple exhortation, if there were more sense in it, it, and closes with this characteristically Rigdonian sentence "Finally Brethren I bid you farewell, until I shall meet you before the pleasing 'bar of God,' which bar striketh the wicked with awful dread and 'fear.'" The Nephite Jacob, 500 years before Christ, knew all about the English legal idea or phrase "bar," at which a criminal is arraigned. He knew all about

the general judgment, hundreds of years before it was revealed by Christ and his apostles. What a consistent metaphor is the expression "the pleasing bar of God" which strikes with awful dread and "fear," King Ahasuerus' horse got away with Sidney's good sense that time. In the next chapter we have a debate between Jacob and a Deist, in which the mediatorship of Christ, the atonement, and kindred New Testament ideas and modern theological speculations, are discussed, very much after the manner they were, in controversies between Rigdon and a sceptical Justice of the Peace in Beaver county, Pa., to which my father listened about sixty years ago. There is an awkward caricature of the miracle of Paul's striking Elymas blind, and there is more talk about "plates" and how they were to be kept, so that no reader of the Book of Mormon could have any doubt about Imposter Joe's plates.

On page 137 we have another miracle. Mosiah, a Nephite, discourses to the people of Zarahemla—Judahtes—who left Jerusalem eleven years after Lehi's departure. They had lost all knowledge of God, and were atheists, for they denied his existence, and their language had become so changed that they could not understand Mosiah, yet these atheists, who could not understand Mosiah, rejoiced exceedingly when he told them what they did not believe, and what they could not understand. Now we will call attention to one of the most gigantic blunders in this bundle of blunders, the Book of Mormon. We are told, on page 137:

"And it came to pass that after the people were taught the language of Mosiah Zarahemla (their chief) gave a genealogy of his fathers according to his memory, as they were written, (what the fathers!) but not on these plates. And it came to pass that the people of Zarahemla (the chief) and Mosiah (the chief) did unite together, and Mosiah (the chief) was appointed to be their King. And it came to pass in the days of Mosiah there was a large stone brought unto him with the engravings on it, and he did interpret the engravings by the gift and power of God. And they gave on account of one Coriantamur and the slain of his people. And Coriantamur was discovered by the people of Zarahemla (the Chief) and he dwelled with them (the subject of the chief Zarahemla) for the space of nine moons."

If this language means anything it means that Coriantamur died among the subjects of the chief Zarahemla in Zarahemla's time. That was about 150 years before Christ. Turn to the Book of Ether and we learn that Coriantamur was the last of the Jaredites, who were all slain but Coriantamur 600 B. C. Mormons may take which horn of the dilemma they please. If the Jaredites were slain before Lehi came to America, Coriantamur was 500 years old when he came among the subjects of King Zarahemla. Or the Jaredites and the Nephites inhabited the same country for 450 years, living together, knowing nothing of each others existence!

King Benjamin, *alias* Rigdon, declares in a sermon, 150 years before Christ,

"Behold I come to declare unto you glad tidings of great joy, Behold the time cometh when the Lord shall come down from heaven with power, and shall dwell among the children of men, in a tabernacle of

"clay, and shall go forth amongst men, working mighty miracles, such as healing the sick, raising the dead, causing the lame to walk, the blind to receive their sight, the deaf to hear; and curing all manner of diseases, and shall cast out devils and evil spirits which dwell in the hearts of the children of men: And he shall suffer temptations and hunger, and thirst, and fatigue and pain of body even more than man can suffer, except to be unto death, for behold blood cometh from every pore"—(You see King Benjamin knew all about the physiology of the blood 2000 years before Harvey) "so great shall be his anguish for the sins and abominations of his people. And he shall be called Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the father of heaven and earth, the Creator of all things, from the beginning, and his mother shall be called Mary, and lo He cometh to his own that salvation might come to the children of men, even through faith in his name, and even after all this, they shall consider him a man, and say that He hath a devil, and shall scourge him, and crucify him, and he shall raise the third day from the dead, and behold He standeth to judge the world."

Did Isaiah, who stands among the prophets of the Old Testament, as the prophet of the Messiah, ever utter such prophecies as these? Rigdon interpolated the history of Christ, as he took it from the New Testament, into Spaulding's romance, when he was remodelling it so that he could make a "big thing out of it" as a new revelation.

Benjamin, *alias* Rigdon, proceeds. Remember Benjamin is an Israelite, living under the law, 150 years before the birth of Jesus.

"Salvation cometh to none except it be through repentance and faith on the Lord Jesus Christ. There shall be no other name given under heaven, nor any other means whereby salvation can come unto the children of men, only through the name of Christ. Except they humble themselves, and become as little children, and believe that salvation was and is and is to come (a Disciple Idea) in and through the atoning blood of Christ (One of Rigdon's revival expressions.) For the natural man is enmity against God and has been since the fall of Adam (More modern theology.) But if he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit (one of Rigdon's revival isms) and putteth off the natural man and becometh a Saint through the atonement of Christ our Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive humble meek, patient, full of love, willing to submit to the things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict on him even as a child doth submit to his father."

Seriously, now, as persons of sense, shall we believe that an Israelite, under the law of Moses, preached in that way, 150 years before the birth of Christ? Or that Rigdon interpolated these sentences from the New Testament, these phrases from modern theology, these revivalisms of his own, into the MS he stole from Spaulding—when he was fixing it up to make "a big thing" out of it as a new revelation?

In the sermon of a prophet, Abinadi, which is as much like one of Rigdon's sermons as the sermons of King Benjamin, Rigdon completely "gives himself away," as the slang expression has it. Page 174. "If Christ had not risen from the dead, or have broken the bonds of death (Shades of Murray, what grammar), that the grave should have no victory, and that death should have no sting, there could have been no resurrection. But there is a resurrection from the dead, therefore the grave hath no victory, and the sting of death is swallowed up in Christ." Rigdon forgot that he was trying to put the resurrection of Christ into the mouth of an Israelite be-

fore it occurred, which demands the future tense, and used such language as the real speaker, Rigdon, should use, and spoke of it as a past event, saying, "had risen, "has broken." On page 277 we have doctrine taught that is as clearly the work of Rigdon as is his blackguard letter to the "Boston Journal," or his glorification of King Ahasuerus' horse. Immersion for the remission of sins is preached over 100 years before John the Baptist, and in the name of Christ, more than 150 years before the day of Pentecost, just as Disciple preachers preach it; and to clinch the matter, that it is Rigdon, immersion in the name of Christ is for the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, what Rigdon believed and brought from the Baptists, and the Disciples do not believe. Observe the teaching agrees with the Disciples as far as Rigdon agreed with them, and disagrees with them, just where he differed from them. Converts were added to the church, which was completely organized and in full operation more than 150 years before Jesus said, "I will build my church," proving that it did not then exist. Here again we have an instance in which Rigdon differed from the Disciples. On pages 192, 193, 194 and 195 we have descriptions of churches of Christ, Christian teaching—Christian ordinances. Church discipline, all in accordance with Rigdon's ideas of what these things should be. A wicked son of a preacher is converted, just as men were converted under Rigdon's preaching,

a regular miraculous Baptist "experience." This was followed by a regular series of Rigdonish revivals, under preachers preaching like Rigdon, the gospel in all of its fullness, according to Rigdon's notions. On page 233 we have a long extract from one of Rigdon's sermons:

"Ye must repent and be born again, for the spirit saith (where except in John III in the exact words of Jesus) if ye are not born again ye cannot enter the kingdom of God; therefore come and be baptized unto repentance, that ye may be washed from your sins, that ye may have faith on the Son of God, that taketh away the sins of the world, who is mighty to save and to cleanse from all unrighteousness: Yea I say unto you come and fear not, lay to one side every sin which doth so easily beset you which doth bind you down to destruction, yea come and go forth and show unto your God that you are willing to repent of your sins, and enter into a covenant with Him, to keep His commandments, and manifest it unto Him this day, by going down into the waters of baptism, and whosoever doeth this, and keepeth the commandments of God, from this time forth, the same will remember that I have said unto him that he shall have eternal life according to the Holy Spirit which testifieth in me.

Let me ask any person of common sense which do you believe, that an Israelite, under the law of Moses, preached in that way, in the exact words of Christ and his apostles, more than 100 years before Christ? Or has Rigdon interpolated one of his exhortations into the manuscript he stole from Spaulding when he was making "a big thing," in the shape of a new revelation out of it? Old acquaintances of Rigdon in this audience can almost hear him uttering, spread eagle Sidney, in one of his revival exhortations, as they hear that language.

MR KELLEY'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—Before entering upon my main argument I will notice one or two objections that have been made by my opponent.

First, with regard to the purported affidavits that he read.—Take and read the statement showing the manner of interviewing the witnesses I introduced,—when the language was taken down at the time—the parties own words—and compare it with the manner of running around and getting up an affidavit when the other side is not there and you will soon discover who has the truth.

Mr Braden: Was Mr. Thorn present when you interviewed those parties?

Mr. Kelley: I have not presented any affidavits, sir. I have given their exact language taken at the time; written in their presence. That is the manner of getting

this, and it is so stated here. I will read from the conclusion of the interview:

"These facts and interviews are presented to the readers of the Herald impartially, just as they occurred, the good and bad side by side; and allowing for a possible mistake or error from a misapprehension or mistake in taking notes, it can be relied upon as the opinion and gossip had about the Smith family and others among their old neighbors. It will be remembered that all the parties interviewed are unbelievers in, and some of them bitter enemies to the faith of the Saints; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that they all told the worst they knew. So we submit it to the Herald readers without comment, with the expectation of sending each one of the parties interviewed a copy when published."

When this was published each of the parties was sent a copy of the Herald with the interview, and not one from whose affidavit Mr. Braden has read has had the audacity to write to Mr. Kelley of Coldwater, Michigan, and say that he was misrepresented. But somebody can run around and get up an affidavit that does not men-

tion a single material contradiction, and a couple of them sign it. How many affidavits did he have from the witnesses I read from last night? From nobody but from Major Gilbert, and Major Gilbert fails to point out a single thing in which he is misrepresented. Did you not notice that? He says that he was misrepresented, but he does not state wherein he was misrepresented. The fact is, Major Gilbert, if he made that affidavit, lied, and I know that he did. I am willing to face him in Palmyra, or any other place, and say that it is not true because I know his language was taken at the time. As far as the contradiction is concerned, I do not care anything about it. I wanted it to come before this audience. I knew what Gilbert had done when he found he was caught; and what Braden had to bring, but I wanted to show this audience how easy it was to run around and get affidavits and statements from persons and prove things, when you write 'em up yourself and have them signed. The way it started, this Mr. Thorn, a Presbyterian preacher was living there in the neighborhood, and he heard of Elder Kelley's preaching at Cadillac, Michigan, and he went to these parties to get their evidence, and he sent it over to Cadillac, Michigan, to publish it there in order to defeat Elder Kelley's preaching.

Elder Kelley, instead of saying "O! you're another," went directly to the parties themselves, and there upon the ground took their statements, and took them down in writing and sent their statements back to them afterwards. Mr Thorn never did any such thing with Mr Kelley, nor with these witnesses, when they said they had made other statements, as Mr. Braden represents. I leave it then, for the honest and candid thinkers, and those who love truth rather than falsehood, to decide who has told the falsehood and who has told the truth, if there is any antagonism between these parties. There is, in fact, no worthy contradiction of W. H. Kelley's report of the interview, as yet. Major Gilbert does not state a single thing wherein he has been misrepresented. Was it in the statement that he had been trying for fifty years to collect evidence against the Book of Mormon? Was it in that he said he had a way out of the difficulty now he thought; that he had spoken to Saunders to testify that Rigdon was there, and afterwards had written him, but Saunders had not received it? Was it in that he is reported as disbelieving in the Bible? He is the only witness whose testimony I read before you, who has said he was misrepresented. The majority have stood by their evidence as published in the interview. The others I could say something about, but I will not at this time.

Here I will refer to one or two other matters and then proceed with my argument. First, with regard to the "woman preacher" referred to in Mr. Spaulding's letter, as found in Smucker's History. Does he not know that that is the original statement from which all the rest of these

histories of Mormonism go to for their material, and yet the rest of them have struck out the word "woman." What right had they to do that?

Mr. Braden: "When was Smucker's book copyrighted?"

Mr. Kelley: "I do not care when Smucker's book was copyrighted?"

Mr. Braden: "In 1878?"

Mr. Kelley: "I did not get it from Mr. Smucker. I got it from a book that was published long before Smucker. Mackey's History of the Mormons, published in England. I will hand you the book any time you may wish to examine. It is a book published long before Smucker, and it has the words 'a woman preacher;' and it is the oldest work that I have seen that contained the letter. These others have taken it out of the letter because it killed them so easily. You quoted from works that had deliberately garbled the letter and have used such before this audience.

I was, in a former speech, speaking of these purported statements of John and Martha Spaulding, as set out by Howe, showing that they are quotations from something and not the original. He does not give any date to these statements;—no time or place, or party by whom they were taken. They are put in quotations in the book, and they do not, in any sense, amount to statements. If they did, they are so contradictory to what Mrs. Spaulding herself states, that they could not possibly be relied upon. This is the testimony he so triumphantly threw into my face the other evening—the best he has. How do you like to swallow it down? The publication by Howe of these purported statements, and the garbled extracts from our works in his "History of the Mormons, or Mormonism Unveiled," shows that the enemies of the Book of Mormon had nothing of truth to sustain their wicked attacks and overthrow it, or they would have used it.

All of the statements which he has produced have now been examined, except that of Mr Campbell and Adamson Bentley, the last of these the one whom Rigdon referred to in the letter that I read to you last evening. I did expect to refer to Mr Campbell's this evening. I guess I shall, as I am in this connection—also Mr. Bentley's.

Mr Campbell, you remember, mentioned in his statement that he was not positive with regard to this; that is, that he thought that he would like to see what brother Bentley had to say about it before he gave his testimony. It is not independent evidence by either of these parties. This Adamson Bentley is the same party who was referred to by Sidney Rigdon; who, from the outset (1831) undertook to destroy him; and Mr Campbell says, as you will find by reading his letter, "that the conversation alluded to in Bro. Bentley's letter, in 1841, was in my presence as well as in his. My recollection of it led me, some two or three years ago, to interrogate Bro. Bentley concerning his recollection of it."

But I will produce the article and statement of the parties in full, so that all may properly judge them:—
 Millennial Harbinger for 1844, page 38—

Mr. Campbell heads these articles as follows:—

"MISTAKES TOUCHING THE BOOK OF MORMON."

He then publishes an article entitled "*Mormon*"—*The means by which it stole the 'True Gospel,'* taken from the *Evangelist*, one of their own papers, then edited by Mr. Scott.

The article is as follows:—

"It is well known that the Mormons preach the true gospel, and plead for immediate obedience to it on 'the part of the hearers, as the advocate of original Christianity. This was not an original measure of 'Mormonism' for, indeed, baptism for the remission of sins is a phrase not found in their book. A few of their leaders took it from Rigdon at Euclid, on the Western Reserve, as may be learned from Brother Jones' account of their first visit to Kirtland, published in a preceding volume of the *Evangelist*. Rigdon we were perfectly aware, had possessed himself of our analysis, and the plea for obedience raised thereupon, but not choosing to rely on my own recollection of the means by and the times at which 'they were imparted to him, we wrote to Mr. Bentley, 'who is his brother-in-law, for the necessary information. Mr. Bentley's letter shows, not only whence he received his knowledge of the true gospel, but also that, coward that he was, he had not the independence necessary to preach it in his own vicinity after 'he had received it. Thus the knowledge of ordering 'and pleading the elements of the true gospel by that 'people, is seen to arise near the same time, and from 'the same source, as that of our own reformation. Mr. Bentley's letter is as follows:—

"SOLON, January 22, 1841.

"*Dear Brother Scott:*—Your favor of the 7th of December is received. I returned from Philadelphia, Pa., 'on the 10th, and the answer to your acceptable letter 'has been deferred. I was much gratified to hear from 'you and family, but would be much more to see you 'once more in the flesh, and talk over our toils and 'anxieties in the cause of our blessed Redeemer. 'You request that I should give you all the information I am in possession of respecting Mormonism. I 'know that Sidney Rigdon told me there was a book 'coming out (the manuscript of which has been found 'engraved on gold plates) as much as two years before 'the Mormon book made its appearance in this country, or had been heard of by me. The same I communicated to brother A. Campbell. The Mormon 'book has nothing of the baptism for the remission of 'sins in it; and, of course, at the time Rigdon got Solomon Spaulding's manuscript he did not understand 'the Scriptures on that subject.' [Of course he did not. He was in the Campbellite Church then and they never understood the Scriptures as they ought to have done.] 'I cannot say he learned it from me, as 'he had been about a week with you in Nelson and 'Windham, before he came to my house. I, however, 'returned with him to Mentor. He stated to me that 'he did not feel himself capable of introducing the subject in Mentor, and would not return without me if 'he had to stay two weeks with us to induce me to go. 'This is about all that I can say. I have no doubt but 'that the account given in Mormonism Unmasked [this is Howe's book "*Mormonism Unveiled*," which he refers to. They all go back to that for their information] is about the truth. It was got up to deceive 'the people and obtain their property, and was a 'wicked contrivance with Sidney Rigdon and Joseph 'Smith, Jr. May God have mercy on the wicked men, 'and may they repent of their great wickedness! May 'the Lord bless you, brother Scott and family.

"Yours most affectionately,

"ADAMSON BENTLEY."

This is a genuine Campbellite letter, as it has all of the ear-marks. He wants to tell something, when it is evident without the least comment that he knows nothing at all. He is Sidney Rigdon's brother-in-law, and since Rigdon has left his church wants

to give him a dab, and he does not care how so that he is not caught. He had been intimate with Rigdon all along during the years 1823, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30: the two working together, preaching together; and Bentley knew perfectly well that Rigdon could have had no more to do in getting up the Book of Mormon than he had; and yet because Rigdon had united with the Saints he was mad and wanted to destroy him. He indorses Howe's book as no doubt being "about the truth." This is the book which I showed you so perverted, misquoted, garbled, and wickedly falsified our works in order to write down something against them. Bentley drinks it down. And the "May the Lord bless you, brother Scott," That was the spirit that marked the career of this man, at the time, to a dot. Never mind anybody else. No difference what their claims. Hound them down because they do not follow us. But the Lord bless us! me and my wife, my son John and his wife, brother Scott and his wife, us poor, and no more.

I reserve comment upon this statement of Scott's and letter of Bentley till after presenting the review of it, and the evidence, as Mr. Braden has termed it, of Mr. Campbell. You will observe at once that this letter of Bentley's was too brazenly absurd for Campbell to swallow for a moment.

Mr. Campbell says:

"Brethren Scott and Bentley are both mistaken as to 'the fact of baptism for the remission of sins not having been found in the Book of Mormon, and one of 'them in the inference contained in the note appended to Elder Bentley's letter.' [Here, then, are two mistakes, at least, and by both on one of the points.] 'The conversation alluded to in Brother Bentley's 'letter of 1841, was in my presence as well as his.' [This is a third, for Bentley says, "I communicated it to brother A. Campbell."] 'and my recollection of it led 'me, some two or three years ago to interrogate brother Bentley, touching his recollection of it.' [Here is a fourth contradiction of brother Bentley, for he said he communicated to brother A. Campbell.] 'which 'accorded with mine, except the year in which it 'occurred, he placing it in the year 1827, and I in the 'summer of 1826.' [This is the fifth contradiction.] 'Rigdon, at the time observing that in the plates dug 'up in New York there was an account, not only of the 'Aborigines of this country, but also it was stated that 'the Christian religion had been preached in this 'country just as we were preaching it on the Western 'Reserve."

Here is the sixth; and a very essential difference. Mr. Campbell says that Rigdon was telling them about an account that was contained upon plates dug up in New York, but Mr. Bentley puts it in his letter "the manuscript of which had been found engraved on gold plates." Here Bentley is convicted of deliberately lying in order, if possible, to make a show of connection between the "Spaulding Manuscript," which at this time, was in the possession of Howe, and the Book of Mormon; and so he wickedly puts the word "manuscript" into his letter to mislead.

Mr. Campbell proceeds:—

"Now, as the Book of Mormon was being manufactured at that time, for the copyright was taken out in June 1829, two years according to Elder Bentley, and three years according to me, after said conversation (and certainly it was not less than two years), the

"inference of brother Scott touching the person upon whom the theft was committed would be plausible if it was a fact that baptism for remission of sins is 'no part of the Book, but something super-added since from the practice in Ohio in the end of 1827 and beginning of 1828; a year or more after Rigdon made the aforesaid statement.'"

Mr. Campbell proceeded then to make quotations from the Book of Mormon, to show that Messrs. Scott and Bentley were wrong and over conclusive, quoting from pages 240, 479, 581 and 582 of the book, and then says:—

"Certainly this is testimony enough without further readings. The note on the text of brother Bentley's letter shows how easily men may reason wrong from false facts, or from assumed premises. If the Editor of the Evangelist were not above the imputation of envy, jealousy, or vanity, the whole affair might be construed disadvantageously, but as it is seems to show the necessity of a scrupulous examination of the premises before we presume on such grave conclusions."

Just so. There are a great many earmarks visible to the naked eye about this alleged conversation with Mr. Rigdon, showing "the necessity of a scrupulous examination of the premises before we presume on such grave conclusions." Mr. Campbell, undoubtedly, made a large number of his followers wince when he struck these two conclusionists that little blow; and had he on this occasion heeded the advice tendered to others, another erroneous, yet "grave conclusion" would not have been arrived at.

The only remarkable thing about this statement of Campbell's at all, is the fact that any man can be so blind as not to see that there is not a shadow of proof in it that in the least points to Sidney Rigdon as a party having any connection with the origin of the Book of Mormon. Suppose that the memory of Mr. Campbell to be entirely correct in giving this conversation at least ten years after the time fixed for its occurrence (and he shows it is not, by himself stating that he first asked Mr. Bentley about it to see if he had it right), and what have we? Simply that Sidney Rigdon stated in his presence in the year 1826 or '27 that there was a claim made by some person in New York State, not even the name of the party then known to him it seems, that some plates of gold had been dug up in that State, giving an account of the aborigines of this country, and stating that the Christian religion had been preached in this country just as we (Campbell, Rigdon, Scott and Bentley) were preaching it on the Western Reserve. This same claim (with the exception of the words "just as we were doing upon the Western Reserve"), doubtless, to this time had been repeated by more than ten thousand people in the United States; for the claim was in the public press before this, the announcement being made as early as 1823, and the plates were obtained in September, 1827; and would it be a strange thing or proof of guilt for Sidney Rigdon to also talk about it with others? Indeed, when you turn the thought over, the strength of the evidence is the other way, for had Rigdon been connected with this in

any wise he would not have spoken of it to Mr. Campbell and Mr. Bentley. But, says one, why did he use the words "just as we were doing on the Western Reserve?" I answer, because he did not know anything about it, for had he, he could not have so spoken. The record from the plates did not teach as they were teaching on the Western Reserve, but in nine-tenths of all its principles taught the reverse. Mr. Rigdon could not have made the statement had he been connected in any manner in getting up the Book of Mormon. All through, that book contains doctrinal principles entirely different to the teachings of Mr. Campbell and these preachers of the Western Reserve.

When Joseph Smith first announced that the angel said to him that there was a record of the ancient inhabitants of this continent written upon gold plates and deposited, to be brought forth in the own due time of the Lord, immediately all the good old deacons and pious preachers of Manchester and Palmyra, New York, started the story of a "Gold Bible." It was published over the country; and since Campbell and Bentley can not agree within a year of the time when they say Rigdon spoke of the notice, who will dare to say the conversation was not in 1828, or even 1830, instead of 1826 or 1827. They can not agree within one year of the time themselves; yet, they pretend to give such certain testimony, as they would have you believe, although your salvation may be shadowed in the grand hereafter by it, for having rejected the truth.

Persons who will take such statements for evidence do so because they love that which appeals to their own selfishness and evil desires, and which is fallacious, rather than God's word, which says, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." And again; "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." Well, but Mr. Braden says, "the devil may come abiding in the doctrine."

When did you ever know of him coming and abiding in the doctrine of Christ? It is the New Testament my opponent attacks upon this, and not me. Are we not to practically rely upon John's statement, wherein he says: "If any come bringing not this doctrine, receive him not?" the converse of which is, if any come bringing this doctrine, no difference who; he may be good, although called bad, him receive. It is founded upon the certain ground that the devil will not come preaching the truth, for it would destroy him;—it would be contrary to his own existence. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." For this reason Satan "abode not in the truth from the beginning," says Jesus. I am surprised that a professed minister of the Gospel should take the indefensible ground that you must denounce a thing whether it contains the doctrine of Christ or not. In this he gives the entire Christian religion away.

The standard is "Though we, or an angel from Heaven preach any other gospel," [anything other than the truth or doctrine of Christ] "let him be accursed." But my opponent would have you give them a little cursing if they do bring the Gospel. My friends, you need never be afraid that the Devil will come around abiding in the doctrine of Christ. He might teach one thing. He might teach for instance, baptism by water only; but he will never teach baptism by water and of the Holy Spirit, to the believer, because God alone can give the Holy Spirit, and the Devil could not teach that, without soon being detected and exposed in the deception. Do not understand me as referring to my opponent or the Disciples as Satan. I was only making the argument by way of an illustration. (Laughter).

I have all of his questions here: forty-two questions, I believe. He said I would never look at or examine them; but I have and find no basis to them whatever, except the false statements, as I have shown, that he referred to at the first. I need not say to you that I do not have to take up my time in examining each one of them separately after having shown that the basis of every one of them is false. Let him get upon a true basis and argue the facts essential to this case if he can. I think, perhaps, he might do better had he a different case. But, in the name of common sense what has he accomplished by the forty questions presented? Simply changed the form of the statement of what he claims his witnesses say and puts it interrogatively. Do I have to take up this same evidence which I have shown before to be entirely unreliable and examined it because now he has revamped it and put it in the shape of questions? You would certainly call me silly to so waste my time. I have, by showing the falsity of the statements upon which his questions are based, struck his foundation down, and what care I now for the twists he takes in the *debris*.

If he has anything to offer in support of his foundation, or any new evidence, I shall gladly take the time to examine it. I have already examined all of his testimony, except, possibly, a few of the parties referred to by Patterson in his pamphlet. Should I find the statements of any others than whom I have examined I shall refer to them hereafter.

Now I will proceed to the argument upon the main question, taking up first and answering objections made.

My opponent, on the last evening of the discussion said that all the good there was in the Book of Mormon Smith and Rigdon stole from the Disciples, alias the Campbellites, but this is a thing to be proven, if true. I confess, viewing the matter from one standpoint, that it seems as though there might have been some tampering with the Campbellite faith, some time, if there was ever any special good in it, as it seems to be quite barren of any good thing now; but whether it was stolen from them by the Latter-Day Saints remains to be shown.

He says: "It is all balderdash," to argue that "whosoever abideth in the doctrine of Christ he hath both the Father and the Son." Yet this is the emphatic statement of the word of God. Remember it is not the language of myself, but he calls it balderdash. He says that bad men and the devil might come around abiding in the doctrine, but they would not have the Father. Then the apostle must have missed it. It is not true that bad men or the devil ever did or ever will abide in the doctrine. Of the devil it is distinctly said "he abode not in the truth." Abiding in the doctrine is one rule given by John to test true teachers from false ones. The true ones abide in the doctrine; the false ones do not.

Mr. Braden and his Disciple friends do not abide in the doctrine, as I will show more particularly in discussing the next proposition; and they also argue that God cannot be with them only in the word; hence they have neither the Father, Son nor Holy Ghost. He is fighting the inspired evangelist, not me.

Again, he says when Mormonism is attacked by showing the bad character of those engaged in it that I retort by dragging the Bible down to the level of the Book of Mormon, attacking it. My opponent knows too well the tendency of the kind of argument that is resorted to by him to defame and destroy the Book of Mormon and blast the reputation of its friends; but if the argument is good against the Book of Mormon and its adherents, as showing that God did not inspire or direct them, the same argument is good against any other class of men making similar claims. All of you can see that if the Book of Mormon is to be rejected because somebody slandered the character of those who brought it to light, that the New Testament must be under the same hypothesis; that if it be true that God would only select pure and exalted characters, such as would at no time of life do a wrong thing, through whom to reveal his will, then pretty much all of the Bible is to be rejected, for Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, Peter and Paul, those with whom God is said to have communed, were not men of such exalted and perfect characters. There was none good, so far as that term is used, "no, not one." When my opponent accepts them as mediums through whom God revealed himself, what becomes of his position taken here, that if he can show that if some of the leaders who brought to light under divine guidance the Book of Mormon did things some time in their lives that was not just right, he has proven the Book of Mormon false.

Among the first things which Moses did was to kill an Egyptian and hide him in the sand and then flee his country. Abraham, the father of the faithful, had a concubine, "Sarah's maid." Noah got drunk soon after he touched dry land, after the great flood. David had wives and concubines too numerous to mention; Solomon the same, combined with the sin of being an idolater. Abijah, after five hundred

thousand had been slain in battle before him, the Lord being with him, waxed mighty and took 14 wives and begat 22 sons and 16 daughters. 2 Chron. 13. 21, 22. Hesea went and took a woman of whoredoms and lived with her, and then took his friend's wife; but still went on prophesying, and my friend claims to believe the prophesy. Peter cursed and swore, denied his Lord, and yet who would discard his epistles? Saul assented to stoning Stephen to death, and afterwards he was an apostle and had many trials and temptations, and yet the list is not full. All of this is in the Bible.

My opponent assumes to believe in the inspiration of pretty much all here mentioned, just because their names occur in the Bible, not because they did no bad things during their lives, yet he endeavors to sink the Book of Mormon by connecting something to the lives of Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon that is not just right. He can see that if such arguments will destroy the Book of Mormon's claims to being divinely inspired it destroys that of the Bible also, and while he fails in bringing an array of accusations against Smith and Rigdon and others, which he has failed to prove,—with him it is dragging the Bible (which he claims to believe in) down, to apply to it in an argument the same kind of warfare.

For the sake of the argument, I might admit (that which is not true) that Smith, Rigdon et al were as bad as he represents them to have been, they would then be entitled to a respectable standing among the very best of those whom he admits that God revealed himself through. He has only got beside himself. It does not drag the Bible down to tell the truth about it. It must stand on its merits just like the Book of Mormon. I am a believer in both. It is consistency, truth and fairness that we want.

He objects to the Book of Mormon because one of the writers says: "If there be faults in it they are the mistakes of men," claiming that if it is inspired there should be no faults. But the Book of Mormon does not claim to be wholly inspired any more than the Bible claims to be wholly inspired. The writer says he writes according to his knowledge in the characters;—confessed that they had an imperfect language and that they could not write as well as they could speak. When done his record, he asked that men might read the book with charity in their hearts, and not condemn it on account of finding some fault; and then the writer goes on and says: "If there are faults they are the mistakes of men; but I know of no faults." He then exhorts not to condemn the things that are of God. This is the honestly declared statement of the writer.

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 II Kings, xvi. 6, the King of "Syria drove the Jews from Elath." This was about 742 years before Christ, and 120 years before the Jewish captivity. The word Jew is found in Jeremiah xxxiv. 9, 590 years before Christ, and long before the return of the Jews from their captivity. The word was in use 710 years before Christ, in the time of Hezekiah, king of Judah, II Chron., chap. xxxii. 18. It was applied to all Israelites 580 years before Christ. Dan. viii. 12.

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 Saml. 22:35, it is stated, "He teacheth my hands to war, so that a bow of steel is broken in my arms." This was only 1018 years before the time of Christ. The same thing occurs in Psalms of David, chap. 18, v. 34, as well as in Job 20:24; and this is said to be the oldest book in the Bible.

My opponent 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.

Again, he says, the Israelites did not make and write on plates which would have been the case if Lehi could bring plates from Jerusalem. Very true, now let us see. In I Kings, 7:30 we are informed that they made "Plates of brass." These plates were used in building the temple, and the 36th verse says: "Graved [engraved] cherubims, lions and palm trees" on them. In Exodus, 39:3 we read: "They did beat the gold into thin plates." They wrote, or engraved, also on gold plates. "And thou shalt make a plate of pure gold and grave upon it like the gravings of a signet, Holiness to the Lord!" That which was the most highly prized, beautiful and sacred they wrote on gold plates. Ex. 28:37, Ex. 39:30. They made a plate of pure gold, and wrote upon it a writing like the engraving of a signet, Holiness to the Lord." The Israelites not only engraved upon gold and brass plates, but also upon stones of various kinds, see Ex. 28:9, 11, 21 and 30:6, 19. But working in brass and iron commenced with Tubal-cain. Gen. 4:22, and the art of engraving on hard substances was known 1700 years before the Christian era. See Gen. 38:18, 25.

So much for his objection to the Book of Mormon because they wrote on gold plates and brass plates.

Again, he ridicules the idea of God giving Lehi the "Liahona," or compass; and says that "one spinnel pointed the way they should go: the other the way they

should not go," of course, but the record says nothing about the way they should not go. He thinks they could not read a writing on the spindle in a brass globe, but the writing was on the spindle and they could see the spindle. This is too marvelous a story for my opponent to believe; but he can swallow Jonah and the whale and then be ready for more like it. He can believe that God wrote the tables of the law and went before the Israelites and fed them on manna for 40 years; when they got hungry for fresh meat God would send a shower of quails, and when they were thirsty the water would roll out of a dry rock to quench their thirst. He can gaze with delight and the utmost rapture at the spring of water as it gushed from the jaw-bone of an ass in Samson's hand, and drink them all in and then think them but common things, and still be ready for more like it. But when the Book of Mormon claims that God guided the Jaredites and the Nephites by miracle it is not to be believed; it is all one of Joe Smith's fables gotten up to deceive. Whether Smith stole this part of the Book of Mormon, (the big stories), from the Campbellites or not, remains to be proven along with the rest. Now there is not as astounding and miraculous things stated in the Book of Mormon as there is in the Bible; yet, my opponent objects to the Book of Mormon because it states that God by miracle aided the people who came to this continent, notwithstanding the huge miraculous accounts that are to be found in the book which he admits to be true.

Nephi does not say, as asserted by my opponent, that he made plates in the wilderness where there was no ore; but that after they had arrived at the promised land they found "ore of gold," and here he made his

first plates. So much for his statement that they made plates out of nothing.

He objects to the Book of Mormon because the word church is used in it before the Christian era. Church means an assembly of worshippers. The Book of Mormon is a translation into English. No matter what an assembly of a like kind may have been called in old time it would be called a church when translated into English. Besides Stephens says, Acts, 7:38 that there was a "Church in the wilderness," in the time of Moses. He objects to the Book of Mormon because it says the gospel was preached on this continent before the time of Christ. It was preached to Abraham, Gal. 3:8, and to Moses and the Israelites, Heb. 4:2. He objects to the Book of Mormon because the Nephites professed to have the Holy Ghost before Pentecost Day; and said the Holy Ghost was not given until after Jesus was glorified. Peter says "Prophecy came not in old times by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Peter, 2:21. This Holy Ghost inspired all of the prophets and saints from Adam to Christ; why not the Nephites? After Christ commenced his ministry on earth, his disciples were not to receive the Holy Ghost until after the ascension. He says: "If I go not away the Comforter will not come."

While he was in the world he was the especial light of the people. That is the way it was, Mr. Braden. There is no clash here with the Book of Mormon. The Holy Ghost and the gospel were enjoyed before the Savior's ministry on earth, and they kept the law of Moses, also.

(Time expired.)

MR BRADEN'S TWELFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—On page 234 we have a description of many kinds of coin, and some of them were very large. Why have we never found any of these coins in America? In ruins in the old world millions of coins have been found. Why not on this continent?

On page 235 a Nephite preacher solves all the disputes of modern theology concerning the resurrection, and 100 years before Christ. Men may differ in their interpretation of the general truths taught by Christ and his apostles, but there can be no dispute over the minute, dogmatical revelations of the Nephite prophet, who, strange to say,

gives by inspiration the exact ideas of Rigdon 1800 years before Rigdon lived to preach them.

"Now there is a death which is called a temporal death; and the death of Christ shall loose all bonds of this temporal death, that all shall be raised from this temporal death. The spirit and the body shall be re-united again in its perfect form, both limb and joint shall be restored to its proper form, even as they now are at this time, and shall be brought to stand before the bar of God, knowing as we now know."

There, that settles the vexed question in favor of a literal resurrection. God inspired the Nephite Amalek, long before the birth of Christ, to explain the resurrection and temporal death and spiritual death, just as Rigdon believed.

On page 238 a soul-sleeper is silenced with

Rigdon's ideas on eschatology. On page 289 we have the modern term "Dissenter"—a word never used until men dissented from the creed and practice of the church of England. On the page we have a description of Episcopalians, and the Lord's day is mentioned. This is followed by pages of preaching in which nearly every idea of modern theology, even the most abstruse, is discussed and settled in a manner that utterly eclipses the general teachings of Christ and his apostles; and what is more miraculous, these Nephites always agree exactly with Rigdon's theology in their revelations. On page 280 we have the Church of God described, and it is described as having perfect Christian teaching concerning topics the New Testament declares were mysteries until revealed by Christ and his apostles. On page 326 we read:

"He prayed for blessings of Christ to rest on the brethren so long as there should be a band of Christians to possess the land, for thus were all true believers of Christ, who belonged to the Church of God called by those who did not belong to the Church. And those who belonged to the Church were faithful, yea all those who were true believers of Christ, took upon them gladly the name of Christ or Christians as they were called, because of their belief in Christ."

The New Testament declares that the disciples of Christ were first called "Christians" at Antioch over one hundred years after the Book of Mormon declares they were called Christians universally in America.

I wish now to call attention to one of those little things that speak volumes. There was a difference of opinion among the co-adjutors of Campbell concerning what should be the name of the followers of Christ. Campbell, Sheppard and others insisted that they should be called "Disciples of Christ." Walter Scott and others insisted that they should be called "Christians," and that the Church should be called "the Church of God" or "Church of Christ." Rigdon agreed with Scott. Observe that his ideas are repeated several times in the above extract. By inserting into his stolen manuscript his ideas, he contradicted the New Testament concerning the time the name Christian was first given and made his "big thing" a tissue of absurdities. According to the Book of Mormon there were great numbers of Churches of God and multitudes of Christians hundreds of years before Christ came. They had a perfect knowledge of his Gospel and the most abstruse ideas of modern theology, all settled by revelation, long before Christ; and the most singular fact is that the Lord agreed with Rigdon in all of these revelations that he gave these highly favored Nephites. How highly favored these old prophets were in receiving, by inspiration from God, all of Rigdon's theology 1800 years before the advent of Sidney.

We come now to another of those little things that speak volumes. Rigdon as a regular Baptist preacher, had a bitter prejudice against all secret societies. In the

days of the anti-Masonic excitement of the time extending from 1824-5 to 1834-5 Rigdon was a rabid anti-Mason. On page 382 he gives the Masons a dig and airs his anti-Masonic ideas. Gadianton and a band of robbers have a Masonic lodge and act just as anti-Masons said Masons acted. Again on pages 365-6 he airs his anti-Masonic ideas. A band of cutthroats have a secret society with oaths, grips, signs, pass words, and swear to protect each other in crime. On page 399 and on several pages following we have a repetition of Rigdon's anti-Masonic ideas. Seriously, is this the work of a Nephite before Christ, or is it the work of the anti-Masons, Spaulding, Rigdon, or Smith—one or all of them? Page 474 a prophet tells the Nephites that on the night our Savior is born it will be as light as day all night. The sun will set and rise, but the light will not be diminished in the least. The Bible flatly contradicts such stuff. On page 415 we are told again that the darkness at our Savior's crucifixion will last three days. The Bible says three hours. Page 422 we are told that it remained as light as mid-day (Sidney never does things by halves) all one night and a star was seen, the night our Savior was born. What sort of a star could be seen in mid-daylight we are not told. Perhaps all the Nephites had peep stones and looked into their hats and saw the star. For some years Gadianton's wicked Masons vex the righteous anti-Masonic Nephites terribly but at last the righteous anti-Masons prevail and exterminate these vile Sons of Darkness the Masons and righteousness prevails all over the land as the result. Page 431 Mormon, who informs us that he is a fully developed Christian, says that he cannot write all that he wants to write because of the imperfection of the language. The Almighty has inspired a man to engrave a revelation on brass plates and suddenly finds himself balked by the imperfection of the language that he has in his ignorance chosen. As the Mormon God is not infinite he might make such a blunder. Then follows a description of the three days of darkness, and Sidney just cavorts on King Ahasuerus's horse in depicting the horrors of that time, that according to the Bible never was. After this was heard the voice of our Savior, and it was heard over all North America. Sidney's miracles are always something worth while; none of your little miracles such as the Son of God wrought in Palestine, nothing but sky-splitting and universe-shaking miracles will do for Sidney. Then a small voice—not a loud voice—is heard that pierces their frames and causes their hearts to burn; and our Savior, speaking in this small voice, says to the Nephites on this continent, "I am the Alpha and the Omega." Let the reader stop for a moment and think of the absurdity of the Son of God saying to Nephites on this continent, who knew nothing at all about the Greeks or their language, "I am the Alpha and the Omega," the first and the last letter of the Greek alphabet. He might as well have

used the first and last letters of the Cherokee alphabet.

After this our Savior, who had been resurrected at Jerusalem, appears on this continent and preaches one of Sidney Rigdon's discourses to them, and commands them to use Sidney Rigdon's baptismal formula, "Having authority given me of Jesus Christ I baptize you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." By the way, Sidney dropped the Disciple peculiarity of saying "Spirit" instead of "Ghost," and went back to his old Baptist formula. Who is such a simpleton as to believe that our Savior visited America after his ascension into heaven, in violation of the New Testament that declares his next coming after his ascension will be at the end of his dispensation; that his mission was to preach one of Sidney Rigdon's sermons to the aborigines of America, and to give as the law of heaven, by solemn revelation of the glorified Son of God, that they must use Rigdon's baptismal formula. On page 444 we have one of Rigdon's idiotic extravaganzas. Our Saviour commanded doubting Thomas to thrust his fingers into the nail prints in his hands and feet, and into the side that had been pierced. Such a simple natural affair as that would not do for the hifalutin spread-eagle glorifier of King Ahasuerus' horse. He tells us that the entire multitude went forth and each thrust his fingers into the nail prints in his hands, into his feet, and into his pierced side. We learn from a following page that there were at least 2,500 of them. It would be very rapid work for a person to go up and put a finger into a nail print in each hand, each foot, and into the pierced side, in fifteen seconds. Suppose they did the work as expeditiously as that, it took ten hours and twenty minutes to go through this farce. The Son of God came down from heaven, stood ten mortal hours while 2,500 persons filed past him, thrusting fingers into a nail print in each hand, each foot, and into his pierced side. Our humorous papers used to have cartoons caricaturing Grant's hand-shaking when he shook hands with a few hundred for an hour or two; but this "beats Grant." If those who raised the cry "Anything to beat Grant" had called on Sidney he could have beat him all hollow and not half tried.

Our Saviour, after this idiotic tomfoolery is finished, delivers a discourse made of badly arranged scraps of his discourses recorded in the New Testament. We cannot say that his glorification has improved his revelations. Rigdon can tell bigger yarns than the truthful history of the New Testament, but when it comes to making revelations that is another thing. It is to be observed that our Saviour follows King James' version. Even the obsolete English words, style, and mistranslations are followed exactly. He appoints twelve apostles and Nephi baptizes himself, and then the eleven, and the scenes of Pentecost are outdone. Jesus did not come back from heaven on the day of Pentecost, but poured out the Holy Spirit. But then Sidney's

Nephites were always far above their brethren back in Palestine. Our Saviour examines Nephi's plates, so as to have everything fixed for Imposter Joe, and corrects one error. The plates did not contain the prophecy that the multitudes would arise in America at our Saviour's resurrection. The Nephites admit that the prophet did say so, and declare that prophecy had been fulfilled. Observe, again, how these Nephites of Sidney outdo their brethren in Palestine. In Palestine a few arise at the crucifixion; in America great multitudes at the resurrection of Jesus. We have then a specimen of Mormon extravagance of ignorance. Our Saviour in rebuking Peter, tells him that if he were to order that John should remain on earth till his second coming, it is no concern of his, and that he is to attend to his own work. John further declares that our Saviour did not say that he should remain. Here was something that just suited Mormon ignorance and folly. Rigdon makes our Saviour tell three Nephites that they shall never see death, and remain till he comes again. Sidney's Nephites are blessed again above all others. There is no doubt here. Our Saviour says three *shall* remain instead of one. He bestows a boon he did not bestow upon his beloved disciple John. Imposter Joe and Oliver Cowdery have a revelation, on parchment from John that he did not die, and did re, main on earth, in flat contradiction of God's word. Just such silly wonders as these are what Mormonism feeds on. The book closes with a prophecy of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and denounces fearful woes on all who do not receive the tomfooleries of Sidney Rigdon, Solomon Spaulding and Imposter Joe.

The Book of Nephi, the son of Nephi, is an unimportant one. It tells us on page 481 that masonry revived, and that Satan was let loose and iniquity did fearfully abound. Sidney must have been exceedingly malignant against the Masons. Moroni takes up Mormon's work and he informs us that Masonry shall be prevalent when the Book of Mormon appears; and that churches shall be worldly and proud and that it will be a time of unmeasured apostacy. Above all men shall deny that miracles and revelations are possible. Then Sidney goes for the Disciples who would not accept the Baptist idea of a direct and miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit. We have Sidney's ideas for several pages and one of his exhortations in his most approved camp meeting style.

We find another of these incidental matters that expose the fraud in this Book of Mormon. We have proved that Spaulding wrote several manuscripts. To his second Mormon manuscript he added the emigration of the Zarahemlites, closing his manuscript with the book called the "Book of Mormon." He very appropriately has Moroni declare that he finishes the record of his father; and that he has only a few things to write, a few things that his father has commanded him to write on the few

pages left on the plates. He declares his father made the record and declares its intent. He then says he would write more if he had room on the plates but he cannot for the plates are full and he has no ore to make any more and is alone. He then adds the few pages he declared he would and the book appropriately closes.

When Spaulding went to Pittsburg, at Patterson's request he rewrote the romance, writing Mormon Manuscript No. III, and adding the Jaredite portion. He overlooked this language of Moroni, with which he had appropriately closed the Manuscript No. II, and as the Book of Mormon now stands, Moroni wrote 56 pages—the whole of the Jaredite portion, no nothing, for his plates were full, and he could write no more. That one blunder is enough to condemn this fraud.

In this Jaredite Portion, written on nothing, and with nothing as a basis for it, we have a wonderful series of stories. Mormon has buried all the plates except "these few plates," that he handed to Moroni, the Plates of Ether with the rest years before. Where did Moroni get the plates of Ether to use in writing the 56 pages he wrote on nothing? He wrote on nothing and had nothing to write. The Book of Ether says that the speech of the Jaredites was not confounded at Babel. The Bible declares that the speech of all mankind was confounded. If time would permit we could multiply almost indefinitely such contradictions. We will now give an idiotic caricature of the history of Noah and the ark and defy anyone, outside, or inside of a lunatic asylum to equal it. Noah took eight persons into the ark. Jared took with him twenty-two grown persons and their families. Noah took with him into the ark, at most two of all animals and fowls that could not subsist in or on the water: Jared took two of all animals and fowls, swarms of bees and wonder of wonders, two of all kinds of fishes and all kinds of seeds. Sidney never does things by halves. Jared was to take food and water for this large company of persons, for all his fowls, and fishes, and flowers for his bees. If the cubit used was the sacred cubit, as was doubtless the case, the ark was 60 feet, long, 100 feet wide, and 60 feet high. Jared built eight cigar shaped canoes, and each was small, set light on the water, was sharply pointed at each end, and as tight as a dish, for we are told "the top thereof was as tight as a dish, and the sides thereof was as tight as a dish, and the bottom therefore was as tight as a dish." Each of these barges was the length of a tree and not more than 75 feet. Since the ends were sharply pointed, the ark would hold as much as 2000 such barges or 250 fleets of such barges. All kinds of animals could enter the ark; there were many that could not enter one of these canoes. Noah was told to have a system of windows in the ark for that is the meaning of the Hebrew word. Jared made his as tight as a dish. He took

into these eight canoes, sharply pointed at each end, not longer than a tree, twenty-two grown persons with their families, two of all kinds of animals, two of all kinds of fowls, two of all kinds of fishes, swarms of bees, and food and water for all for 344 days, and then shut down the door. No wonder he halloed to the Lord for light and air, shut up with such a crowd in a tight little canoe, as tight as the inside of a jug with the cork in.

The Lord finds that he has made a mistake in ordering Jared to make the canoes after the Divine pattern. He seems to have forgotten that animal life needs light and air. How does he remedy it? With infinite wisdom he tells Jared to knock a hole in the top and another in the bottom of each barge. Now, being an unbelieving Gentile, and not a spiritually enlightened and inspired Mormon, I can see that the hole in the top would let in the air and light, if it was big enough, and it would let in water and drown them all in a storm also, but for the life of me I cannot see what that hole in the bottom was for, unless it was to let in water and drown them. With ordinary mortals, holes in the bottom of such heavily loaded canoes would send every soul of them to "Davy Jones's Locker" quicker than you could say Jack Robinson, with your mouth ready puckered, as the Yankee expressed it.

But something like Mormon inspiration seizes me; I see it all as clear as mud. An Irishman's boots had holes in the toes. Pat sagely cut a hole in each heel. When asked what that was done for, he replied, "Why, to let the wather out at the bael when it comes in at the toe, sure." As Jared's canoes were to go plunging and diving through the water, much of the time under water, the hole at the bottom was to let the water run out, when it ran in at the top. Having provided ventilation on the most approved scientific principles, and having guarded, in the most scientific manner, against drawing by the water let in at the ventilating hole, the Lord then provides light for them, and his mistakes are all corrected. "And Jared did moulten out of a rock" (shades of Johnson, what English)! "sixteen small stones, and they were all clear like glass"—another scientific discovery—glass at the time of Babel. He brought them to the Lord, and the Lord touched them with his finger, and immediately they let out a flood of light, and Jared did not have to use kerosene, and he was independent of the Standard Oil Company. Jared placed one of these stones in each end of each canoe, and the Lord and Jared got out of all of these scrapes except one small mystery. How did the Lord and Jared get several times as much as Noah took into the ark into less than one two hundred and fiftieth part of the space, and how did they get into one of these canoes, animals that must have been much taller than a canoe was deep; and then what about that big tank of fish, or did the fish get along without water to live in, and were then taken

into the canoes to save them from being drowned? But then such questions will spoil the best revelations in the world, even the revelations of Sidney Rigdon. Two of the stones mentioned above were the stone interpreters of Jared's brother, and imposter Joe found them with the plates buried by Moroni, although Moroni never had them, and never buried them, and no Nephite ever saw them, and they were never to come forth until the Gentiles were all converted.

On page 509 Moroni prophecies that the one who finds these plates shall show them to three persons. Joe showed them to eleven. David Whitmer, says Moroni, showed them to his mother, and Emma Smith says she saw them for days on the table and handled them only covered with a thin cloth, and, strange daughter of Eve that she was, she never "peeked" under that cloth. With all our respect for the "Elect Lady" we can not swallow such a miracle as that. On the same page we have this balderdash "Jared's brothers did put forth these stones into the vessels which were prepared, one into each end thereof, and behold they did give light unto the vessels thereof." "Thereof" means of it or of them. The vessels thereof then means the vessels of the ends, for that must be what "thereof" refers to. Such balderdash as that is the "Fullness of the Gospel," given by inspiration—the fullest inspiration man has ever known, was preserved by miracle, revealed by miracle, and given to the world, word by word, so precious is it, by direct miracle of Almighty God. Who dares to stand up and blaspheme the Almighty by such an assertion?

At last the Jaredites set sail. Their canoes were in the depths of the sea, far under the water, and not a drop of water ran in through these two holes, one in the top and the other in the bottom of each canoe, and they had air with these holes under the water. Bah! Let us stop! If, as Imposter Joe tells us, God saves the world by folly, there is idiocy enough in that one scrap of Mormon "Fullness of the Gospel" to eternally save a whole universe of Mormons.

On page 514 we are told that Masonry broke out among the Jaredites and of course Satan was let loose. We have a combination of Herodias and Tullia, Herod and Tarquin. Jared, a murderous conspirator, promises the hand of his wicked daughter to Akish if he would bring him the head of the king, Jared's father. Akish starts Masonry among the Jaredites to accomplish his infamous purpose, and then "they all did swear unto Akish, by the God of Heaven, and also by the heavens, and also by the earth; and also by their own heads." (What a fearful job of cursing they did do), "that who should vary from the assistance that Akish desired" (what English) "should lose his head, and whoso should divulge what Akish made known unto them, the same should lose his life." Ordinary mortals would suppose that when a man loses his head, he lost his life; but then

Mormon inspiration is a wonderful thing. The difference between losing his head and losing his life is as great as the Irish Justice of the Peace discovered when he declared, "It makes all the differ in the wurruld, in the eyes of the law, whether he said, 'Come out of the hoos McCarty,' or 'McCarty come out of the hoos.'" "And Akish did administer unto them the oaths which were given to them of old, who also sought power, which had been handed down even from Cain, who was a murderer from the beginning." There you have it—Cain was the first Mason! "And they were kept up by the power of the devil," (The devil originated the first Masonic Lodge) "to administer those oaths unto the people and keep them in darkness, to help such as sought power, to gain power and to murder and to plunder and to lie and to commit all manner of wickedness and whoredoms. Now it was the daughter of Jared who put it into his heart to search up these things of old, and Jared put it into the heart of Akish, wherefore Akish administered it unto his kindred and friends, leading them away by fair promises, to do whatever he desired, and it came to pass that they formed a secret combination, even as they of old, which combination is most abominable and wicked above all things in the sight of the Lord." There Masons put that in your pipes and smoke it. The Lord is not a Mason, "for the Lord worketh not in secret combinations." "Neither doth he will that man should shed blood, but in all things hath forbidden it from the beginning of men." The Lord is an anti-Mason, and don't you forget it.

"And I, Moroni, do not write the manner of their oaths and combinations." He is not a Morgan, then, "for it hath been made known unto me they are had among all people and they are had among the Lamanites, and they have caused the destruction of this people of whom I am writing, and also the destruction of the Nephites." What an awful thing this Masonry has been, and now listen: "Whatsoever nation shall uphold such secret combinations to get power and gain, until they spread over the land, behold they shall be destroyed, for the Lord will not suffer the blood of his saints shall be shed by them; they shall always cry unto him from the ground for vengeance upon them, and yet he avenge them not." Now listen, Masons: "Wherefore, O ye Gentiles, it is wisdom in God that these things shall be shown unto you, and that thereby ye may repent of your sins and suffer not that these murderous combinations shall get above you which are built up to get power and gain, and the work, even the work of destruction shall come upon you, even the sword of Justice of the Eternal God shall fall upon you." Won't they catch it, though!! "To your overthrow and destruction if you shall suffer these things to be, wherefore God commandeth you when you shall see these things come among you that you shall awake to a sense of your awful condition"—

one of Rigdon's revival expressions—"because of this secret combination which shall be among you all. Woe be unto it, because of the blood of them that hath been slain, for they cry for vengeance upon it, and also upon those who built it up, for it cometh to pass that whoso buildeth it up seeketh to overthrow the freedom of all lands, nations and countries." The anti-Mason rant of 1825 to 1830. "And it bringeth to pass the destruction of all people, for it is built up by the devil." There, Masons, you have it—the devil is the founder of Masonry, and Cain was the first Mason! "Who is the father of all lies." There, Masons, that cooks the Masonic goat to a cinder!!

Page 517 King Heth turns Mason, and, of course, plots to murder some one. Page 522 Masonry breaks out in a new spot and

Satan is let loose of course. In all there were over a score of stabs at Masonry, covering several pages. Every charge made against Masonry in the years 1825 to 1830 is reiterated several times. When we learn from Mrs. Spaulding that Spaulding was a rabid anti-Mason, and remember that Rigdon, a regular Baptist preacher, was fanatically opposed to secret societies and was a ranting anti-Mason, and that Smith was an anti-Mason, all this rant and abuse is just what is to be expected. But who is such a sodden fool as to believe that Israelites, in the wilds of America, 1400 years before the anti-Masonic excitement in the United States, uttered repeatedly all the anti-Masonic abuse of Masonry?

This one feature is enough to condemn the claim of the Book of Mormon and to expose it as a transparent fraud.

MR. KELLEY'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The *Spaulding story* upon examination has been fully shown to be a story;—a wonderfully large one, too, for its time. That thing was thoroughly answered and put to shame by Sidney Rigdon as early as January, 1836. His slaughter of that through a published article in the *Messenger and Advocate*, a paper printed here in Kirtland, was sufficient to put all honest men at the time upon their guard. Mr. Rigdon showed that there was not only no truth in the general statement connecting him with Joseph Smith and the publication of the Book of Mormon, but further, that each and every one of the statements and allegations said to have been made by the parties (the very same ones Braden has brought up and cited as his witnesses in this discussion) were false. This was long prior to the death of Mr. Patterson, the Presbyterian preacher, in Pittsburg, whom Mr. Rigdon, in his letter of 1839, refers to as not lending himself "to the infamous plot to blacken his [Rigdon's] character." A man of no sympathies in common with the Latter Day Saints, and whom Rigdon's enemies had held out as the one to whom Spaulding delivered his manuscript for publication in Pittsburg, and as knowing certain things connecting Rigdon with the romance manuscript. But these persons never get his (Patterson's) statement, although he lived twenty years after they had started the story, and eighteen years after it had been publicly challenged and put to shame

by the Saints. However, Wm. Small, of Camden, N. J., in the meantime, goes to this same Patterson in Pittsburg, and he makes affidavit to the fact that he never knew anything about such a manuscript as these parties had told about. But this don't in the least dash these story-tellers; they lie low for a time till Patterson dies; and then, like them of old who said to the soldiers, "Say that his disciples came and stole him away by night while we slept," they revive and start other theories in order to carry out their nefarious work.

If it was so easy in the first century to get the guard to lie with reference to the resurrection of Jesus, after they had beheld the heavenly messenger and had fallen back as dead men, would it be remarkable that in the nineteenth century men would be able to get parties to spin falsehoods, to fill up the measure of crime as to this Spaulding tale?

But these fair and full denials of this story were made when the professed "Manuscript Found," was in the hands of Howe at Painesville, only nine miles away from Kirtland and consequently, while there was access to the *first*, and only sufficient evidence they ever had for such a story, if ever such a story had existed in fact; and with the challenge of the truth of the story in their very faces, and a demand made for the proof, by one of the men assailed, too, with others, and in the very midst of the parties who claimed to know, Hurlburt and Howe and these men, (said to be witnesses),

fail to put forth a single statement that can in any view of the case be looked upon as evidence, burned the manuscript they had received of Spaulding, so admitted by themselves and began in an underhanded and *insidious* manner to publish their stories through the ready newspapers for such things, and in 1840, after the Saints were far away from this part of the country, in the States of Missouri, Illinois and Iowa, Howe gets out his slanderous and disreputable work of "Mormonism Unveiled," or "History of the Mormons."

This was four years after Sidney Rigdon through the Kirtland publication had shown the falsity of the story; one year after his letter in the "Boston Journal," which played such havoc among the despoilers of his good name; one year after the full and clear examination and plain contradiction of the story by Parley P. Pratt, in the *New Era*, a New York paper; and five years after the story had been publicly met and put to shame in various parts of the United States and Canada, by the elders of the Saints, and notwithstanding all of this, Howe and Robert Patterson, this last a little fellow now living over here at Pittsburg (who would like to do something to destroy the faith of the Saints, if he only could rake up something to do,) brazenly put out for the truth, the statement that their story was never denied till just lately. Men who will deliberately or ignorantly make such false claims as these, and ask you to believe them, cannot be relied upon in any feature of the case by honest men. Before a person publishes a thing as true, he should know it to be such, and he cannot justify himself afterwards upon the ground, or plea of ignorance.

Another point do not forget. All the time, from 1834 to 1840, this same Howe had the Spaulding manuscript in his hands, and at the same time he had it in his hands, Mesdames Davidson and McKinstry, the widow and daughter of Solomon Spaulding, were claiming it was in fact, the genuine article that Spaulding wrote; the "MANUSCRIPT FOUND." And Howe writes Mrs. Davidson a letter in the meantime, saying, "It did not read as we expected, and we did not use it;" but never the once hints that it was the wrong manuscript, or not the "Manuscript Found," as claimed by these parties, who were the only persons under the sun who could possibly tell whether it was the "*Manuscript Found*" or not.

He never once in his letter to them asks if they did not have another manuscript some where of Spaulding's, or if they had any means of telling whether he had the right one; or whether Hulbert had played off on him and given him the wrong one. No; Howe knew he had the *Spaulding Manuscript* in his possession, and that story in his control, with all advantage in his favor; and as the coward that strikes down his innocent victim at the time he thinks no whisper of the deed can ever fall upon mortal ear, so, brooding in jealousy and in-

cited through the lies and tales which had been poured into his ready mind, he puts forth his hand to consign to the past the first and only evidence of this *Spaulding tale*, while, with the weapons of false statements and stories hawked about by the vile and depraved, he essays to destroy an innocent and noble people.

He knew at the time of his writing that he ought to have a different class of evidence to meet these things with and make good his assertions than that which he had, and he states in his book that he will furnish depositions for this purpose, and which, he says, "will sink these people." Oh! yes; *sink them*; that was the object of Howe and Hulbert; but he fails, however, to publish, or give in all of his writings or works, a single deposition of any person whatever, notwithstanding this boast.

But what does he do? Answer:

1. He publishes spurious, garbled, perverted and false things under the claim he was making quotations from the works of the Saints.

2. He publishes the questionable statements of a few persons, the quoted statements of two others; all of which are positively contradicted by Mrs (Solomon Spaulding) Davidson, Solomon Spaulding's daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, Sidney Rigdon, Parley P. Pratt, and Patterson, the Presbyterian preacher at Pittsburg; besides the fact that they so clearly and unmistakably bear upon the face the stamp of inconsistency and falsehood. They hold the idea throughout that these testifiers, who did not pretend that they had heard of or seen Spaulding's writing for more than twenty years, were so familiar with a manuscript, (which, to have been what they claim for it, must have contained from fifteen hundred to two thousand pages,) that they could, after twenty years' lapse of time, give names that were at the time strange and new to them; and never spoken by them for all of this time; and other little things which it is plain the copiers of the pretended statements must have taken from the Book of Mormon, as this was four years after its publication, and done when they have the book before them, this last fact being clearly disclosed in the statements themselves.

The absurdity, however, does not rest alone upon all of these things; but their statements were emphatically, directly and flatly contradicted by the manuscript then in Howe's possession, and which claimed for itself to be the one Spaulding said was found in a cave, and which was truly the "MANUSCRIPT FOUND."

These statements so directly contradicted, together with a few fraudulent affidavits which Hulbert got up in New York, and which I have fully shown were fraudulent, is the entire stock in trade of Mr. Howe to form his basis of belief and cause him to so severely and viciously attack the faith of the Saints and make them appear odious, except the bare disbelief of himself in God, the Scriptures, and the fact that

there was any such thing in the universe of God, or history of man, as the Holy Spirit, in which the Saints believed and claimed to rejoice. Ah! The secret is unfolded in his own words:—"I could better believe that Spaulding wrote it than Joe Smith saw an angel." And so he wrote as Voltaire, Hume and Thomas Paine from the standpoint of his unbelief, without the honesty of these others. I might introduce here as cumulative evidence on this question the additional statement of Mrs. McKinstry, who had a better opportunity of knowing, and did know the manuscript of her father better, than either John or Martha Spaulding and who as late as the year 1886, published, (so stated by the compiler, Mrs. Dickensen), an affidavit in the Scribner Monthly, still claiming and reaffirming that this Hulburt did get the "Manuscript Found." The statement of this Robert Patterson, of Pittsburgh, who is trying to find some terrible thing against the Saints, to Hulburt 4 years ago, in the presence of Mrs. Hulburt, "that his father, [Mr. Patterson, the preacher,] always claimed that he did not believe there was ever such a manuscript as the parties claimed the 'MANUSCRIPT FOUND,' to be, about their printing office in Pittsburgh." And notwithstanding this, this same Robert Patterson, in 1882, suppresses in his publication this claim of his father, and gives the purported statement as obtained from one, Rev. (?) Samuel Williams who wrote up a list of stories for publication against the Saints, when the first three lines of the statement clearly show that it is a fraud, and that Patterson never had anything to do with it whatever. It is as follows:—"R. Patterson had in his employment Silas Engles at the time, a foreman printer," etc., then, signed at the bottom, "Robert Patterson." This is certainly enough on this.

The statement of Mrs. Hulburt, made on Tuesday, February 5th, 1884, I now submit to you:—She said that,

"Mr. Hulburt never obtained but one manuscript from Mrs. Davidson. That one he let E. D. Howe have. When Mrs. (Spaulding) Davidson let him have it, he said he promised to return it; and when he let Howe have it Howe promised to restore it to Mrs. Spaulding, but he never did. Hulburt spent about six months time and a good deal of money looking up the Spaulding manuscript and other evidence, but he was disappointed in not finding what he wanted. This was the reason he turned the whole thing over to Howe. He never was satisfied with what he found, and while on his death-bed he would have given everything he had in the world could he have been certain there was ever a 'M nuscrit Found,' as claimed, similar to the Book of Mormon."

This is overwhelming proof, showing there was never any such manuscript as they claimed Spaulding wrote, and that they got the quire of paper upon which he did write. It is the confirming proof, too, of Howe's guilt. Why did he not do as he agreed, send the manuscript which he got back to Mrs. Davidson? The reason is too plain to be concealed for a moment. He is so anxious to have it destroyed that he violates his agreement to return "as soon as used." Why did he not return it when "it

did not read as they expected," at the time he wrote to Mrs. Davidson?

Shame on such trickery!

I might also introduce the emphatic statement of Mrs. Emma Smith, wife of Joseph Smith the Seer. She positively states: "That no acquaintance was formed between Sidney Rigdon and the Smith family till after the church was organized in the year 1830." "That neither" her husband nor herself "ever saw Sidney Rigdon until long after the Book of Mormon was in print." This is the statement of one of the most honored and esteemed ladies of Illinois, and who, after the murder of her husband, continued a resident of the State, raising her family, and departing this life but a short time ago in a ripe age, loved by all who knew her. Also the positive declaration of David Whitmer, made at Richmond, Mo., April, 1882, in answer to a question asked him in the presence of a number of persons, by President Joseph Smith of Lamoni, Ia., to which he gave this answer: "That the Book of Mormon was published long before Sidney Rigdon was known to our (the witness), family, or the Smiths; that I know that the story told of the Spaulding romance in connection with the Book of Mormon is false."

I will, in this connection, again call your attention to the affidavit of Mrs. Salisbury, to which Braden was so hasty to speak of last evening as being a lie, and therefore the witness could not be believed. Let us examine it and see who lied. She says, "That at the time of the publication of said book, my brother, Joseph Smith, Jr., lived in the family of my father in the town of Manchester, Ontario county, N. Y."

That, you will not certainly say, is contradicted. Now look at the next:

"That he had, all of his life to this time, made his home with the family."

Do you say this is contradicted? Where was his home to this time? Notice, she does not say he was at home all the time, but "made it his home with the family." To the year 1827, he was a young man, and his home was with the family, although he at times worked away from home. There are thousands of poor boys who have to do this, and my observation of humanity tells me that they are just about as apt to be honorable and truthful as those who stay at home and don't have any work to do; or, if they do have, do not do it. In this year he gets married, (steals his wife, Braden says,) although he was in his 22d year, and the lady he marries was in her 2d. Well, it rather strikes my mind that she wanted to be stolen. Besides, it is a proof that their Campbellite preacher, Rigdon, did not steal everything that came into Smith's possession.

But Mr. Smith says in his history, that after the marriage he went to his father's and remained, living in the family a year and farmed with his father. Here is his home till 1828, certain, and without any contradiction of any witnesses. And it is certain from all, that all the time during the year 1827 he was here in his father's

family, and this is the time Tucker, Hulburt, et al., tried to fix, as the time when the "Mysterious Stranger," (a wicked falsehood deliberately made by them,) appeared. Mrs. Salisbury and Mrs. Emma Smith are both right upon the spot then, and know who visit there, and no such person as Sidney Rigdon or any other mysterious stranger, is about their place, or visiting with Joseph Smith. Braden is caught here and he knows it; that is the reason he charges against the positive knowledge and testimony of Mrs. Salisbury.

Mr. Smith receives the plates in September of this year, and a few months after he got them, he was compelled through the persecution of those who were trying to get them from him, to go elsewhere for a time, and he goes to his wife's father's place in Pennsylvania: (the same from which they say he stole his wife.) The lies of Smith's enemies are so thick about this time that a man in that country could hear anything he wanted to. While here also, the history states:

"We had been threatened with being mobbed, from time to time, and this too, by professors of religion. And their intentions of mobbing us were only counteracted by the influence of my wife's father's family, (under divine Providence) who had become very friendly to me, and who were opposed to mobs, and were willing that I should continue the work of translation without interruption; and therefore, offered and promised us protection from all unlawful proceedings as far as in them lay."

It will do well to think, my friends, of the "Screen and blanket" stories, the "peep stones," the story he has told of "Smith being shut up in a cave," and all such ridiculous stuff set afloat by the "high-toned" gentlemen, who gave information to Hulburt, Howe, Tucker, et al.; and then, find him down at his wife's father's, (Mr. Hale's), steadily and persistently doing his work, right in the house of those who did not believe with him and who were terribly prejudiced against his work.

Here is where Oliver Cowdery visited him and wrote for him, right in the house of Mr. Hale for weeks—from the 15th of April to the 1st of June. About the 1st of June of this year by reason of the continued and increased persecution in the neighborhood of his wife's father, he was compelled to go to another place. This he found for a time at a gentleman's by the name of Whitmer, and from here he returned home to his father's at Manchester, New York. The records agree then. His home was at his father's, and he was here in 1829, when the manuscript was given to the printer, and remained till 1830, but in the spring of 1830 left Manchester and returned to Whitmer's.

What does the witness Mrs. Salisbury say:

"That she knew the friends of the family and the 'friends and acquaintances of Joseph Smith, her brother, who visited at her father's house. That prior to the latter part of the year 1830, there was no person who visited with, or was an acquaintance of, or called upon the said family, or any member thereof, to my knowledge, by the name of Sidney Rigdon."

Will you again Mr. Braden insult common

decency by saying she lied, and is contradicted by all others? Or that she did not tell the truth and the whole truth? Bring forward some of your strong evidence, if you have so much that is contradictory and let us hear it read. This lady does not pretend that she was with her brother all of this time, every day or month. But that at her father's house was her brother's home and the place where he brought his friends; was there the greater part of the time himself, and she says, "that to the extent of her knowledge, no such person as Sidney Rigdon was known to the family or any member of the same."

Here then, is the positive and direct knowledge that there was no such person as Tucker tried by deception and innuendo to make the people believe of a "mysterious stranger," being at the residence of the old gentleman Smith or an acquaintance of Joseph Smith.

Here then, are the positive and certain declarations of Sidney Rigdon, P. P. Pratt, Catherine Salisbury, Emma Smith and David Whitmer upon the question as to whether Rigdon was ever an acquaintance of the family of Mr. Smith, and knew of the Book of Mormon, except as a rumor in the world, possibly, as many other people prior to its publication, and they all agree that he was not known to the family or the translator of the Book of Mormon in any sense.

Add to this the statement of Braden's witness, Gilbert, who said in my presence, that he had tried for fifty years or near that long to find out something that would connect Rigdon and Smith together in some way, he living at Palmyra, N. Y., all this time as shown in his testimony, and who stated at the same time, that "they could not find out that Rigdon was ever about here or in this state until sometime in the fall of 1830," and it makes a clear and positive case against his Spaulding story. Compare my testimony upon this point now, with the loose statements got up by Howe and Hulburt and peddled by Braden here, and you have the actual status of the case.

These tales and stories when summed up are truly but tersely put by a writer who has lately canvassed them as follows:

"Rev. Kirk says that Dr. Winters told him that Mr. Rigdon told him—

Dr. Winters' daughter says her father said that Rigdon got Spaulding's manuscript—

Rev. Bonsall heard Dr. Winters say so and so—

And the impression of these three is that Dr. Winters wrote out his recollections—and therefore of course he did.

Mrs. Amos Dunlap saw Rigdon reading a manuscript, therefore it was the Spaulding Romance.

Pomeroy Tucker says a mysterious stranger visits Joseph Smith, therefore Sidney Rigdon is the man.

Mrs. Horace Eaton makes use of a similar statement summing it as a matter of course."

These, with what Tucker said some one else said, and all of which Hulburt and Howe got up, is Braden's stock in trade, and the only things offered to prove this Spaulding Romance.

It seems to me that if there is anyone in this audience, or any person outside, who shall hereafter be found with these facts in

their possession, still trying to gossip the Spaulding story down people's throats, it will be because they are wholly given over to evil, and terribly addicted to that kind of a business.

To such, I would advise in the language of the apostle Paul: "But refuse profane and old wives' fables, [gossip of the 'old neighbors,' silly fables or falsehoods,] and exercise thyself rather unto Godliness." 1 Tim. 4:7.

Ladies and gentlemen, you have now found what there is in fact to this Spaulding tale. I have carefully examined this thing, although I need not have noticed it in order to have maintained successfully the proposition. I have done it, because I knew it to be the means by which satan sought to blind the eyes of the people by gossip, and story, and tale and falsehood, to prevent them from honestly investigating this book in the manner God wants them to investigate all things.

But what has he proven as a fact of this story?

Did he prove that Solomon Spaulding ever wrote such a manuscript as was that of the Book of Mormon?

Has he sustained the burden of proof, showing that Sidney Rigdon and Joseph Smith were ever acquainted in any way till after the publication of the Book of Mormon?

Has it been shown that Rigdon was ever known to Spaulding in Pittsburg?

Did he prove that Sidney Rigdon took the manuscript in order to start a church?

Has he proved that Rigdon, in fact, ever knew anything of what the Book of Mormon was, till it was presented to him by P. P. Pratt, November, 1830?

You know all of these questions must be answered in the negative.

The only thing he has fairly proven with regard to this Spaulding story to my mind, is the fact, that he had no evidence when he began.

He refused to try to answer my arguments and struck out upon his *alibi*, where the burden of proof fell upon him, and his *alibi* has gone down and left him sitting with nothing under him. But he is still plucky, and up and attacks the Book of Mormon for what he deems objectionable in it. This is a proper way to debate; and if he can find anything bad in it, let him turn it out here. I shall not complain so he don't misquote, or mis-state the book.

He has made a few Bible objections which I shall notice in this connection.

Isaiah 16:8, he says, "Refers to the dispersion of the Moabites." But why does he say so? To whom does the prophet refer as leaving this land as being the "vine of Sibtah;"—"principal plants?" The people who were the desire of the Lord; pleasant to him? Will he say what people of the land of Moab was referred to? There were many.

Jeremiah 31, "Refers to the dispersion of Israel in the Assyrian empire," he says. But what right has he to say so? The proph-

ecy is emphatically against such an idea. It says, "Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth." Neither of these places refer particularly to Assyria.

Isaiah 11:1, he takes up and quotes just part of the verse, and says: "This shows it refers to the Israelites in the Assyrian empire." Had he quoted the verse it would have been sufficient to prove him wrong without a word from me. Notice, while I read: "From Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea." (12, verse). "And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth." Was it indeed limited to Assyria? Is this the best he can do towards a refutation of my positions?

He takes up what he considers the pet passage of Mormonism, Ezekiel 37, and thinks to make you believe that staff, rod and stick are used interchangeably in the Bible and mean power. I know we read of the rod of Aaron and scepter of Judah, but they are in no way used in the sense of a stick. We can well speak of the scepter of the king as meaning power, but not the stick of the king as meaning power. The words are not used interchangeably in the English, neither are the originals in the Hebrew so used in a single instance. But in his interpretation he overlooks entirely the writing upon the sticks which I particularly called attention to. Did this mean the kingdoms too? Give us an exposition once or confess you cannot. But read it now substituting kingdom for stick, and you have the ridiculous position of uniting the kingdoms in the 19th verse, and uniting them again in the 21st, without any idea of the writing upon the stick or kingdom.

Now I shall answer the objection made by him, that none of Ephraim came to America. How does he know? Well, he says the Book of Mormon says they were of the tribe of Manasseh. Mr. Smith, he thinks, (or rather the equestrian Ahasuerus, Rigdon), made a great mistake here. If Mr. Smith had just sent over to Andover, or down to Hiram, or waited till the endowment of Bethany, before committing himself, it would have been all right. But he thinks he is clearly caught here. Let us examine the position: Does the Book of Mormon say all who came to this continent were of the tribe of Manasseh? No, it does not. But it says Lehi was, and that is enough for Braden. He can soon make the objection. His objection is, then, that the book of Mormon did not trace Ephraim here by lineage. But had it done so an objection would clearly have lain against it, as we shall see from the prophecies.

It is written in Hosea v. 14: "For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah; I, even I, will tear and go away; I will take away and none shall rescue him."

Here the thought is presented by the prophet that Ephraim, for some cause or the other, is to be broken up, torn to pieces, scattered. By turning to verse 3, of the same chapter we will readily discover the reason for this, which is clearly on account of their evils and abominations. In the prophecy of Jeremiah, vii. 15, the Lord says: "And I will cast you out of my sight as I have cast out all your brethren, even the whole seed of Ephraim." It is clear from this instruction that Ephraim had, brought upon him a great and terrible judgment by reason of his rebellion and transgressions.

What was the penalty to be? Utter destruction—annihilation? O, no. Turn with me for the answer to Hosea ix. 11, 12. The Lord there says: "As for Ephraim, their glory shall fly away like a bird, from the birth, and from the womb, and from the conception. Though they bring up their children, yet will I bereave them, that there shall not be a man left. Yea, woo also to them when I depart from them!"

Here the problem of Ephraim is made more plain. "Their glory," as a people is at some time and in some way to be taken away. They were to be taken as from early birth and separated one from another, and thus destroyed as a nation, as predicted by the prophet and scattered among the people. Ibid. 7:8. "Ephraim, he hath mixed himself among the people; Ephraim is a cake not turned." Evidently not well baked then, so when taken up, it is readily broken to pieces; or, as in verse 11, prefigured, he falls apart of himself. "Ephraim also is a silly dove without heart; they call to Egypt; they go to Assyria." His attachments are to be broken and he left to wander everywhere, and not seek a place with any one particular people. Mixed in Egypt and Assyria his blood will afterwards not only be found among the *tribes*, but among the Gentile nations also.

Ephraim is thus set forth in the prophetic history of the Bible; and yet, the objection is made by my opponent, and was long before made by John Hyde, and other short sighted theologians, that in the Book of Mormon the line or lineage of Ephraim is not traced to America, therefore, it is a terrible blunder. Ah! but the blunder is again upon the side of these self-constituted critics.

Had the tribe been traced by lineage, there would have been a conflict with the prophecies. The Lord does not contradict himself in his own work, that is quite clear. Ephraim then, is mixed with the people everywhere; and per consequence over here, as well as with the other nations. Turning to the Book of Mormon, I find that with Lehi who came to this country, there was the family of Ishmael, and Zoram; and although it had been common in Jerusalem to keep the genealogy of all the people, it seems none was kept of these. Why, we are not informed; nevertheless, we are informed that Ephraim should not be able to keep his lineage or "glory," nor even desire

to do so, but that he should be "mixed among the people."

So it was that when Mulok came out from Jerusalem he brought "a company" with him, but the lineage of the company is not given. However, we are plainly informed in the book that the descendants of Joseph in Egypt were upon this land; "of the seed of Joseph," and not simply through Manasseh. And in Genesis, 49th chapter, it reads, "whose branches," not branch, but "branches," (daughters), "run over the wall"—"pass to the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills, above," (over, beyond), the blessing of my progenitors, of Abraham and Isaac. Both, also, as spoken of by Moses in Deuteronomy, go to the promised land and inherit together; he sets this out in the blessing, which we have shown could only refer to the land of America. In Genesis 48th, they are made "to grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." In the Book of Mormon we find them traced here through the older brother, Manasseh, who had not lost the *birth-right*; but Ephraim as is clearly shown by the prophets would be the case, is yet, "mixed among the people;" and hence, his lineage not traced.

Then the book is still found to accord with the Bible and truth, notwithstanding the objections of some of the self-wise of the age. In the last days, Ephraim is to come out from among the people, and do his work and in his hand, in the inauguration of this work is the "stick of Joseph," the "Ensign," which is to be put with the Bible, or "stick of Judah," and with the two, as with the power, or "horns of the unicorn," "he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth." Hence, in speaking of the gospel work of restoration in the last days, the prophet Jeremiah, says: "They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them: I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble. For, I am a father to Israel and Ephraim is *my first born*." Ephraim is to be first in the work in the last time; he never has been before! but his lineage being lost, when he is brought to light it will be as in the time of Nehemiah, through the instrumentality of a prophet standing up with the *Urim and Thummim*. The Psalmist in the 80th number, exclaims aright then, when he says: "Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; Thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth. Before Ephraim and Benjamin and Manasseh stir up thy strength, and come and save us."

This part of the work of Ephraim with others is so plain that it is hardly possible to go amiss if you take the Bible for your guide. And the prophecies are fulfilled in every condition, so far as the work has progressed, in the coming forth of the Book of Mormon. Here is where Mr. Braden rested his great objection to the Book of Mormon, and his objection to the application of the prophecy in the 37th of Ezekiel to that book.

Now, I want to see him stand up to the

work and answer me upon this, if he can. There is an issue here, and if he can show that I am wrong in my position of Ephraim being "mixed among the people," and "scattered upon all the mountains of Israel: upon the face of the whole earth," but to be re-

vealed in the last day by the light of revelation to inaugurate and "push to the ends of the earth" the work of salvation among the people, let him do so.
(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S THIRTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: My opponent quotes from the Book of Mormon the declaration that men will say in regard to the Book of Mormon, "We have the Bible and that is sufficient." There is no prophesy in that, for the Disciples had been saying that to Rigdon, the author of the book, for years, when he was trying to prepare them to accept new revelations and his book. The word "Bible" was first applied to the scriptures in the fourth century by Chrysostom. We have here a Nephite in America using it hundreds of years before—another miracle. As I have never read a word that Howe said, and have not made him a witness, Kelley's attacks on Howe's analysis of the Book of Mormon is a nonsensical waste of time. As a lawyer will he tell me what effect his attacks on Howe's analysis of the Book of Mormon has on the testimony of the witness recorded in another part of the book? I have sent for legal evidence that T. P. Baldwin was Judge of one of the courts of Wayne county, N. Y., in 1833. When it comes I will settle that cavil of my opponent. I have explained that Spaulding concealed from his wife and daughter his purpose to publish his book, and that he told his creditors that he intended to publish it and pay his debts. Mrs. Eichbaum, clerk in the post office in Pittsburg, from 1812 to 1816 inclusive, testifies that Rigdon was in Pittsburg in 1814-15, or during the time the Spaulding manuscript was taken to Patterson's office; that he was learning the tanner's trade and was intimate with Lambdin, one of Patterson's printers, and was about the office so much that Engles, the foreman, complained of it. That settles that matter.

My opponent said last night that Mrs. Davidson said there were passages of scripture in her husband's Manuscript Found. She does not. She says the passages of scripture and religious talk were added to the romance to get up the Mormon fraud. I have proved that Spaulding wrote several manuscripts, and my opponent's jabber on the assumption that he wrote only one is absurd. His attack on the testimony I presented is absurd and puerile. My oppo-

nent seems to think that his course in interviewing parties, and then going off and writing off what he says they said, was far more honorable than Mr. Thorne's course in going to the parties and having them go before a magistrate and testify in their own words and say what they pleased. The witnesses swear that he falsified their statements. He objects that Major Gilbert does not specify in what particulars he is misrepresented. It was not necessary, for, he says, it is all misrepresentation, deliberate falsehood. He objects that there is no date to the testimony of Conneaut witnesses. There is none to most of what he reads. There is neither date nor place to the testimony of the witnesses for the Book of Mormon: and they do not sign independent individual statements as these witnesses do, but a joint statement written out for them by Imposter Joe. Cannot my opponent see that such pettifoggery is putting into my hands a club that will knock out all the brains he has got.

Campbell says Bentley is mistaken concerning one of the teachings of the Book of Mormon, therefore Bentley's testimony concerning what Rigdon told him is worthless. Such talk is twaddle. Campbell asked Bentley whether he remembered a certain conversation and what he remembered of it; therefore Campbell's testimony is worthless. More bosh. I have said that a man may preach the teachings of Christ, or steal them and present them to the world as a revelation and be a hypocrite. He quotes "If any man abide in the teachings of Christ, etc." Yes, abide. What is it to abide in such teachings? To steal it and present it to the world as a revelation in a lying fraud, or live it out in life? For pity's sake stop that idiocy. He cannot make the Bible and the Book of Mormon parallel cases. But few of the writers of the Bible tell us they were inspired. But few tell us their books were written by divine command. None of the books were revised by inspiration or by Jesus himself. They were written on perishable material; had to be copied by uninspired men; they were not preserved by miracle, and they were translated by uninspired learning.

The Book of Mormon was written by men by divine command and most of them say they were inspired in engraving on the plates. They were preserved by miracle. Revealed to Smith by miracle. Translated by inspiration. Given word by word to Smith, by the Lord, in a miracle; and the witnesses declare that the voice of God declared to them that the translation was correct, and the Book of Mormon true. There is no work of man here. It is all the work of the Lord. If there are mistakes they are the mistakes of the Lord. I said the materials used by the Israelites in writing their books were papyrus, parchment rolls—so the Bible declares. His retort is absurd. Because the American people engrave on gold, or stone, on metal, wood, etc., the material on which we write is metal, stone, etc. Bosh. The use of the word "Jew," is a blunder of the translator, as much as for a Frenchman to call all who spoke the English language "Yanks," from the days of William the Conqueror. He has found "steel" in the Bible and he can find "farthing" also. Biblical scholars say that steel was unknown among the Israelites until shortly before Christ. If the Gospel was preached to Abraham, it was not all of the teachings of Christ and his apostles, in the exact words they used. The New Testament says the Holy Spirit was not given in the name of Christ until after he was glorified. The Book of Mormon says he was.

We will notice an item omitted from the proper place. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants says of the Book of Mormon. "Condemnation rests and will rest on all 'who do not repent and remember the 'New Covenant, even the Book of Mormon.' Again, 'Behold I say unto you 'that all old covenants have been done 'away in this thing' (the Book of Mormon) 'and this' (the Book of Mormon) 'is a new and everlasting covenant.'" Mormon revelation declares that the Book of Mormon is a new and everlasting covenant doing away Christ's dispensation and Christ's covenant. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares that the Book of Mormon "Is the fulness of the Gospel." The Bible—Christ's Gospel—was imperfect—did not contain the fulness of the Gospel. The Book of Mormon declares that the Romish Church "took 'away from the Gospel many parts which 'are plain and precious, and also many 'covenants of the Lord have they taken 'away." It declares that "it" (the Book of Mormon) "makes known the plain and 'precious things that have been taken 'away." It places the Book of Mormon above the Bible, the New Testament and above the covenant of Christ. Such are the blasphemous claims of this fraud. Kelley does not present them to you. He "roars you gently as a sucking dove." He is giving you milk such as becomes babes. I give you the strong meat of Mormonism.

The Book of Mormon tells us that if Ad-

am had not transgressed and fallen he would have had no children. The Bible says God commanded him to be fruitful. According to the Book of Mormon God's first command to man was one that he could not obey unless he sinned. If he did not sin he must forever disobey the first command God laid on him. It says if Adam had not sinned he would have known no joy for he knew no misery. Then God put man in Eden with everything that could cause joy and gave to man no power to enjoy it. Also unless persons suffer misery they can have no joy. The angels that are blessed suffer misery, for if they do not they have no joy. It further says: "They did no good for thy knew no sin." Then the angels that have not sinned do no good? An intelligence can do no good till he sins! Was Adam doing no good when in a state of purity he obeyed God's commands? If good comes through sinning then—the more sinning the more good. This absurd idea of the Book of Mormon is in flat contradiction of the teachings of the Bible. There are many ideas in the Book of Mormon and in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants and in the interpolations of the inspired translation that are plagiarized from fancies of the apocryphal Book of Enoch.

We will now resume our analysis of the Book of Mormon. We are told on page 517 that the Asiatic horse, ox and cow, the same blunder as in the case of the Nephites, the sheep, the ass and swine were common in America thousands of years ago. Science declares that these species of animals were introduced by Columbus and his successors. This Israelite writer (as it is claimed he is) speaks of swine as "good for the use of man." The sordid ignorance of the fabricators of this fraud is beneath contempt. They represent the Israelites as living in the midst of the use of the Hebrew and using the hated Egyptian, instead of their sacred Hebrew for which they had such a fanatical love. They speak of the abhorred swine as good for man's use. They trample under foot every great feature of the law of Moses, and impudently tell us that they live under it and obey it.

On page 523, Ether, a Jaredite, whose ancestors came to America 800 years before Abraham, prophecies in the exact language of the Hebrew letter, a thousand years before it was written, uses the language, the exact language of the Bible, of which his people know no more than the man in the moon, and preaches the gospel to these Jaredites a thousand years before Christ. 527, Masonry breaks out again. 529, more devilry by the Masons. 530, the wars caused by these sons of Belial, the Masons, cause the slaughter of two millions of men on one side to say nothing of women and children. When we remember that all the lives lost in our great civil war, directly and indirectly, was less than a million, and that less than half a million were killed or died of wounds, we can form some estimate of what a war it must have been when ten times as many were slain.

Then the two contending parties arrayed themselves against each other, every last man, woman, and child, and baby, with helmets, swords and breast-plates. What a heroic sight to see children and babies armed with helmets, swords and breast plates, and what a slaughter they made, no doubt! Then they pitched in every last man, woman and child and baby, and they "fit," and they "fit," and they "fit" and they "fit" and "fit," until nobody is left but Ether. He is miraculously preserved to finish some plates for Imposter Joe. Ether does not know whether he will be translated, which would be an easy job judging from his ethereal name, or stay and die out as did Moroni, his copyist. Thus ends the history of these Jaredites who were not descendants of Adam or Noah, for the speech of their descendants was confounded at Babel and the speech of the Jaredites was not confounded—they were not descendants of Noah.

Finally, after copying on nothing, for his plates were full before he began, and he could make none, and from nothing, for Mormon had buried everything except the plates of Ether, which he never had; Moroni whiles away his time in writing a liturgy for the followers of Imposter Joe. He then rehashes portions of the New Testament in a sermon about faith, hope and love, repeating Paul's language in many places. It looks as if Rigdon was trying to fix up his book so that he could set the New Testament as much in the background, as the New sets the Old. Then comes the miracle of miracles. Mormon out in the wilds of America, "all his lone" as Paddy would say, on pages 539, 540, 541, preaches Sidney Rigdon's sermon against infant baptism and quotes scores of passages and phrases from the New Testament. What an insult to common sense to ask us to believe that an Israelite, in the wilds of America, over one thousand years after his people had any communication with the old continent or knew about its troubles over "infant baptism," just beginning, preached in America, 1400 years before Rigdon was born, Rigdon's rant against infant baptism. Mor ni, alias Rigdon, closes with one of Rigdon's rhapsodies of exhortation in which Sidney mounts King Ahasuerus' horse for the last time in the Book of Mormon, and he then lets his Pegasus rest until he joins Imposter Joe in Manchester, New York, in December 1830. Such is a mere outline of the countless absurdities in the Book of Mormon, "The Fullness of the Gospel."

We will now call attention to certain matters that require more space than we could give to them in a running criticism. The ancient Israelites believed that the earth was stationary and that the stars moved. They did not know the difference between the planets and fixed stars. Inspiration among the Israelites never revealed to them scientific facts. On page 286 of the Book of Mormon, Alma a Nephite

nearly 2000 years before Copernicus says "The earth and its motion and the planets which move in their regular form declare there is a God," a prose adaptation of Addison's hymn. Page 410 the language of the Hebrew poet in the Book of Jasher quoted in Joshua is thus commented and explained. "If the Lord say to the earth thou shalt go back that it lengthen out the day, we know that it is done, and thus according to his word the earth goeth back and it appeareth to men that the sun standeth still, yea and behold this is so far it is the earth that moveth and not the sun." It is wonderful how much more than their brethren in Palestine Sidney's Nephites and Jaredites always knew. Had the Israelite poet been one of Rigdon's poets he would not have represented Joshua as commanding the sun to stand. No he would have expressed himself in the most approved phraseology of modern science although his language would have been regarded as idiotic falsehood by his readers. Page 3 Lehi says he left Jerusalem because the Lord commanded him to do so, in a dream. Page 401 Nephi says he was driven out by people. Page 106 Nephi says he and his people were descendants of the Jews. The word "Jew" is a nickname as much as "Yank" and the word from which it is derived was not applied to any nation until a hundred years after Nephi left Jerusalem and the nickname was not used until modern times. Page 231 Amulek declares that Nephi and all who went with Lehi were Manassehites and not Jews at all. Page 375 we are told that the devil led Jared and his people. Page 502 we are told it was the Lord. Page 76 Jacob declares that the Lord told him America is an island. Common sense says it is a continent. Page 416 an inspired prophet declares the darkness at the crucifixion shall be over the whole earth three days and a subsequent passage declares as a fact of history that the darkness covered the whole earth three days. The Bible says it was over the land in which the crucifixion took place and only three hours. John the Baptist declares that only our Savior could give the baptism of the Holy Spirit and that it was future in his day. The apostle declares that the Holy Spirit would not be given in the name of Jesus until after his ascension. Our Savior so declares. A Nephite prophet hundreds of years before the birth of Jesus says of his brethren "that they have been visited by the Holy Spirit, have conversed with angels and been spoken to by the voice of the Lord: have had the spirit of prophecy and the spirit of revelation, and many spiritual gifts. The gift of speaking with tongues, the gift of prophecy, the gift of the Holy Ghost and the gift of translation." A more flat contradiction of the word of God and the Son of God could not be conceived. Page 19 and 20 we are told Jesus was born at Nazareth. Page 223 at Jerusalem. The Bible says it was at Bethlehem. We call your attention next to a tissue of flat con-

traditions. Page 507 "Jared's brother" (I wish Rigdon had given that fellow a name while he was about it) "seals up his plates and interpreters and hides them up unto the Lord and they are not to go forth until the Gentiles exercise faith and are clean before the Lord." That time has not come yet for the Book of Mormon was to go forth in an age of apostacy, unbelief, and crime, even the horrible crime of Masonry. Page 523 Ether, the last Jaredite writes his gold plates. Page 158 Limbi finds them and breastplates and swords but not Jared's plates nor any interpreters. Mosiah interprets these plates of Ether with interpreters handed down among the Nephites for generations. Page 204 Mosiah's interpreters were handed down to Mormon. Page 492 Mormon buries them with over twenty other relics, and hands only "the few plates" with no interpreters to Moroni, who buries "these few plates." Smith finds not only "these few plates" which Moroni buried, and that was all that he buried, but he finds with them Laban's sword that was not buried with them and was buried before and apart from them. Lehi's brass compass which was not buried with them and was buried before and apart from them and the interpreters of Jared's brother that no Nephite or any one else ever saw or can have until the Gentiles all believe and are clean before the Lord.

The Book of Mormon teaches that God led the Manassehites to America and blessed them far above Judah. The Bible declares II Kings XVII, 18-20, "The Lord rejected all the seed of Israel (Manasseh with the rest) and afflicted them and delivered them to the spoilers until he cast them out of his presence. Therefore the Lord was angry with Israel and removed them out of his sight. There was none left but the tribe of Judah only." You can believe the Bible or the Book of Mormon one or the other but not both.

Mormons quote as their special reliance the prophecies in regard to Ephraim applying them to the aborigines of America. According to the Book of Mormon there never was an Ephraimite in America. Page 231. The Nephites and Lamanites were Manassehites. The Zarahemlites were of the seed of Zedekiah-Judahites. There was not an Ephraimite on the continent. They could with far greater propriety quote the prophecies in regard to Judah for some were Judahites. To apply to Manassehites, the prophecies in regard to Ephraim, is as gross a contradiction as to apply to these Manassehites, the laws for the Levites, as these Rigdonite revelations so frequently do. Page 271. Alma says "let us retain our swords that they be not stained with the blood of our brethren for perhaps if we stain our swords again they can no more be washed bright through the blood of the Son of our God." What blasphemy! Swords washed bright through the blood of the Son of God. The blood of the Son of God a polishing powder. Who doubts that

that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin? Page 437 we are told that Christ was crucified on the fourth day of the first month. He was not crucified until after the passover, which was the fourteenth day of the month, and was really crucified on the 20th day of the month. The context declared that a just man kept this record and it was true. Sidney was mistaken that is all. Page 1. We are told that Lehi left Jerusalem in the reign of Zedekiah, in the first year of his reign. If we add the 70 years of captivity, which began with Zedekiah to Daniels 483 years we have 553 years or 47 years less than 600. If we put the date of Christ's birth where it should be we have over 50 years. Sidney is mistaken again.

The Book of Mormon flatly contradicts the Bible in its stuff about the Melchisedec priesthood. I. The Bible clearly teaches that there never were but two priests of that order, Melchisedec himself and Christ.

II. Melchisedec officiated before the Levitical priesthood. There was an introduction of the Levitical priesthood and an introduction of the law of Moses. III. The Levitical priesthood under the order of Aaron was abrogated; Christ is priest, and he alone. The law is changed from the law of Moses to the law of Christ. IV. Christ alone is priest after the order of Melchisedec. V. He was not priest on earth but is priest in heaven. The Book of Mormon makes these priesthoods parallel, and talks of innumerable priests of the order of Melchisedec. Mormons appeal to the fact that Abel, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Jethro and Moses offered sacrifices. That does not prove that they were priests of any order. They offered sacrifices as patriarchs and prophets and not as priests. If there were any Melchisedec priests it was only those who offered sacrifices before the Levitical priesthood was established; and when the law was changed to the law of Moses the priesthood was changed to the Levitical priesthood. Samuel and all who sacrificed after the Levitical priesthood was established sacrificed as prophets. They are never called priests.

The Book of Mormon tells us that the Nephites had priests of the Aaronic order, for they were consecrated according to the law of Moses, but every soul of them was a Manassehite, and not a Levite among them, although the law of Moses punished severely any one except a Levite who attempted to officiate as priest. The Bible declares that Christ did not ascend to heaven until forty days after his resurrection, and that his second coming is yet future—Heb. ix. 28. In the Book of Nephi we are told that Christ descended from heaven and visited the Nephites, and ascended into heaven again, and then descended and spent three days with the Nephites. Here we have a second and a third coming from heaven before the Hebrew letter was written, and in less than a year from his first ascension into heaven. The appearances of our Saviour to Paul and others in a vision

are not comings direct from heaven in the flesh as he appeared to the Nephites—the manner in which the angels declared to the Apostles at his ascension he would come in his second coming.

On page 527, Moroni, a Nephite in America, who knew nothing of any Hebrew or Christian scriptures after Jeremiah, writes: "These things bring to pass the scripture which saith, 'They who are first shall be last, and they who are last shall be first.'" Where do the Scriptures say so? Matthew xix. 30, or Luke xiii. 30. Did Moroni, a Nephite in America, who knew nothing of the New Testament Scriptures, write that? Or did Rigdon, when he was revising the manuscript he stole from Spaulding to make a big thing out of it in the shape of a pretended new revelation? Page 498, Moroni, alias Rigdon, writes: "Do we not read that God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, and that in him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Yea, verily, Sidney, we, you and your readers do read such language in Heb. xiii. 8, and in James i. 17, but no person in America 1,000 years

before Columbus ever so read. Page 539: The Holy Ghost says to Moroni, "Listen to the words of Christ," and then we have over twenty quotations of the sentences and phrases from the New Testament. No, Sidney, the Holy Ghost never said that to Mormon. You used to say just such things to your hearers in your sermon on infant baptism, and you have interpolated your sermon into the manuscript you stole from Spaulding.

Page 494, Jesus says to the three Nephites who were never to taste death: "When I come in my glory ye shall be changed from mortality to immortality." Positively declares that they were mortal and would remain mortal until he came in his glory. In the very next paragraph Nephi says that whether they were mortal or immortal from their transfiguration he does not know. After recording the clear, positive declaration of Jesus that they were mortal and would be till he came in his glory, Nephi coolly declares that he did not know whether Jesus lied or not!

MR. KELLEY'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I will first notice one or two things in the statements that my opponent has just made. I suppose that if I should ask any person in this audience, now that they have just listened to his argument, to state a single objection that he has made against the Book of Mormon, just to arise and state one objection, you would not be able to do it. How many of you would? Why, he has read such a string here that you cannot understand it, so far as making an objection is concerned, and no other person, unless he would take weeks and weeks to go through it, or was well acquainted with the book, and such a person would ask for no reply on my part. And when you see, as I shall show you, that every one of those supposed objections that he has offered is clearly answered in the book, what will you think of the objector? The book itself answers every one of the objections that he has made, which I will show if I have time during this discussion, noticing each one particularly. Now, what is the proper manner of arguing a question? I will call attention to this again, so that you may not forget the difference between argument and the simple statement of something that does not amount to an argument. If he can find a dozen objections to that book that will stand the test, that is enough to send

the book down. Why don't he make his objections fairly, and give opportunity of replying to them? But no, such a contest don't suit. The whole object seems to be to lug in so much that no white man who is sane, nor dark man either, on the continent can answer them all. Well now, he will find out that Sidney was on Ahasuerus's horse all the time when he tries to defeat the question in that way. To-morrow night, however, I will answer the Gordian Knot. Among all these objections there was a "Gordian Knot," you know. That must be answered. That was a strong one! Will he give up when that is severed? It will be cut in twain; just remember that.

The objection was made that the New Testament, in the history which it gives of the events in the time of the Savior, says that the Holy Ghost was not yet given, while the Book of Mormon, he states, says it was given. There he thinks is a flat contradiction. Well, perhaps somebody in the audience who has never read the Book of Mormon, nor the New Testament but very little, may think there is a contradiction here. The New Testament is speaking about a particular time when the Holy Ghost was not given to the disciples of Jesus, viz: between the ministry of the Savior and his resurrection and ascension. The Book of Mormon is speaking of a time long prior to

the time when Jesus was in the flesh here. Will he take the ground that the Holy Ghost was never given to the prophets on the Eastern continent?

Mr. Braden: Not in the name of Christ.

Mr. Kelley: In what name was it given if not in the name of Christ? Will you answer that? Let me cite you an example that will show that the Holy Ghost was given. Don't you remember that Saul was among the prophets at one time when this Holy Spirit was given to them? And that another the seventy elders of Israel prophesied when the Holy Spirit was upon them? The same Holy Ghost, too, that was not yet given, as the term is used in the New Testament scriptures. And did I not quote last night where Peter says, "That holy men of old spake as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost?" Then it was given before, was it not? If you meant not through Christ when you said that the Book of Mormon contradicted the New Testament, why didn't you say not through Christ then?

Mr. Braden: I did.

Mr. Kelley: We will see. But what better does that make it? That is no objection. The Holy Ghost was given in the Old Testament times too, and people possessed it and prophesied by reason of it long before Christ's time in the flesh; and if it was not given through Christ I suppose it was given through men, just common men, away back there. But he ought to know that he who was Christ Jesus in the flesh was the same who was in the church in the wilderness. "And they did all drink of that spiritual rock, which rock was Christ," says the Apostle Paul, and this was when they were in the wilderness. Yet he wants to make out that because the Book of Mormon speaks of men being blest with the Holy Ghost before the time of Pentecost, that there is a contradiction between the Book of Mormon and the New Testament. The rock they drank of was Christ, and the way men partake of that rock is by the Holy Ghost. It is "a well of water, springing up unto eternal life." But enough on this point at present. I have plenty of material here this evening that is in shape.

He objects again to the Book of Mormon, because it says that God cursed certain people with a skin of blackness, (the Indians.) Yet, doubtless, he accepts the idea that God did curse Canaan and from him were the descendants of Ham. That he also put a mark upon Cain. But then these accounts are in the Bible, and possibly my opponent has no difficulty in believing them. It is a fact, however, that the Indians' skins are black, or dark, and there must have been a cause for it. The Book of Mormon says God put this upon them because of their iniquity. Can Mr. Braden give a better reason? But now we strike our friend's invincible objection. The stronghold behind which he bids defiance to the Book of Mormon. He says, among other animals which they found, on the promised land in the wilderness, was the

ox. "Miraculous!" he exclaims. He had quite forgotten that it is stated in the Bible, "Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together," Deut. 22:10. And that ox is used to represent a class of animals known as the cattle kind, just as the ass is used to represent another kind known as the ass; as swine represents the hog kind; and that neither the Bible nor any other writer thought it necessary to use only the male gender in all of their writing; but used the common, the familiar and modest words, "The ox and the ass." If you will turn to Webster's Dictionary, you will see that he defines the word "ox" as applying to all cattle kind, and especially when they are found in a wild state, or in the woods, as they were found when the second people came to this continent. Can't you understand it, Mr. Braden? Read and be instructed and come out from your strong wall of defense! It will be better for your side perhaps, if you will put a little erudition into your speeches, and copy with less credulity from the misrepresentations, and falsehoods, published by Mr. E. D. Howe, et al. Every one of these objections of yours are but the reproduction of Howe. If they would stand the test, all well and good; but when any one can see the fallacy of them by taking the objection as made by Howe, and comparing with the record in the Book of Mormon it seems childish to me for a man who, according to his own story, has scalped Ingersoll, and put a host of Philistines like Underwood, Jamieson, Rev. Mr. Hughey, and Moses Hull to flight, to be thus burdening his intellect with such trifling matters. But he objects to the Book of Mormon by reason of the prediction of the day of darkness upon the earth as follows: Book of Mormon, p. 22.

"And it came to pass that I saw a mist of darkness on the face of the land of promise; and I saw lightnings, and I heard thunderings and earthquakes, and all manner of tumultuous noises; and I saw the earth and the rocks that they rent; and I saw mountains tumbling into pieces; and I saw the plains of the earth that they were broken up; and I saw many cities that they were sunk."

This was a vision of things to occur on the promised land, not on all the earth. The fulfilment of the prediction took place at the crucifixion of Christ as recorded on pages 437 and 438 of the Book of Mormon. However much this may be spurned and laughed at by my opponent, the traditional evidences given by the natives confirm the statement. "There was a terrible hurricane that carried away trees, mountains, houses, and the largest edifices." "All this time they were in darkness without seeing the light of the sun or moon." See North Americans of antiquity, by John T. Short, page 239. I will turn to Baldwin's Ancient America, page 176 and show you what is given in historical works in regard to this. He says:

"In the first place Brasseur de Bourbourg claims that there is in the old Central American Books a constant tradition of an immense catastrophe of the character supposed; this tradition affirms that a part of the continent extending into the Atlantic was destroyed in the manner supposed, and appears to indicate that the destruction was accomplished by a succession of

frightful convulsions. Three are constantly mentioned and sometimes there is mention of one or two others."

Who will he say went down to Central America and got this out of the old books? Sidney Rigdon, or Solomon Spaulding? Take which horn of the dilemma you choose now. But I will read on:

"The land was shaken by frightful earthquakes, and the waves of the sea combined with volcanic fires to overwhelm and engulf it. Each convulsion swept away portions of the land, until the whole disappeared, leaving the line of the coast as it is now. Most of the inhabitants, overtaken amid their regular employments, were destroyed; but some escaped in ships and some fled for safety to the summits of high mountains, or to portions of the land which, for the time, escaped immediate destruction. Quotations are made from the old books in which this tradition is recorded which appear to verify his report of what is found in them. To criticize intelligently his interpretation of their significance, one needs to have a knowledge of those books and traditions, equal at least to his own."

These things it is stated, same page, were handed down to the people, "and were preserved in some of their festivals, especially one celebrated in the month of Izcalli which was instituted to commemorate this frightful destruction of land and people, and in which princes and people humbled themselves before the divinity and besought him to withhold a return of such terrible calamities."

I might refer also to the fact that Geological speculation recognizes "catastrophism" as affecting the wonderful changes on the continent. Baldwin, page 181. The criticism and great parade over the sign that was given on this continent of the birth of Christ into the world, as found on page 422 of the Book of Mormon, is no credit to my opponent. The book simply states that when Christ was born there was no night or darkness on this continent; and this was one of the signs given to indicate the time of his coming. A star also appeared, but it does not say it shined in the day time. Why Mr. Braden should object to supernatural things occurring on this continent at the birth of the Savior, when so many wonderful things occurred on the Eastern continent, as recorded in the Bible, is singularly strange. Or why that the same things should not appear here as there. A star appeared on the Eastern continent and went before the wise men from the East and stood over the child Jesus. Did it shine in the day time or only in the night? Mr. Braden don't know. The wise men and searchers could not have come from very far East in one night. The whole difficulty he has found is answered in the question, was God able to make it appear light in this country at the time when darkness would come on? If this account was in the Bible he would swallow it down and then ask for more like it; but as it is in the Book of Mormon it must be spurned and ridiculed.

Because the Savior's coming was clearly predicted by the prophets on this continent with many of the events that should transpire during his birth and ministry, Mr. Braden sets up, "It is plagiarism—stolen from the Bible or New Testament." Says the predictions were made "more full here than by the prophets on the Eastern con-

continent." And here it is well to observe that he does not know that. There were many things written by inspired men upon the Eastern continent which are not in the Bible. Some twenty books are mentioned in the Bible that are not known at the present time. What those books said about the birth of Christ, Mr. Braden don't know. Christ's second coming, which has not yet taken place, was pretty fully set forth as early as the days of Adam. Jude quotes from an inspired book which Mr. Braden never saw, as follows: "And Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his Saints to execute judgment upon all the ungodly." As the Nephites had the Old Testament scripture up to the time of Jeremiah the prophet, they doubtless were in possession of many of the inspired writings which are now lost to the world, including the one that Jude quotes from, which in all probability just as clearly and definitely set forth this first coming of Christ as the second. This is the reason that the Nephites quote from several prophets whose names are not found in the Bible. What of it? Christ affirmed that all of the prophets testified of him. If they testified, they said something about him, and many of them the same or like things. Moses, David, Isaiah, Daniel, Zachariah and others speak particularly of his birth and events attendant upon his first coming. They specify that he should be born of a virgin,—that none should desire him, "A man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;" would be crucified,—killed between two thieves; be spit upon, his garments parted, smitten on the cheek and a scepter put in his hand in derision; and an array of other things too numerous to mention, and in which it is just as particularly set forth, and more so in detail, than in the prophecies as found in the Book of Mormon. This objection to the Book of Mormon like the others made is of no consequence; and no proof of plagiarism. But he says, "The Book of Mormon teaches the resurrection of the dead just like Rigdon believed it." How many ways are there to believe in the resurrection? Ezekiel says, "I will open your graves and cause you to come out of your graves." Is there any other way to believe in the resurrection? Christ rose from the dead. If the Book of Mormon taught the resurrection of the dead, it would be taught just as found in the Bible, for there is but one way to be resurrected, *i. e.*, to have the body restored to life again. Do the Campbellites believe it in a different way? You notice now when he answers this.

The derisive manner in which he treats the Book of Mormon is the same as that used by all sceptics against the Bible—to hold it up in sport and derision; and there is scarcely a chapter in the Bible but what has received their scathing satire and ridicule. Does my opponent think this a Christian way to examine a subject of any kind in order to reach the facts in the

matter? Has he forgotten that noted sceptics who believe as little in the Bible as he can in the Book of Mormon, make a business of entertaining great audiences by treating the Bible precisely as he does the Book of Mormon. He must remember, that after all of his mirth and light treatment, truth remains just the same. That the audience may know just how much argument there is in such a method, I will read a passage from the Bible after his style of reading the Book of Mormon, and see how it sounds. Isaiah 7: 14-23:—"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel."

Is not this miraculous enough to begin with? But I will continue:—

"Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good."

According to Mr. Braden's superficial view of commenting, that would be a singular thing. Hereafter all you parents need to do in order to have good and wise children is to give them plenty of butter and honey to eat. Eighteenth verse:—

"And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria."

What is to be done with these wonderful flies that live in the rivers of Egypt and the Assyrian bee. Read the next verse and you will see; they are to fill all the holes of the rocks in the country, and to eat in the "thorn bushes." But I will read on:—

"In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, the king of Assyria, the head and the hair of the feet [on the bottom of the feet my opponent would say], and it shall also consume his beard."

Well, a great many razors do that these times.

Now, if this was in the Book of Mormon would he not have a more miraculous or terrible thing to laugh at than any he has found in that book—shaving the "hair of the feet?"

And again: "It shall come to pass in that day that a man shall nourish a young cow and two sheep; and it shall come to pass, for the abundance of milk that they shall give, he shall eat butter; for butter and honey shall every one eat that is left in the land."

If this was in the Book of Mormon, would it not be a fine piece for Mr. Braden's ridicule?

Now, it seems to me, my friends, that before you begin to swallow down such arguments as that, you had better just stop and candidly think awhile; weigh and consider these things and statements in the connection in which they are written in their full and true light, and not regard the ridiculous statement made as to them. This ridicule is not argument. It does not meet argument upon any plane, and it will not attack the Book of Mormon. Neither can

it attack the Bible in any successful sense with thinking men and women.

But he makes sport of the Book of Mormon, because, says he, "It speaks against Masonry." Yet, strange as it may appear, the word *Mason* does not appear in it. It speaks against secret societies, where people band together to rob, and steal, and murder, and plunder; warns the people into whose hands the book should fall against all such, as they had been a fruitful cause of the destruction of the government upon the continent and the peace of the people. Is this bad advice? Or is this Masonry? If so, the sooner it be put down the better. But that is not what Masons profess. Their's is a benevolent institution; and Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon were both "Masons." The Book of Mormon says, page 382 that "Gadainton, who was exceeding expert in many words, and also in his craft to carry on the secret work of murder and robbery; therefore he became the leader of the band of Kishkumen." "They also sought place in the government." Page 399. This band of robbers became so powerful that the law-abiding people were compelled to take up arms and defend their wives and children and property against them. See Book of Mormon, pages 424, 425. Is this Masonry? These robbers had such strong holds in the mountains that the people could not dislodge them. Pages 426, 427 and 430. On page 423 of the Book of Mormon it reads: "And it came to pass that the ninety and third year did also pass away in peace, save it were for the Gadainton robbers, who dwelt upon the mountains—who did infest the land; for so strong were their holds and their secret places that the people could not overthrow them."

Again, page 424, verse 10: "The war between the robbers and the people of Nephi did continue and became exceeding sore; nevertheless the people of Nephi did gain some advantage of the robbers, insomuch that they did drive them back out of their lands into the mountains, and into their secret places."

Book of Mormon, page 427: "And it came to pass in the latter end of the eighteen year, those armies of robbers had prepared for battle, and began to come down, and to sally forth from the hills and out of the mountains, and the wilderness, and their strongholds, and secret places, and began to take possession of the lands."

This is what my friend calls Masonry. This account is confirmed by recent explorations. On the Lookout Mountain, lying between the Genessee and Cass rivers, there is a strong fortification built upon the brow of the great ledge of stone. It includes about two acres of ground. Within thirty feet of the top of this rock are five rooms made by dint of labor. The entrance to these rooms is very small. Mr. Ferguson thinks them to have been constructed during some dreadful wars and those who constructed them acted on the defensive; and believes that it was so formidable, that

twenty men could have withstood the whole army of Xerxes; as it was impossible for more than one to pass at a time, and by a slight push could be hurled one hundred and fifty feet below. Says, Mr. Short, in speaking of these: "This introduces us to another class of ruins, which, with a couple of exceptions, were not discovered prior to the summer of 1874. We refer to the cliff dwellings, the most remarkable habitations ever occupied by man." Pages 293 to 298. "The most surprising results in all history of archaeological exploration in this country was obtained in Sept., 1874, by a party connected with the United States' Geological and Geographical Survey Corps." "One of the first cliff houses discovered by explorers is a most interesting structure, the position of which is over 600 feet from the bottom of the cañon in a niche of the wall furnishes a significant commentary on the straits to which this sorely-pressed people were driven by their enemies." "Five hundred feet of the ascent to be made to this aerial dwelling was comparatively easy, but a hundred feet of almost perpendicular wall confronted the party, up which they never could have climbed, but for the fact that they found a series of cuts in the face of the rock leading up to the ledge upon which the house was built. This ledge was ten feet wide by twenty feet in length, with a vertical space between it and the over-hanging rock of fifteen feet. The rocks of the cliff served as the rear wall of the house. The door opening on the esplanade was but twenty by thirty inches in size." "Some little taste was exhibited by the occupants of this human swallow nest." "An examination of the immediate vicinity revealed the ruins of a half dozen similar dwellings in ledges of the cliffs, some of them occupying positions the inaccessibility of which, must ever be a wonder, when considered as places of residence for human beings." Down the valley away, a remarkable "watch tower" was discovered. "The outer wall of which was 43 feet in diameter, the inner twenty-five. The outer wall is still standing twelve feet high." Mr. Jackson's next discovery was "on the face of the vertical rock, which here ran up from the bottom of the cañon; and at a

height of from fifty to one hundred feet, were a number of nest-like habitations." "The cliff house in this case was reached by its occupants from the top of the cañon. The walls were pronounced as firm as the rock upon which they were built. The stones were very regular in size. The dwelling measured fifteen feet in length, five feet in width, and six feet in height. Three miles further down the cañon, the party discovered at heights from 600 to 800 feet above their heads, some curious, unique little dwellings, sandwiched among the crevices of the horizontal strata of the rock of which the bluff was composed. Access to the summit of the bluff a thousand feet high was obtained by a circuitous path through a side cañon, and the houses themselves could only be reached at the utmost peril—of being precipitated to the bottom of the dizzy abyss—by crawling along a ledge twenty inches wide and only high enough for a man in a creeping position. This led to the wider shelf on which the houses rested. The perfection of the finish was especially noticeable in one of these houses, which was but fifteen feet long and seven feet high, with a wide wall running back in a semi-circular sweep."

Here I will state that in the summer of 1876, when I was in Washington City, I visited the National Museum and noticed that they had just begun to place casts, representations of these cliff dwellers' cities, among the relics and curiosities of that institution. But when in 1882 I visited the same institution there were large numbers of these representations that seemed to particularly interest and attract the public. You will find there miniature representations of these cliff cities that have been lately discovered, prepared for the purpose of interesting and entertaining the world, for there is nothing that has ever been found that is like them. And yet they are set out, described, located and traced in the Book of Mormon, in the history of what he terms Masonry, but which in fact is the history of the combinations of robbers, and not Masonry. How did Sidney Rigdon get these facts? Here is another thing of which to make a note when he answers.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We will now ask your attention to a conglomeration of contradictions and absurdities, as incapable of being untied as the Gordian knot; and no Mormon can cut it either, not even with the wonderful sword of Laban. Page 507: The plates of Jared's brother are to be sealed and buried, and are not to go forth until the Gentiles repent of their iniquity, have faith and are clean before the Lord. According to the Book of Mormon that time has not come. Page 523: Ether hides up his plates of gold, and they are afterwards found by Limbi. Not Jared's brother's plates, but Ether's plates, who never had or saw the plates of Jared's brother. Page 158: Servants of Limbi find twenty-four gold plates, said to be Ether's plates, not the plates of Jared's brother. Page 156: King Benjamin lived only three years after Mosiah began to reign in his stead. Three years after Mosiah ascended the throne, or just after his father's death, he sent men out who first learned of Limbi and his people. Limbi told them of the gold plates of Ether, found by his people. Page 507: Jared's brother was to write and seal up what he had seen, and bury it, and his two stone interpreters, and they were not to come forth until after the death of Christ, and until the Gentiles were converted, and this time has not come yet. Then occurs this sentence: "For this cause did King Benjamin keep the plates of Jared's brother, that they should not come to the world till after the death of Christ." Page 200: King Mosiah translates the plates found by Limbi's people, with the interpreters handed down from generation to generation from the beginning, that the people might know concerning the people that had been destroyed.

Now, then, let us point out a portion of the contradictions. 1. The plates of Jared's brother were hid up, and were not to go forth until the Gentiles were converted, and yet King Benjamin had them. 2. Here it is represented that the servants of Limbi found the plates of Jared's brother, and they came into King Benjamin's hands. In another place it is the gold plates of Ether that they find. 3. King Benjamin had the plates found by Limbi's people, yet he died before his people knew anything about Limbi's people, or the plates they had found. 4. King Benjamin had these plates found by Limbi's people, yet Limbi gave them to King Benjamin's people after the king's death. 5. If the plates in King Benjamin's possession were the plates of Jared's brother, they could not be translated without the two stone interpreters he buried with them—at least the Lord said so. Those interpreters were never found, yet Mosiah translated the plates without these interpreters, with a pair his ancestors

had handed down for generations. 6. If they were the plates of Jared's brother they were not to go forth until after the death of Christ and the conversion of the Gentiles, yet Mosiah gave their contents to his people before the death of Christ, and the Gentiles are not converted yet. 7. Jared's brother buried his interpreters with his plates. If King Benjamin had his plates where were those interpreters that were so all-important to an understanding of the plates. 8. Mosiah interpreted these plates with stone interpreters handed down for generations, from the beginning. From the beginning must mean since Lehi left Jerusalem. We hear of Laban's sword, Laban's breast-plate, Lehi's compass, but nothing of these all-important instruments, interpreters until now. 9. Mosiah's grandfather translated the stone of Coriantimur without any interpreter; but his grandson must use interpreters that his grandfather did not have, or did have and did not use, and yet could not translate without using them. If they were the plates of Jared's brother we have in the Book of Mormon, at least all their important features, in the Jaredite portion, yet the Lord said they should not go farther until the Gentiles were converted, and that has not been done yet. Well, there we will stop, though we are by no means done with the contradictions.

The Jaredites left Asia right after the confusion of tongues. Between that time and their destruction they had twenty-six kings, some of whom reigned but a short time. They were destroyed about 250 B. C., for Coriantimur died among the Zarahemlites about that time. From Moses to Christ was 1600 years by true Chronology. Subtract 250 and we have 1350. From Moses to Abraham 645 years by true chronology. From Abraham to Babel was 250 years, or the time from the departure of the Jaredites from Babel till their destruction was 2250, which divided by 26 gives 86 years, as the average length of the reign of each Jaredite king. If we accept the other statement that they were destroyed 600 years before Christ, the average reign was 73 years. Sidney did not stop and figure that story out, when he wrote it.

Jared's brother (I wish Sidney had given that fellow a name while he was about it), seals up his record and buries it, and with it his stone interpreters, without which no one can read the record, and the Lord says it shall not go forth until after the death of Christ and the conversion of the Gentiles, an event yet future. Over 2000 years afterwards, long before Christ, Ether finishes this record. How could he so long before Christ get the portion Jared wrote, when the Lord said he could not? How did he write on the plates if they were sealed? How did he interpret it so as to know

when to begin his record, so as to begin when the record stopped in the history? If Ether got those plates was not the Lord mistaken? If he read them was not the Lord mistaken? If he left them so that Limbi got them, was not the Lord mistaken? If Mosiah translated them without Jared's brother's interpreter, was not the Lord mistaken? If Mosiah gave the whole thing away to his people, was not the Lord mistaken? If Ether's plates are a continuation of the plates of Jared's brother, how did Moroni interpret the portion of Jared's brother's? How did he get Jared's brother's interpreters without which, according to the Lord, it was impossible to understand the plates? He did not have them, he had Mosiah's interpreters. Then he had Mosiah's translation, or rather his father did, and buried it, and Moroni had neither plates nor translation, come to think about it. If he had what Mormon buried, and he must have had them in order to get Ether's plates, he had Mosiah's full translation. What need then of Moroni's translation, when Mosiah had done it? What need of his abridgement, when he could have buried for Imposter Joe the whole fleet load of plates, the whole library? What need of Moroni's translation for Imposter Joe since he had Jared's brother's interpreters, and could read the original? How did Imposter Joe get those interpreters since Moroni never had them? Moroni never had them, nobody ever had them, and nobody can have them, until the Gentiles are converted. How could Moroni and Mormon translate those plates of Jared's brother, without the interpreters sealed up with them and without which the Lord said nobody could understand them, and Imposter Joe had to have Jared's brother's interpreters that the Lord said nobody should have, to interpret an abridgement of a translation made by those who did not have what the Lord said they must have. How—but there we will stop again. This jumble of lies is the "Fullness of the Gospel."

The Book of Mormon tells of three fellows who never died, and never will die. That is a pretty big story, but it beats that in another place. It tells us of a fellow who lived before he was born, or before he lived at all. Page 481 Amaron hid up the records in the year 320. Page 482. Mormon was then ten years old. Page 483. When he was fifteen or in 325 the Nephites who were never to see death, were taken away because of the sins of the people. They were taken out of the land entirely. Page 485. Moroni writes:

"There are none that know the true God, save it be the three disciples of Jesus, who did tarry in the land, until the wickedness of the people was so great that the Lord would not suffer them to remain with the people, and whether these be on the face of the land, no man knoweth. But behold my father and I have seen them, and they have ministered unto us."

Contradictions: I. Mormon says that these three were taken out of the Land when he was fifteen. Moroni says nobody knows whether they are in the Land or not, although he tells us that the Lord

took them out of the Land. Mormon says they were taken out of the Land when he was fifteen. If they ministered to Mormon it was before he was fifteen. Moroni says they ministered unto him and his father.

They ministered to him years before he was born, or he had a very precocious father. With ordinary people that would be extraordinary, but it doubtless was a common thing with Sidney's Nephites.

The story of the extermination of the Nephites is idiotically absurd. We are told, page 384, that the Nephites covered the land from the sea East to the sea West, and from the sea South to the sea North, or from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Northern Ocean, or all of British America and the United States, and probably most of Mexico. They were a highly-civilized, wealthy people, with ships, temples, houses, cities, cultivated farms, and fixed residences. In the year 380 the Nephites were signally defeated by the Lamanites. Page 491. Moroni, their leader, proposes that both sides gather every man, woman and child, on each side for a final struggle, in the Plain of Cumorah, in the present State of New York. The object of the writer is to get the people together to have them exterminated, and in the right spot for Imposter Joe to find the plates. Who believes that an intelligent leader, of an intelligent civilized people, ever dreamed of such a fool's project, or even proposed it to a sensible people? The Mormons who flock together at the call of Imposter Joe, or Priapus Young, might do it, but people of common sense would not. Who believes that an intelligent, wealthy, highly civilized people, covering British America, United States and Mexico would abandon cities, homes, farms, property, and flock together, millions of them, in obedience to such an idiotic command? Who believes that such millions of people could accomplish such an undertaking? Think of the North and South leaving homes and property, and flocking, men, women and children, to the central part of New York for a "Kilkenny cat fight;" and this was done before telegraphs to send out the command from the State of New York to Alaska, California, and Florida. And the people flocked by millions, men, women and children, to central New York, without railroads to carry them, marching, men, women and children, every soul of them to central New York, from Alaska, from California, from Florida, to be exterminated, and all that Imposter Joe might get those plates. In less than four years these millions of idiots who had come at this idiot's idiotic decree, gathered, men, women and children in central New York. And the fool Lamanites they gathered also. And then they "fit," and they "fit," and they "fit," and "fit," and "fit," until only one Nephite was left, Moroni, and he escaped for no earthly reason, except that the Lord wanted him to finish up and bury these plates for Imposter Joe. Seriously, ladies and gentlemen,

do you believe that such idiocy as that is the "fulness of the gospel?"

The slaughter of the Jaredites is even worse than this. In their case there was a war until ten times as many soldiers as were killed in our great civil war were slain, and fifteen or twenty millions of non-combatants; and then there is an idiotic gathering of millions of idiots—men, women and children—for an idiotic "Kilkenny cat fight."

There is the same leaving of home, cities, property, and all behind. The same flocking together of men, women and children. Observe the idiocy of both this account and the Nephite slaughter. Warriors leave their wives, children and non-combatants at home. But a portion of the men as are ever taken to the field; some are left to take care of the property. It is only migratory nations or people on an emigration like the Israelites in the wilderness that take their women and children with them. This people were a highly civilized, wealthy people, and the very people who would send out only a portion of their men. Another idiocy. We are told men, women and children marched armed with shields, head plates and breast plates and other weapons of war. Women armed with weapons of war, children armed with weapons of war! Idiocy ineffable! And then they went forth to battle, men, women and children, millions of them—babies and all, with head-plates, breast-plates, shield and swords, spears, bows, arrows, darts, and doubtless with catapultae and battering rams. And they "fit," and they "fit" and "fit," and "fit" and "fit," till Coriantimur, and Shiz, and Ether (who was bottle holder) alone were left. "Then Coriantimur smote off the head of Shiz, and it came to pass that after he had smote off the head of Shiz, that Shiz raised up his hands and fell after that he had struggled for breath he died." Now most men die and quit breathing when their heads are off, all except Sydney's Jaredites. That explains the oath of the Masons among the Jaredites. "If a man would not do what he had sworn to do, he was to lose his head. If he told the secrets he was to lose his life." As Sydney's Jaredites did not lose their lives when they lost their heads, the difference in the two penalties is all clear now. Ether then finished his work in making out a report for Imposter Joe. This fight was worse than even the Kilkenny cat fight. In that classic contest the tip of each cat's tail was left, but in this, the cats, tails and all, on both sides, down to the last hair, were used up, except one hair, Ether, that was not in the fight at all. The Jaredites were taken up to central New York to be exterminated. Then the Nephites were taken up there to be exterminated; and all that Ether and Moroni might leave the plates where it would be handy for Imposter Joe to find them. The Book of Mormon piously moralizes—"We see the Lord accomplishes great things with small means." Yes, in these two instances he accomplished the smallest possible thing with infinitely and miraculously great means.

Having told us of men who lived before they were born, or lived at all, and men who lived after they were dead, Sidney tells of two great nations who occupied the same country, farms and cities at the same time and never knew of each other's existence. On page 136 we are told that Coriantimur died among the subjects of King Zarahemla about 250 B. C. The Jaredites covered the continent of North America until that time with cities, farms, houses, and at the least calculation there must have been 60,000,000 of them. 600 B. C., or 530 years before the Jaredites were destroyed, the Nephites and Zarahemlites came over and they spread over and occupied the same land for 350 years before the Jaredites used each other up, so we have two great nations of different race and language occupying the same farms and cities at the same time, and not knowing anything about each other. There now, who doubts that the Book of Mormon is of Divine origin? These Jaredites marched up to New York and slew each other, and the Nephites who were occupying the same land and farms knew nothing of it. I was going to suggest that Symmes's theory must be true, and that one party occupied the upper side of the farms while the other occupied the lower side in Symmes's hole, but the State of New York, where the Jaredites perished, is on the upper side. Perhaps they occupied the land as the Irish and the fairies occupy Ireland at the same time. Will Kelley tell us which were men and which were fairies, or "good people," as the Irish call them.

We are told that Jaredite cattle went into the land of Zarahemla: that Jaredites went after them: that Jaredites hunted in Zarahemla and built cities there and yet the Zarahemlites and Jaredites knew nothing of each other, although the Zarahemlites were over 300 years before Coriantimur came among them. One of these people must have been fairies certainly. Page 516 Jaredite prophets tell the people that unless they repent the Lord will destroy them and bring in a people to take their place. As Coriantimur died among the Zarahemlites about 300 years after the Nephites and Zarahemlites came to America they had already been in the land hundreds of years when these prophets were prophesying, but doubtless it was as fairies—invisible people, and the Jaredites and their inspired prophets knew nothing of it.

The Book of Mormon tell us that the Jaredites had glass when they left the Tower of Babel for how could Jared's brother tell that the "stones he did moulten out of a rock" were like glass if he had never seen glass? They must have had glass for Granny Smith says, Jared's brother's interpreters were diamonds set in plates of glass, which were set in silver bows. They had steel also before Abraham's day, for "Shule did moulten steel out of ore and make swords for his people." Page 512. We have also such anachronisms as "Church" 600 B. C., when the word was not used till after his time. We have

Christians by millions hundreds of years before Christ: when the followers of Christ were first called Christians at Antioch after his ascension. We have "Churches of Christ" by thousands when that term was not thought of until after his death. We have "Martyrs for Christ" before he was preached to men. We have Masonry described and denounced thousands of years before it was thought of. Episcopalian liturgy, pulpits and "Lord's day" and "Dissenters" before the day of Christ, when they are peculiar to England and the Christian Dispensation. We have the English legal idea of the "bar of God" frequently. There are debates on Soul-sleeping, Universalism, Deism, Unitarianism, and all the topics that Rigdon used to debate, and the Nephite prophets agree with Sidney every time.

The Book of Mormon has such Americanisms as "Bearing down against the Church." "All manner of good homely cloth." "Sent forth to preach among the people." "Somewhat." "It supposeth me." It has these Rigdonisms. "The numerority of our forces." (I suppose Rigdon believed with the Western stump orator that he had as good a right to make words as old Webster.) "The enormity of our number." What particular wickedness constituted the enormity of their numbers Sydney does not tell us. "Rations." "Are a marching." "It mattereth not." "Makes Bellowses." (That is equal to the boy who wanted some "molasseses.") "Having waxed stronger in health." "I am a man of no small reputation among those who know me." (That is the Nephite way of saying "I am some Punkins to him.") "As I was a journeying." "The foundation is beginning to be laid." "As I was a going forth." "He saw Amulak a preaching." "My heart is brim with joy." "A tremendous battle." "One continual round of murder."

Sidney Rigdon was famous for his power in revival excitements. He had his revival expressions common to the camp-meeting style of his day. The Book of Mormon is full of them, such as "I am encircled about eternally in the arms of his love," (page 55, 570 B. C.) "Have ye been spiritually born of God;" "If he have experienced a change of heart;" "If ye have felt to sing the songs of his redeeming love;" "For the arms of mercy are extended towards you." (Page 222, 80 B.) The last expression occurs several times in the book. "Ye shall awake to a sense of your awful condition." (Page 531.) "Many died firmly believing that their souls were redeemed by the Lord Jesus Christ." (Page 333, 80 B. C.) "Have they not revealed the plan of salvation." (Page 136, 400 B. C.) Disciple all over. "The own due time of the Lord." (Pages 17, 72, 600 B. C.) "Or otherwise ye can imagine yourselves brought before the tribunal of God with your souls filled with guilt and remorse." (Page 321, 80 B. C.) Rigdon all over. "Thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice." Page 304, 75 B. C.)

Nephi declares, 600 B. C., "his father Lehi spake by the power of the Holy Spirit, which he received by faith on the Son of God, and the Son of God was the Messiah." (Page 123.) Nephi declares, 536 years B. C., "I glory in my Jesus, for he has saved my soul from hell." "Enter into the narrow gate and walk in the straight way which leads to life." A regular Baptist experience and exhortation. "For none of these can I hope unless they be reconciled to Christ." "Pour out your souls in prayer." "Live without God in the world." "O blessed Jesus, save me from an awful hell." "Pure as the driven snow." "Days of probation." "One eternal round." We might quote Rigdon's pet revival expressions by the page. Perhaps the clearest cases of modernisms are the following: "From nature up to nature's God"—a quotation from Alexander Pope's "Essay on Man," line 331, 2000 years before he lived. On page 54 Lehi says: "I go to the cold and silent grave, (a revivalism of Rigdon) from whence no traveler can return," quoting from Shakespeare's Hamlet 2000 years before Shakespeare was born.

Then listen to some of the revelations and translations that Jehovah doled out to Imposter Joe, "word by word, so precious was it." "If there be fault it be the mistake of men." "And I, Nephi, beheld his sword and drew it from the sheath thereof, and the hilt thereof was of gold and the workmanship thereof was exceeding fine, and I saw that the blade thereof was of most precious steel." What a sentence thereof. "Ye shall clear away the branches which bear bitter fruit according to the size of the good and the strength thereof, and ye shall not clear away the bad thereof all at once, lest the roots thereof be too strong for the good and the graft thereof." We understand thereof. "And it came to pass that after many days it began to put forth somewhat a little young and tender branches, and behold the main top thereof began to perish."

"And the barges were built after a manner that they were exceeding tight, and that they would hold water like unto a dish, and the bottom thereof was tight like unto a dish, and the sides thereof were tight like unto a dish, and the ends thereof were peaked, and the top thereof was tight like unto a dish, and the length thereof was the length of a tree, and the door thereof when it was shut was tight like unto a dish." As clear as mud thereof. "Behold the Lord said thou shalt make an hole in the top thereof, and in the bottom thereof, and when thou art in want of air thou shalt unstop the hole thereof, and receive air, and if it be that the water come in upon thee thou shalt stop the hole thereof (hole of water) that ye may not perish in the flood."

"And he put the stones in the vessels which were prepared, one in each end thereof, and behold they did give light unto the vessels thereof." (Vessels of the ends of course.)

What sense in this: "Never has man come before me with such exceeding faith as thou hast, for were it so ye could not have seen my finger." "The Scriptures are before ye, if ye shall arrest them (what harm have the Scriptures done that they should be arrested?) it shall be to your own destruction." Take such English as the following: as "the fullness of the Gospel." "The Lord spake and sayeth." "Dwindle into unbelief." "I saw rumors of wars." "The walls were rent in twain." That is, several walls were rent, and when the rending was done there were two walls. "Become worse than as though he had never known these things." "He that eateth of this bread eateth to their soul." "Bury weapons of peace." "I ought not to harrow up in my desires the firm decrees of a just God," No, no, Sidney, you shouldn't order to do any such awful thing as that. "Sent forth to preach among the people, &c." What a revelation of truth there is in an "&c." "No afflictions save swallowed up in joy," is, I suppose, what the Dutchman meant when he told of a "schweet pain." "Stabbed by a garb of secrecy." What a hole that would make in a fellow. "The more part of a history." "The more part of the ministry." "Shepherd hath called and art calling." "Nevertheless they did not remain a perfect peace." "They yieldeth." "I the Lord delighteth in the chastity of women." "Ye are like unto they." "Do as ye hath hitherto done." "These things had not ought to be." "Plates of which hath been spoken." "Law had ought to be done away." "Knowledge of they which art in Jerusalem concerning they which shall be scattered unto they which art of the house of Israel, unto all they that believe, unto all they which are filled with the spirit." "I had spoke many things." "They saith unto the King." "I who ye call your king." "Moroni had wrote."

The Book of Doctrines and Covenants contains such inspiration as the following: "I the Lord willeth." "Verily I say unto you for this once." "I the Lord justifieth you." "I the Lord maketh you free." "For lo and behold saith the Son Anmon, or in other words Alphus, or in other words Omegus, once Jesus Christ, your Lord." Alphus and Omegus are new Greek letters, never heard of by Pericles. "It is expedient in me." "All they shall be comforted." "All they should gather together." "Did moulten out of a rock." "And this servant went and did all things whatsoever." We will submit a conundrum to our opponent: What did this sentence, on page 244 of the old edition of the Book of Doctrines and Covenants mean? "That ye go to make use of the stewardship which I have appointed unto you exclusive of the sacred things for the purpose of shine love these things." We have put in these beauties of the Book of Doctrines and Covenants to show that Mormon revelations are *sui generis*; there is nothing like them. Admire sufficiently, if you can,

such beauties as the following: "Now the joy of Amron was great, even that he was full, yea he was swallowed up in joy of his God, even to the exhaustion of his strength, and he fell again to the earth. Now was that not exceeding great joy?" Yea, verily Sidney, it was.

"There were no robbers nor murderers, neither were there Lamanites, or any other manner of ites." Sidney Rigdon all over.

We have reserved the climax of Mormon inspiration to the last. Page 327. "And Moroni went forth among the people waving the rent of his garment in the air that all the people might see the writing that he wrote upon the rent." There now doubt if you dare that the Book of Mormon is of Divine origin. The one who hid up the plate that Impostor Joe translated went forth waving a hole that the people might see the writing he had WROTE on the hole. I never heard of but one instance to rival this. An old chap who lived in Trumbull county, Ohio, used to tell that in a freshet in the Mississippi river it washed away so much of a bank that was full of kingfisher's holes, that it left the holes sticking out into the air fifty feet. The hole that Moroni waved in the air, and on which he had wrote the writing that the people might see what he had wrote on the hole must have been like the old fellow's kingfisher's holes.

The adaptations and imitations of modern literature and the Bible expose the fraudulent character of the Book of Mormon. In the first book we have the revival power of animal magnetism imitated 600 years before Christ. Pages 23 to 28 John's Apocalypse imitated and the Church of Rome described, as only history can describe it. Page 24. The American Revolution described. Pages 176, 180, 181, 243, 245, 272 and 373 are imitations of Fox's Book of Martyrs. Pages 196-7 a weak imitation of Paul's conversion. Page 202 teaches the modern radical democratic idea of *vox populi vox Dei*. Pages 226, 246. Peter's deliverance is imitated. Ananias lying to the Lord imitated. Page 223. All spiritual gifts enjoyed. Page 246. Peter healing the father of Aeneas imitated. Page 252. Watering of Jethro's flocks by Moses imitated. Pages 256 and 266. The fall down power of modern revivals is imitated. Page 289. Episcopalians preach from high pulpits, and have liturgies and on the Lord's Day, something never dreamed of till after Christ. 322. An inspired prophet scalps his enemy just like any other "big injun" who takes "heap much scalp." Page 391. The delivery of the Hebrews from the fiery furnace imitated. Pages 406-407. Elijah's miracle of drought and rain imitated. Page 480. Daniel cast into the lion's den imitated. Page 438. Candles invented. Page 436. The raising from the dead by Jesus and others imitated. Page 456. The miracle of the loaves and fishes imitated by making the institution of the Supper just like it. Pages 228 and 231. Peter and Cornelius imitated. Scenes at the crucifixion of Christ,

darkness, rending rocks, raising of the dead, imitated, only Sydney far out-does the New Testament writers. Thomas putting his fingers in nail prints and side imitated, only Sydney has over 2300 spend ten or twelve hours in such a performance. An attempt to imitate our Saviour's language to Peter about John's tarrying here absurdly changed into his saying and doing what the New Testament (John himself being the writer) says he did not say or do. Page 514. Daughter of Herodias imitated. Page 230. Daniel's interpreting the hand writing on the wall imitated. Solomon imitated 519.

These are only a portion of the adaptations and imitations. So servilely does Rigdon copy the Bible, and especially the New Testament that all his prophets and preachers preach and prophecy just as the Bible preachers and prophets speak, using their exact language much of the time except when they preach Rigdon's special hobbies. The Jaredites who came to America from the Tower of Babel have the complete gospel preached among them before the days of Abraham. No Israelite prophet was ever favored with such revelations, not even Isaiah as Jared's brother.

I challenge my opponent to name an important Christian idea, or important idea of

modern theology that Rigdon does not put into the mouth of his Nephites. His gross illiteracy appears in the fact that he did not see that he was exposing his own hand and work and voice as clearly as he ever did in any sermon he preached. It is the most transparent blundering fraud ever attempted.

By actual careful count the plagiarisms from the New Testament of paragraphs, phrases and sentences are over 500. The quotations of phrases amount to hundreds. There are over ten in each page of Rigdon's sermon against infant Baptism. Pages 330-340, 341. Whole chapters are quoted.

Isaiah II to XIV.

" XXI.

" XLVIII.

" L.

" LII.

" LIV.

Malachi III.

Matthew V. VI. VII.

II Corinthians XIII.

One-eighteenth of the Book is stolen by chapters. If we add to this paragraphs and verses fully one-twelfth; if we add phrases fully one-eighth. If we enumerate ideas stolen, adapted or imitated, we have the entire religious portion of the Book except its Rigdonisms.

MR. KELLEY'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH!

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: When I closed my remarks last evening, it was with a record of some of the discoveries of this country that I claim to be corroborative evidence of the truth and divinity of the Book of Mormon. The author from whom I was reading gives cuts, representations and descriptions of many of those cliff dwellings and cities which are in direct connection with my proofs here, but I will not take the time to read farther at present, as I wish to examine the objections so far as presented by my opponent, and present also another line of proofs obtained by the researches of explorers and scientists, and introduce others touching particularly upon the individual identity of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, which it is claimed lived in a highly civilized and enlightened state upon this continent.

Von Humboldt in his Equinoctial Regions of America, vol. I, pages 16 and 269, refers to the finding of the bones of the megatherium and megalonyx on this continent, but reports them as extremely scarce. He also states in same work: "That natulraist, M.

Cuvier, has also recognized two new species of mastodons and an elephant among the fossil bones of quadrupeds which we brought from America."

Prof. Winchell, in his Sketches of Creation published in 1874, pages 356 and 357, says: "In the United States we detect also some evidences of the co-existence of man and extinct species of quadrupeds. Dr. Koch, the reconstructor of the Tertiary Zenglodon, insisted long ago that he had found in Missouri such an association of Mastodon and Indian remains as to prove that the two had lived contemporaneously. "I have myself (says the author) observed the bones of the mastodon and elephant imbedded in peat at depths so shallow that I could readily believe the animals to have occupied the country during its possession by the Indians, and gave publication to this conviction in 1862." "More recently (he says) Prof. Holmes, of Charleston, has informed the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia that he finds upon the banks of the Ashley river a remarkable conglomeration of fossil remains in deposits

of post-tertiary age. Remains of the hog, horse, and other animals of recent date, together with human bones, stone arrow-heads hatchets and fragments of pottery are there lying mingled with the bones of the mastodon and extinct gigantic lizards. Contemporary with these American animals, but not yet found associated in their remains with the relics of the human species, lived in North America horses much larger than the existing species, grazing in company with wild oxen (another of Braden's miracles; this is Alex. Winchell, B.L. D., Prof. of Geology, Zoology and Botany in the University of Michigan who discovers this miracle) and herds of bisons and shrub-loving tapirs. The streams were dammed by the labors of gigantic beavers, while the forests afforded a range for a species of hog, and a grateful dwelling-place for numerous edentate quadrupeds related to the sloth, but of gigantic proportions."

Short, in his *North Americans of Antiquity*, page 530, published in 1882, says: "The question as to whether man and the mastodon were contemporaneous in America has long been a matter of dispute, as the reader is aware." Then he cites the elephant pipe discovered six or eight years ago by a farmer living on the line dividing Muscatine and Louisa counties, Iowa. He says: "The finder, who had no idea of its archaeological value, kept it with a number of 'Indian stones,' as he termed them, until last year (1878), when it became the property of the Davenport Academy." Dr. Farquarson says: "The ancient mounds were very abundant in that vicinity (Louisa county), and rich in relics, which are deposited on the surface of the soil, not in excavations." "Then," says the author, "the pipe, which is of a fragile sandstone, is of the ordinary mound-builders' type, and has every appearance of its age and usage—of its genuineness I have no doubt. Together with the elephant mound of Wisconsin, the elephant head of Palenque depicted in Lord Kingsborough's work, our pipe completes the series of what the French would call 'documents,' proving the fact of the contemporaneous existence on this continent of man and the mastodon."

I might, in this connection, refer you to the late article in the *Chicago Advance*, by Professor Wright, of Oberlin College, upon the "Animal mounds," ancient earthworks of Wisconsin, particularly describing, among others, the elephant mound before referred to, and from certain features which are presented it seems that the Professor is doubtful as to whether he should believe it was intended to represent the elephant or some other animal. "The mound is 135 feet long, 60 feet broad (from the bottom of his feet to his back), with a trunk or proboscis 30 feet long. The head is large, and the proportions of the whole are symmetrical."

Now it is just possible after all that the difficulty in identifying this mound arises from the fact that one of the other animals referred to in the Book of Mormon in connection with the elephant is that repre-

sented; but, whether this or the elephant, it is true that the existence of all of these animals, and the fact that they were contemporaneous with man, was published boldly to the world in 1830, in the Book of Mormon, when these things were unknown to the world, and no scientist has since made discoveries which are at variance with it.

The force of this corroborative testimony will be readily seen when we consider for a moment the overwhelming evidence which subsequent developments had brought against the book, had it in its full and clear statements upon like things omitted to have even mentioned the sheep, the horse, the ox, the elephant, the camel, the cummow, and many others, or had given an entirely different class of animals from these. I tell you, my friends, that with this work in my hands, I can substantiate the fact that God is, and that there is truth in the narrative that Jesus Christ was his Son, and came into the world to help fallen humanity. Is this a bad thing for Christianity? Is it not well entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people? I am well aware of the fact that for the past 50 years people have been crying out deceiver and imposter, and trying to ridicule and laugh this people down; and even went so far in Missouri and Illinois as to try to put them down by force. But in comparing men with men as I have found them in all grades of society in this country and in all the industries and professions of life, I unhesitatingly state before you, that for ability of thought, clearness of perception and honesty of purpose and determination, I have met with none who excel this same people, and but few societies that will equal or compare with them. The day of silly stories, fabricated falsehoods, and old wives' tales is of the past. If there are objections worthy of consideration, we have plenty of men and women who are able and willing to examine them; and I call upon this giant in debate to stop his spinning of yarns told about the Saints, and bring forward one argument or proof that he is willing to stand by.

Returning to these corroborative scientific evidences, I again refer you to *Sketches of Creation*, page 362: "The primeval inhabitants of North America were Asiatics in their features, their language and their arts, and tradition speaks of them as moving from the direction of Asia. These movements of human populations like radiating streams from the western part of Asia, certainly afford a presumption that the only people of whose movement we have neither history, tradition nor buried monument, proceeded also from the direction of the orient. From the same quarter of the world proceeded most of our *domestic animals and plants*, and in the same quarter of the world the perpetually uttered prophecies of the geologic ages proclaimed that the line of animal life should have its culmination."

These are the thoughts of the learned. Now, who is ready to say that the critic-

ism of Mr. Braden was a smart one against the book for bringing the domestic animals, the fish, and the seeds of the earth, to a certain extent across the broad ocean. He would have you believe that these animals came over themselves. Especially the fish. "Just listen to the nonsense," he says; "took the fish in the boat to keep them from being drowned in the water." When he produces the example of a fresh water fish from the old world swimming the briny ocean and safely landing on the coast of America, it will be time enough for the facetious ridicule of the eight vessels or barges which brought the Jaredites and certain animals and fish to the continent.

Then the eight "vessels or barges" are ridiculed; spoken of as a canoe, the reflection made that they were dug out of a tree. I will read it: "The Lord said, go to work and build after the manner of barges which ye have hitherto built."

How did these people build them before? Turn back to page 502, where we have the account of their departure and journey toward the sea. "And they did also lay snares and catch fowls of the air [not every one as he represented to you]; and they did also prepare a vessel in which they did carry with them the fish of the waters; [anything strange about that? Have we not got fish commissioners in almost every State in the Union, whose business is to transplant fish and stock the many lakes and rivers?] "and they did also carry with them deseret, which, by interpretation, is honey bee; and thus they did carry with them swarms of bees and all manner of that which was upon the face of the land, seeds of every kind."

Here then we have the first vessel built, and it is no canoe, but sufficient to hold for a short time many things; not everything, however, as he represented. Turning back now to the vessels, the length of which "was the length of a tree," I read: "And the door thereof, when it was shut, was tight, like unto a dish."

How many canoes with doors did you ever see? In his anxiety to get "the bottom thereof tight and the sides thereof tight," (what is the use of laboring to make them tight if it is a dug out?) "and the ends thereof peaked," he innocently forgets that "the door thereof" must be large enough for this mighty man whose name he would like to know, to go in at; and for such animals as were to be inmates thereof to go in at, whether the camel, the elephant or the whale. The larger the animals he puts in, the larger he must make the door, and the larger the door the larger the vessel. I will now read to you what the book says, page 510:

"And it came to pass that when they had prepared all manner of food that thereby they might subsist upon the water, and also food for their flocks and herds and whatsoever beast or animal or fowl that they should carry with them."—"Whatsoever beast, animal or fowl that they should carry with them."—They did not carry all

then? Oh no, well, is that the way you understood Braden? Why did you try to make this audience think they brought everything as fully as Noah had in the ark? But neither you, nor any other man can show but what these eight vessels would hold more than the ark. Then what becomes of the criticism. O, he says, it had a hole in the top and a hole in the bottom; how large he don't know, yet he speculates upon it as though he did. It would be presumed that a person who knew enough to build a boat would also know enough to put a hole in it, if directed, in proportion to the size of the same and the use to be made of the opening; and in the bottom as well as the top. This description of these vessels is in favor of the inspiration of the book rather than against it. There is not a probability in favor of the idea that as early as 1829, there was a man in ten millions who was able to read and write and who was getting up a work of fiction, who would have ever thought in describing a boat of such a thing as putting a hole in the bottom. Yet in the time of fifty years it has become quite common. Our best Life-boat is made upon that principle. I have seen it myself. And the bottom thereof was tight like unto a dish, and the sides thereof were tight like unto a dish, and the ends thereof were peaked; and the manner of building it is, that after it is built the holes are made in the vessel and in the bottom too; and sufficiently large to empty it of the water if filled, in a few seconds; and the length thereof was not quite the length of a tree. And it is the very boat that is used by the United States Signal Service, altogether on the Pacific coast, so stated by the gentleman in charge of the Signal Service Department in Washington to me when he showed me the boat, and not only is it used in the United States Signal Service, but in the British Signal Service also. Yet his sportive description of a like vessel in the Book of Mormon, is the best that can be said against the book to prove it is not of divine origin and not entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people.

Ah! but he has made another objection, a terrible one. What is it, you ask? This is it:—There is so much of the Campbellite faith in it. Yes; but you will see, my friends, how much Campbellite faith there is in it before these discussions are over! There is in truth hardly to be found so much as was left of the Jaredites, after they had "fit, and fit, and fit, and fit." Tell me the faith that is a living active principle as taught in the Book of Mormon was taken from the Campbellites! They never believed or taught the principle of restoration in repentance as set forth in the Book of Mormon: Nor did Sidney Rigdon till after his conversion to the faith the last part of the year 1830. They never taught nor believed in the baptism of the Holy Spirit except as a thing of the past, nor did Rigdon till after 1830. They never believed in contending for the faith once delivered to the Saints as

that book teaches; but they contended for only a part of it, a very small part at that; neither did Rigdon till after his conversion in 1830. They never believed in a divine call to the ministry, nor do they now, claim that their ministers are so called; nor did Sidney Rigdon till after his conversion in 1830. They do not believe in the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Spirit, nor did Rigdon till after his conversion in 1830. They do not believe in God answering the penitent child for wisdom by any communication directly to him, or by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, nor did Rigdon till 1830. They do not believe in the signs of the Gospel as spoken of by Jesus attending the believer, nor did Rigdon till 1830.

They do not believe in the organization of the Church as spoken of in the 12th of Cor., 10th of Matt., and 4th of Eph., nor did Rigdon till 1830. The Book of Mormon teaches all of these things; that God not only is, but is willing to shed forth his Spirit in the heart crying Abba, Father! and many more things I might mention which Rigdon nor none of the Campbellite Church believed till after the publication of this work. Then will he still, without a shadow of proof, continue to assert, "Rigdon did it?" Because, forsooth, he left Braden's Society and sought one whose faith is more nearly in accord with the Bible, and manfully fought his way in life for what he honestly from the heart believed to be true, and died as he lived, taught his friends and his children the faith as he received it in 1830--will Braden, because of vengeance and spite, continue the assault upon his dead bones? My opponent will never make a case by such a course that will stand the test. Not even as much will be left of it as was left of the "Kilkenny cats." He may have a couple of tails left, but they are shown to be putrid and rotten ones. But he says the book teaches that two nations existed here and killed each other in their great battles. So it does, and so does science. It teaches that the enlightened were slain. So do scientists and archaeologists. It teaches that they had their battles and defenses, and signals for alarms and watch-towers from the Ohio to New York, and nearly all over the country: so does scientific research. Mr. Short, in his *North Americans of Antiquity*, page 50, says: "The military works of the mound-builders, other than those previously mentioned as existing on the lakes and in western New York State, are of a two-fold character, consisting first, of fortified eminences, of which an instance is found in Butler county, Ohio." He then describes this and others, among which is the remarkable one known as Fort Ancient, Ohio, on the Little Miami river, a description of which was given to the public by Professor Locke in 1843. The whole circuit of this work is between four and five miles. The number of cubic yards of excavation may be approximately estimated at 628,800. The embankment stands in places twenty feet in perpendicular

height. The most interesting and valuable paper on this work is that by Mr. L. M. Hosea, of Cincinnati, in the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, October, 1874, page 287, *et seq.* Judges Dundry and Force, the latter in a memoir on the mound-builders, (1872,) estimate the period at a thousand years, while Mr. Hosea thinks several thousand years would be required to produce the numerous little hillocks and depressions which mark the spot where trees have fallen and decayed.

These men of science place it a thousand years back as the time when that fort must have been last occupied, and that is not a great way from the time the Book of Mormon fixed in 1830.

"Fort Ancient, which would have held a garrison of 60,000 men with their families and provisions, was of a line of fortifications which extend across the State, and served to check the incursions of the savages of the North in their descent upon the mound-builders' country."

Don't talk of families, gentlemen, or Mr. Braden will have you arming the babies!

"The second class of military works is exceedingly numerous on all the water courses--existing not only on the Ohio and Mississippi, but on all their tributaries, especially on the Muskingum, Scioto, Miami, Wabash, Illinois, Kentucky, and minor streams--are mounds which served as out-looks."

Squire and Davis remark on this subject, that, "There seems to have existed a system of defenses extending from the source of the Alleghany and Susquehanna in New York, diagonally across the country, through central and northern Ohio, to the Wabash. Within this range the works which are regarded as defensive are largest and most numerous. The signal system, we have reason to believe, was employed throughout the entire extent of this range of works."

Shall I claim your time further to show what was stated in the book years before to have been since corroborated?

But he calls them "fools" for fighting so. Well, that don't help the matter. The Book of Mormon don't endorse their work as having been right. The question is, did they so live, and fight, and destroy each other? The book says they did, and that there was not only one nation, but two, who came to a similar end in this very country; and after the people have tried to laugh the idea down for fifty years, explorers and scientists have come in and say they are facts.

Then do they not corroborate the history as given in the book, and place it beyond any doubt that the book must stand? Will he not answer to the arguments instead of standing like a schoolboy and talking about Kilkenny cats?

FIRST HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS.

I will now briefly refer you to the time in which Ancient America began to be known through the reports of archaeologists to the world. Of their journey to Guatemala in 1839 and 1840, Stephens says, page 124:

"We did not know that the country was so completely secluded; the people are less accustomed to the sight of strangers than the Arabs around Mount Sinai, and they are much more suspicious. Col. Galindo was the only stranger who had been there before us and he could hardly be called a stranger, for he was a Colonel in the Central American service, and visited the ruins under a commission from the Government."

These are the remarks of Mr. Stephens, who with Mr. Catherwood, was under the auspices of the United States Government, and they required this backing to get the aid of the Central American Government as far as it could give, to protect them in their explorations as late as 1839 and 1840, in exploring and describing the very country and its cities, described in the Book of Mormon in 1828 and 1829. He says that no stranger except Col. Galindo had been there before. And yet my opponent wants to make you believe that Sidney Rigdon, Solomon Spaulding, or Joseph Smith knew all about these ruins and cities and peoples so as to place it in the Book of Mormon; that book placing the landing of one portion of the people that came to this country in Yucatan, the very country that is spoken of by this eminent traveler.

Referring to the explorations of Captain Del Rio, he says:

"The report of Captain Del Rio, with the commentary of Dr. Paul Felix, of New Guatemala, deducing an Egyptian origin for the people, through either the supineness or the jealousy of the Spanish Government, was locked up in the archives of Guatemala until the time of the revolution, when by the operations of liberal principals the manuscript came into the hands of an English gentleman, long a resident of that country, and an English translation was published at London in 1822. This was the first notice in Europe of the discovery of these ruins; and instead of electrifying the public mind, either from want of interest in the subject, distrust, or some other cause, so little notice was taken of it, that in 1834, the Literary Gazette, a paper of great circulation in London, announced it as a new discovery made by Col. Galindo."

Now for a research for the publication of Captain Dupaix. His expeditions were made in 1805, 1806, and 1807, the last of which was to Palenque. The manuscript of Dupaix, and the designs of his draftsman were locked in the Cabinet of Natural History in Mexico till 1828, when *M. Baradere* took them from the museum, "where," says Stephens, "But for this accident they might still have remained, and the knowledge of the existence of this city again been lost." "Afterwards the work was first published in France in 1834 and 1835."

About this time Lord Kingsborough publishes his works, which, says Stephens, "so far as Palenque is but a reprint of Dupaix, and then his works in Paris were four hundred dollars per copy." Stephens, etc., 297, 298. Then he says, with reference to his own work, the materials for which were gathered in 1840 and 1841, "My object has been, not to produce an illustrated work, but to present the drawings in such an inexpensive form as to place them within reach of the great mass of our readers." Page 310, vol. 2.

Speaking of these buried cities in another place he says, "that even Humboldt had never heard of, much less seen."

Do I still, my friends, have to convince some in this audience, or even Mr. Braden himself, that there was no general knowledge known to the world to be gathered to form the basis to make the history contained in the Book of Mormon in 1828 or 1829, much less 1810 and 1811, when it is claimed by Braden that Solomon Spaulding wrote? The work therefore is not the work of man alone, and has a higher authority, which proves its divinity.

Continuing the question of individual identity of the remnants of the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh, who formerly lived in a civilized state upon this continent, and Israelitish tribes of the old world, I introduce the analogical evidence of identity of the family, as set forth by Mr. Delafield, page 65.

He finds that there is a resemblance: In language, anatomy, mythology, uses of writing, knowledge of astronomy, and habits of burial of their dead.

The effrontery exhibited in standing before an audience and asserting without the least shadow of proof that there are no such proofs of similarity, is only equalled by the audacity of the statement that there are no proofs of the remains of the horse on the continent, or if there were horses, as he argued at Wilber, they were not like our horses. Does the Book of Mormon say that they were like *our horses*? Prof. Winchell, in his "Sketches of Creation," page 210, says:

"It is a curious fact that so many genera, now extinct from the continent, but living in other quarters of the globe, were once abundant on the plains of North America. Various species of the horse have dwelt here for ages, and the question reasonably arises whether the wild horses of the Pampas may not have been indigenous. Here too the camel found a suitable home."

This is the way our scientific men, persons who are posted upon these things talk.

In 1877, there were discovered in the fossil beds of Lake County, Oregon:

"Fossil bones of the elephant, camel, horse, elk and reindeer. The horse being much more abundant than either of the others. Also bones of other animals larger than the elephant."

There are now in the museums of this country, of Yale College and the Smithsonian Institute, skeletons of two kinds of animals which formerly lived upon this continent, either of which is larger than the elephant. Do I have to call your attention to the fact of the discoveries of Prof. Marsh, who in the "Chicago Times Expedition" to the west three years ago, found in the peat beds of Wyoming, the bones of the mastodon?

The Book of Mormon, in the year 1830, was published, and on page 577 it mentions with the horse the fact of the existence upon the continent of "elephants, camels, and manoms;" and placing them in their order as to size, and giving the nature of the animals also, as to disposition, strict-

ure, &c., by saying they were "useful unto man." Are these bold statements of a work claiming for itself ENTIRE credibility, anything like the musings of Gulliver's travels, which we have been referred to?

But the objection is further made that it is like Gulliver's travels as there was no beginning point, no directions, no stopping places by which to test it. The trouble is the assertion is not true. From the outset it begins with giving the names of the parties setting out upon the journey described. The very spot known to the world from which they migrated. The very time and names known to the world at the time and found in history and in the Bible, to-wit, Lehi, Laban, Lemuel, Ishmael, &c. Giving a full genealogy of the prominent parties of one tribe, running all risks of being caught by reason of historical or other contradictions,

or by reason of disclosures of history or discoveries in science:—Takes these families from Jerusalem, giving direction of travel, distance, naming number of days of travel in each direction, definitely, distinctly, and clearly—see pages 2, 4, 33, 35, 36, 41, 43 of the book—giving a description of the country, the rivers crossed, deserts passed and mountains reached, until it lands them upon the sea shore. And yet it is persistently stated before you that the account is on a par with Gulliver's travels—a work of fiction that pretends to give no time, place, country, or people or fact. Has he represented it fairly or truthfully? Is there not time, place, people, destination, race, characteristics, habits, customs and the exact present status of descendants all given?

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S FIFTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Kelley told you last night how Rigdon exploded the Spaulding story in the Messenger and Advocate. Would it not have been better to have repeated the explosion, than to have given his unsupported assertion that Rigdon performed such marvels. He repeats the story already exposed as a fabrication of his own at least twice that Hurlbut got the Manuscript Found from Mrs. Davidson, and Mrs. McKinsty. They only gave him an order to search a trunk for it. He repeats his falsification of the language of Hurlbut; that he says he got the Manuscript Found. Hurlbut says he did not get it, but a part of an entirely different manuscript. He repeats that Howe says they got the Manuscript Found, and it was not what they expected it to be. Howe says no such thing. He says the manuscript Hurlbut brought to us was not what he expected. It was not what they expected, because it was not the Manuscript Found. The assertion that either Howe or Hurlbut said they obtained the Manuscript Found, and it was not what they expected, is a deliberate fabrication of Kelley. Hurlbut did get the Manuscript Found. He wrote Mrs. Davidson that he did. But he did not give it to Howe. He sold it to the Mormons. Mr. Patterson does say that he knew but little of the manuscripts taken to the printing office. Engles, the foreman, attended to them. But Patterson's ignorance, however, does not set to one side the clear testimony of other witnesses.

My opponent undertakes to ridicule the

evidence I introduced as heresay—"Rev. Bonsall Winter's stepson; Mrs. Irwin, his daughter, and Rev. Kirk said that Winter told them." Let us retort. "Kelley says that Joseph III. says that Emma Smith says. Kelley says that Howe said. That Gilbert said. Kelley says that the Quincy Whig says, that Nichols says, that Ely says, that Mrs. Davidson said." Does he not know that he commits murder on his own testimony when he resorts to such pettifoggery? My opponent has not offered a scintilla of evidence that an Ephraimite ever entered America. He tries to get out of that ridiculous blunder about oxen. I know that *cow* is used as a generic name for the genus *bos*; so is *ox*. But where both are used together, neither is generic; but both are the names of a class of the genus. "Cows" means the females of the genus, when used with *ox* and "oxen" means an unnatural class of the genus when mentioned with cows. Suppose instead of saying "sheep" the Book of Mormon had said "ewes" and "wethers." Would they be generic names? Come, sir, you can't get out of that idiotic blunder in any such way. As the Book of Mormon says in one place that darkness shall cover the earth three days after the crucifixion, and the Bible declares that it was only three hours and over the land about Jerusalem, he cannot pettifog away the contradiction. If it was as light as mid-day all night how could a star be seen in mid-day light? My opponent has not explained it how the Nephites foretold the exact language Christ would use to such an extent, that whole pages are so foretold.

Nor how they come to speak of the language as *then* in the Scriptures, hundreds of years before Christ and the apostles uttered it. He asks me if I know what was in the 40 books known and unknown, quoted or referred to by the Bible. I don't. But until he proves that the language was in those books, he cannot prove that his Nephites quoted from them. Again if it was, it would only change the absurdity from the Book of Mormon to another book. Finally, we find the language in the New Testament and we know that neither Nephite or anyone else could quote it until it was uttered, any more than they could quote Shakespeare or Pope. Did these unknown prophets quote from Shakespeare and Pope thousands of years before they lived, so that Sydney's Nephites could quote such language from them? I read from the Book of Mormon denunciations of secret societies, their oaths, grips, signs, pass-words, all the denunciations uttered by anti-masons when the Book of Mormon first appeared. This shows that it was written in that excitement. Science says that the Asiatic species of our domestic animals were not in America until introduced by Europeans. The Book of Mormon says they were—a flat contradiction.

Another fraud in this affair, Oliver Cowdery began his work of writing down the translation of the Book of Mormon, the Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares, April 17th, 1825. The translation was finished, Mrs. Smith says, early in June. The copy-right was taken out June 10th. Just to think of a man writing as dictated to him slowly word by word the manuscript of a book as large as the Old Testament, or about 2000 pages of foolscap in less than sixty days, thirty-three pages per diem, and the writer a blacksmith unused to copying. Here is another Mormon miracle. Another fact that exposes the fraud in the Book of Mormon. It was given by miracle to Smith word by word by the Almighty. Inspired Joe called off each word. Inspired Oliver copied or wrote it down. Inspired Joe and Oliver read the proofs of the printer. Of course it was all right. The concoctors of the fraud told Gilbert, the printer, that the manuscript was the work of inspiration, and it must not be changed a particle. It had in it not a mark of punctuation, not a capital letter at the beginning of sentences, was badly spelled, and the grammar was atrocious. The printer refused to print such a monstrosity. He was allowed to punctuate and correct the spelling where he could. When the book appeared it had in it thousands of errors and blunders, and of the worst kind imaginable.

We are ready to expose another of the ridiculous blunders of the fabricators of the Book of Mormon. In translating from one language to another, if the translation be at all literal, there will appear the idioms of the original and the idioms of the tongue into which the translation is made. The former will be the idioms of the origi-

nal language that were peculiar to it in the age in which the book was written. The latter will be the idioms of the language into which the translation is made. There have been scores of translations of the Bible, from the original into English, in different ages. In each appear the idioms of the Hebrew and Greek, and the idioms of the English language peculiar to it in the age in which the translation was made. The first belong to the Bible in the original. The latter to the English translations. We can tell in what age each book of the Old and New Testament, was written by the former. We can tell in what age of the English language each translation was made by the latter.

The fabricators of the Book of Mormon, in their gross ignorance of this fact, in their attempts to imitate the Bible, and to make the Book of Mormon like the ancient Hebrew so as to accord with the assumption that the authors were Hebrews who emigrated to America, have imitated the idioms of the Greek of the New Testament, wherever it appears in King James' version; notwithstanding the Nephites could know nothing about that: and to cap the climax of absurdity, they have imitated the English idioms of King James' translators, that did not live until 1200 years after the last Nephite was dead. They have made the idioms of the English language of 1611 the idioms of the Nephites in America who lived hundreds of years before there was any English, and 1200 years before such idioms were used. We can illustrate the absurdity of this blunder by a case like this. A man who knows nothing about the Old Testament, except what he learns by hearing an Irishman read the original Hebrew, and translate it into English, the Irishman reading the Hebrew to himself and giving the English of it to his auditor, as he reads, comes before us with a book that he claims an angel gave to him in Hebrew manuscript, and that he was inspired to translate it into English. When we come to examine it, we find that he has imitated, not only the Hebrew idioms of the Old Testament, that were brought out in the Irishman's translation, but has actually imitated the Irishman's Hibernicisms, his brogue, supposing in his ignorance that Paddyisms were Simon Pure Hebraisms. Would any body but a Mormon be such a fool as not to declare, in one moment, that his ridiculous putting of Paddyisms into the mouth of Hebrew, exposed his story as a lie and a fraud, and his book as a ridiculous blundering fraud? Would it not be as clear as day?

In precisely the same stolidly ignorant manner, the fabricators of the Book of Mormon have put into the mouths of Israelites in America, not only the Hebraisms that are in the King James' version of the Old Testament, but the Hellenisms of the Greek of the New Testament, that appear in King James' translation; and what is idiotically absurd the Anglicisms, the

brogue of King James' translators. Think of Israelites in America, thousands of years ago, using the brogue of King James' translators, thousands of years before such brogue was spoken by the English themselves. Not only so, but they have imitated the incorrect readings of the manuscripts used by those translators, as any one can see who compares the plagiarisms from the Bible, in the Book of Mormon, with King James' version and the late Canterbury version. The Lord in giving the translation, word by word, to Joe Smith, slavishly followed the incorrect readings of the manuscripts, from which King James' translators made their translation, just as they appear in that translation. Not only so but he actually copied their mistranslations also, as one can see by comparing the plagiarisms in the Book of Mormon with King James' version and the Canterbury version. Let me give two noted instances. The Lord in doling out word by word, I Cor. xiii. 4, copied the blunder of King James' translators and inserted the word "easily" and translated the Greek "Charity is not *easily* provoked;" when every scholar knows, whether the Mormon God does or not, that "easily" is not in a single Greek manuscript known to exist. In like manner in doling out Isaiah, xviii, 10, he copied the blunder of King James' translators and gave it to Joe, "The Lord God and His Spirit hath sent me" when every scholar knows, whether the Mormon God does or not, that it should be "The Lord God hath sent me and His Spirit," i. e., "He hath sent me and hath sent His Spirit." This is sufficient. We might give many more.

The fabricators of the Book of Mormon have copied the obsolete words, the obsolete grammar, the violations of grammar, and the punctuation of King James' version, showing that they were as ignorant as the man in our illustration. They have copied the blunders of King James' translators as Simon Pure Hebraisms, just as he copied the blunders of the Irishman. They are like the Chinaman that a lady employed to make some plates to fill out a set of chinaware. She had but one plate to give him as a pattern and it was cracked and nicked. To her amazement and amusement when John brought to her the two dozen plates she had ordered, every one was cracked and nicked just as the plate she gave him. He copied everything, supposing it to be a part of the pattern. Just so the fabricators of the Book of Mormon have copied every crack and nick in King James' version.

Another thing that proves that the peculiarities of the Book of Mormon are awkward attempts to imitate is, they are such a blundering caricature of King James' version. They are as much of a caricature and as awkward as the attempt of a New England Yankee to imitate the brogue of an Irishman. The paddyisms are exaggerated until the attempt is a caricature. The "Beholds," "Wherefores," "Therefore,"

"Thereofs," and "Now it came to pass," in the Book of Mormon, are ridiculously frequent and most awkwardly used. By actual count nearly 1,700 sentences have "Behold" at the beginning of them or near the beginning. Nearly 1,400 have "And it came to pass." Nearly 700 have "therefore." Nearly 500 have "wherefore;" and "lo," "yea," and "thereof" are most awkwardly frequent. The awkward use of the brogue of King James' translations betrays them just as the hackdriver's blunder betrayed him. A great Quaker convention was assembling in Philadelphia. Quakers patronized their own people. To get customers one limb of the world put on drab and a broad brim. He looked all right, but when he asked an old Quaker, "Where is thee's baggage?" the Quaker retorted, "Away with thee for a cheat." The same is true of the jargon of the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. It is no more like the brogue of King James' version than the talk of the stage Irishman is like the brogue of the genuine Paddy right from the "ould sod." Mormons absurdly seem to think that the brogue, the lingo of King James' translations, is the genuine dialect of heaven, and that angels and the Lord cannot or do not talk in any other. The Lord and angels spoke to Egyptians in Egyptian, to Philistines in their dialect, to Chaldeans in their tongue, to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and when the Israelites ceased speaking Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, or whatever was the speech of the people they were addressing; but they affected no antique brogue, or rather caricature of it. If the Lord had translated the Books of Mormon for Joe Smith he should have put it in decent English of the nineteenth century, and not in the obsolete brogue, grammatical blunders and atrocities of King James' version, or rather in a most absurd, disgusting caricature of them in an ignoramus effort to imitate them. Hardshell Baptists think that preaching is not preaching unless in the nasal sing-song whine called "the holy tone," and that the most idiotic bald-dash is equal to the preaching of angels, if in that twang. So Mormons seem to think that revelation is not revelation unless it is in the brogue of King James' translators, and that the most idiotic twaddle is equal to the seraphic strains of Isaiah, if in that lingo. In their attempts to imitate it they come about as near to it as the Yankee schoolboy does the genuine Hardshell sing-song when he attempts to declaim "A Harp of a Thousand Strings."

Mormons attempt to parry these objections, by appealing to faults in the Bible. We reply 1. The blunders of King James' translators, their brogue, is no part of the original, as Mormons are so ignorant as to suppose. 2. The messengers of God in the Bible never used an old obsolete brogue, or rather a most awkward, absurd caricature of it. Nor did the Holy Spirit make the persons inspired perpetrate such idiocy.

3. The uneducated Amos did not use the polished Hebrew of Isaiah or Jeremiah. Nor did Peter use the classic Greek of

Thucydides. But neither Amos nor Peter violated all laws of grammar and speech, in their writings. Their language is terse and blunt, but not such an atrocity as the balderdash of the Book of Mormon and Mormon revelations. Will our opponent give us such a list from the original as we have given from the Book of Mormon? It may be asked if Spaulding, an educated man, and a person like Rigdon were authors of the Book of Mormon, how could it be full of such errors? How could they put such errors in it? Would not they know enough to avoid them, and would not they do so? We reply: 1. Spaulding has been very much overrated. His education could not have been what it is claimed it was, or he never would have been so grossly ignorant as to suppose that the brogue of King James' translators was the oldest dialect he could find, as his wife tells he did. His ridiculous imitations of the brogue of King James' translators, his awkward imitation that caricatured it, until his neighbors ridiculed it and nicknamed him "Old-came-to-pass," and his stolidly retaining such an ignorant blunder to the last, shows that he has been very much overrated. He was doubtless a dull visionary prosy pedant who undertook a work for which he was utterly incompetent. 2. Rigdon was very illiterate as his letter to the *Boston Journal* proves, by its misspelled words, violations of grammar, and utter ignorance of punctuation, as the publishers describe it. His education was obtained in a log school house. He was never a reader except of the visionary and extravagant. He was a ranting, spread-eagle, highfaluten declaimer, who mistook bombast for eloquence, fustian for rhetoric, extravagance for sublimity. We have then the blunders that such a man as Spaulding would make in writing on such a theme. His prosy dull repetitions and awkward imitations of the Bible, that made his stuff what Mark Twain calls it "chloroform in type." Then the ignorant blunders of such an illiterate person as Rigdon and his rant, fustian, spread-eagle and bombast. The blunders that an ignoramus like Smith would make in reading such a manuscript to another, and the blunders that an illiterate blacksmith like Cowdery would make in copying, then the blunders a printer would make in setting up such unusual stuff, especially when he dare not strike out what seemed wrong to him, as he might mar the inspiration by striking out its cant and its brogue. If it had been decent English, the printer could have corrected it. But it was like Josh Billings spelling. The wit in Josh is the bad spelling. So the inspiration in the Book of Mormon was its butchering of the people's English. The atrocities of speech were the divinity that was in it. Still one is compelled to admit that with all of these causes of error, each cause of error, wrought a stupendous miracle, to have gotten up such a monstrosity as the Book of Mormon. We have proved by historic evidence that Rigdon remodeled Spaulding's manuscript, interpolating the religious por-

tions so as to fit it to be used as a pretended revelation. We have proved by the Rigdonisms in the Book of Mormon that it is his work. His belief in immersion, believer's baptism, baptism for the remission of sins, free grace, opposition to infant baptism, opposition to the doctrine of total hereditary depravity that borders on Pelagianism. These were the ideas of the Disciples then. His opposition to secret societies, denunciation of Sectarianism. When he agreed with the Disciples we have Disciples teaching, but when he differed, their teaching is bitterly opposed. He contends for community of goods. He retained the Baptist idea of direct and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. This led him to contend for baptism of the Holy Spirit, baptism to receive miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. Imparting spiritual gifts by laying on of hands. Restoration of miracles, revelations and spiritual powers of the Apostolic church. We have also the fall down power of Rigdon's revivals, and that he was subject to himself. When he agreed with the Disciples the Book of Mormon agrees with them. When he differs from them it differs bitterly. Take for instance his bitter denunciation of those who say, "We have the Bible, we need no new revelation." He is especially bitter over this, and his book is full of instances of the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, such as he contended for. We have his pet expressions, his revivalisms, his baptismal formula, his rant against infant baptism. The child is not more clearly the offspring of his parent than the religious portion of the Book of Mormon is the work of Sidney Rigdon.

Rigdon committed an absurd blunder in using the words "baptize" and "immerse" as he did. On page 44 he represents Christ as making baptism and immersion two entirely different things. He commands men to baptize, and tells them to immerse in doing it. Our Savior used but one word, and that meant to immerse and that alone. He committed another absurd blunder when he represented immersion as universal among the Nephites, hundreds of years before Christ. Immersion was utterly unknown as a religious rite, except the bathings of the law of Moses, until John the Baptist. He made the blunder still more absurd when he represented the Nephites as immersing in the name of Christ. That was never done until it was done by the apostles of Christ. He magnified his blunder still farther when he represented them as immersing for the remission of sins. That was never done until it was done by John the Baptist. He capped the climax of this tissue of absurdities when he represented them as immersing for the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, and he flatly contradicted the word of God. He coolly tells us that these Nephites had all spiritual gifts, and every miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, to an extent utterly unknown, even to the apostles.

John vii. 38, Jesus said "He that believeth

on me, as the scriptures have said, out of him shall flow rivers of water. But this he spake of the Spirit which they that believed on him should receive. For the Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not glorified." John xv. 7, "Nevertheless I tell you the truth, it is best for you that I go away. For if I go not away the comforter will not come unto you, but if I go away, I will send him unto you." Eph. iv. When Jesus ascended, then he gave spiritual gifts unto men. Had Rigdon been there he would have told Jesus, "Nevertheless you are telling a falsehood. The Holy Spirit, in your name, has been enjoyed by my Nephites over 600 years, and to an extent that no human being ever did or ever will enjoy, outside of my Nephites."

This stuff of Rigdon contradicts the teachings of the Bible, that the revelations that constitute the sacred scriptures were given in Palestine and in connection with the Israelites in Palestine. Rigdon has a higher and far better dispensation, over in America, and different from the one in Palestine, for the priesthood is in Manasseh, not in Levi, and the scepter is in Manasseh, not in Judah, thus abrogating the Mosaic dispensation entirely.

The Nephites had the gospel so fully and completely that there was nothing left for Jesus to reveal; nothing for him to do but to fill the programme that Nephite prophets had marked out for him, as minutely, word for word, act for act, as Shakespeare has written out the part of the one who plays the part of Hamlet.

The law of Moses was to prepare the way for the teachings of Christ, just as the Territorial Government prepares the way for the State Government. Rigdon has a more perfect State Government than even the apostles instituted in full blast hundreds of years before the Territorial is abolished, or the Constitutional Convention held, or the State organized.

He has the people living under the State Government and claiming all the time to be living under the Territorial Government, every feature of which they are trampling under foot. One is inclined to ask Sydney "why did not God give prophets and revelations and the Gospel to the Israelites in Africa, India, or China?" There were great multitudes of them, with great schools, in all of these places. Why was not the Gospel revealed, and the baptism in the name of Jesus, and the Holy Spirit and all spiritual gifts, in Christ's name, enjoyed among such prophets, as Ezekiel, Daniel, Malachi in Palestine as well as among your Nephites in America? Why did not Jesus go to Spain, India, or China, after his resurrection, as well as to your Nephites? This lying fabrication of Rigdon contradicts Christ's commission to his apostles. The Gospel was to go forth to the world through his apostles, and through them alone.

They were to go to all nations, give the Gospel to every creature. It contradicts the claim of the apostles, "To us is commit-

ted the ministry of reconciliation. We were chosen to do this work." It contradicts Isaiah and Micah; "The law of Christ was to go forth from Zion, his word from Jerusalem." "The gospel was to be preached among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." It teaches that Manasseh took the priesthood from Levi, before the Messiah, the Melchisedec priest, and the scepter from Judah, before Shiloh came. The rebellion of the Ten Tribes was a sin. The conduct of Rigdon's Nephites was rebellion, apostasy, and yet God blessed them, even above faithful Judahites and Levites.

Rigdon, in the case of his Jaredites, flatly contradicts Gen. xi. 9. At the Tower of Babel the Lord confounded the language of all the earth. Sidney declares that his Jaredites were too smart for the Lord and ran away from him, and the Lord did not do what he thought he did or said he did. Sidney pretends that his Jaredites, who came to America 250 years before Abraham, had a higher and more perfect knowledge of the Gospel than any Israelite, known to the Bible, had before the advent of Christ, and in some particulars better than any have ever had, except his Nephites. Why did not Christ make his advent among these Jaredites 2,000 years before he came? They were better prepared than he found the Israelites in Palestine when he did come. Why did he not make his advent among the Nephites, hundreds of years before he came? They were better prepared for him, and indeed he and his apostles did not leave the Israelites and Gentiles on the old continent in as highly favored a condition as these Nephites were hundreds of years before he came. Why did not God make Jared's brother the father of the faithful instead of Abraham?

If the Book of Mormon be a revelation Jared's brother so far excelled Abraham hundreds of years before Abraham lived that he is the real father of the faithful, and Abraham only a pretender. He was favored above all Israelite prophets except Sidney's fictitious Nephites. The apostles were not so highly favored and all to no purpose for he was to seal it up. The time that the Lord said they were to go forth is not yet come. After all the work of Christ and his apostles the world is not yet ready for the revelations that God gave to Jared's brother long before Abraham's day. If the Nephites had our Bible, or as much of it as was in existence before they left Jerusalem, why was not it buried instead of Moroni's plates? Why do not we have an abridgment of it on the plates as well as what is given on them? If it is because they had the Bible, then why did the book of Mormon steal so much from the Bible? We have neither the historical part of the Bible nor an abridgment of it in the Book of Mormon, but the religious portions of the Book of Mormon are stolen from the Bible and mixed with Rigdon's notions. If we need the Book of Mormon in addition to our Bible, it must be because it contains addi-

tional truth. What single new idea, what single better expression of a biblical idea have we in the Book of Mormon?

We are told on pages 505-508 that Jared's brother (I wonder if that fellow really had no name, if he was always anonymous?) said that Christ was literal flesh and blood, that Jesus showed himself to him as he did to the Nephites, after his resurrection, with his body of flesh, bones and blood. This flatly contradicts the positive declarations of the Bible, that he first tabernacled in flesh, became incarnate, in the person of Mary. That he took on him the seed of Abraham. That his human nature was of the seed of Abraham, was a lineal descendant of Abraham. That his body was prepared for him when he came to do God's

will, or in the person of Mary. Here we are told that he showed that body to this anonymous fellow of Sidney Rigdon's creation, hundreds of years before Abraham or any of his seed existed, and thousands of years before he became incarnate, according to the Bible. We are further told that man's body is an exact image or copy of God's body. Then God has a literal body of literal flesh, blood and bones, notwithstanding Jesus says "God is a Spirit," and "spirit has not flesh and bones." Of course, then, God has organs of eating, digesting, evacuation, procreation, and uses them, or he eats, digests, evacuates and procreates like man, and Priapus Young's Adam-God theory is true according to the Book of Mormon.

MR. KELLEY'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I will first call your attention to one or two things that have been mentioned, as objections, and then go on with my argument.

1. That it is not probable that any persons could have been led to this continent as claimed at the time of the confusion of languages without the same being known to the people of the old world. Gen. 11: 8 states: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth." It seems to me that they did know it on the old world.

Josephus says, that they were scattered abroad upon all the earth, and that some of them "went over the sea." The Book of Mormon tells about a colony that came out from there composed of a few families, and Mr. Braden thinks it could never have happened. In fact, however, it is improbable to the Bible-believer that God should not have taken steps to the colonization of all the earth, since he had created man for the purpose of dwelling thereon. It is said, here that the language of all the earth was confounded, and Mr. Braden objects again, for the reason that the Book of Mormon states that there was a family who were permitted to retain their speech so that they could understand each other. The history of it in the Book of Mormon is as follows: That at the time of the confounding of the language of all the earth, the brother of Jared went and asked that the Lord would

remember him in his mercy, and that He would permit that these brothers and their families might understand each other; and he prayed, and the Lord granted his prayer as to himself and Jared and a few others. Now, is it in fact unreasonable, or does it contradict the Bible in any particular? The language was confounded so that the people could not work together to build the tower there—and that they should go abroad and inhabit the whole earth. That was the object of it. And a few were permitted, and we don't know but what dozens of families, or hundreds even, were permitted in the same way to understand one another of which we have no record. But he objects because the family, first of Jared and then of Jared's brother, or the brother of Jared and then Jared himself, were permitted to first converse about this and understand each other. Mr. Braden makes his mistake in supposing that the work of confounding the language was all of a sudden, a thing similar to a stroke of lightning. There is no sense in supposing that in this God did not work like himself and use some proper means to perform this work and warn too, the people.

Again, he says that the Jaredites ran away from the Lord so he could not confound their language. But where did he get it? When a man says a thing he ought to have some foundation for it. The Book of Mormon states that the Lord led them away. He did not get it out of that Book. Where did he get it? Where did you get the statement that Jared ran away so the Lord could not do it? The Book of Mormon does not say either that the Lord could not do it, but on the contrary that the Lord

could do it, but that he had compassion and pity on these parties because they cried unto him. Do you understand that God is not such a being that he will answer when people cry unto him?

But, he objects again that Jesus did not come to this continent, because if he did why did he not go to Spain and other places also. How does he know but what he did? It may be that he did. He appeared, says Paul, to five hundred brethren at one time after his resurrection, and doubtless to many that we did not have any account of on the Eastern Continent. And how does he know but what he went to Spain and China and the islands of the sea? If it is an argument in his favor to interrogate upon something he knows nothing about, it is an argument in mine. That is the logic of it.

2. Then he gives to us a reminiscence of Sidney Rigdon's bitter denunciation, as he says, of those who cling to the Bible while he was a Campbellite preacher. What has that or anything else Rigdon did while a Campbellite to do with the question under discussion? Do you believe that while he was a Campbellite, preaching here in Northern Ohio, and converting so many upon the Western Reserve, my Campbellite friends, that he was denouncing those who claimed to believe in the Bible? Was that his manner? Mr. Braden says it was. Yet you kept him for your preacher and he was the ablest preacher you had. He made more converts than any other two preachers on the Western Reserve. This is shown in your own history. And still Braden asserts this man was denouncing everything that was good at the same time that he was making these converts. Is that the way to make converts to the Campbellite faith? If not, where is the sense in such statements, my friends?

3. Again, he objects to the Book of Mormon because somebody prophesied he should receive the Holy Spirit in the name of Christ, or through Christ. I would like for him to tell this audience two things.

1. In what way did the people of olden time receive the Holy Spirit? How did Elijah and Malachi, or any of the prophets? I asked him the question upon a former evening. Let him answer that question.

2. Turn to the Book of Mormon and show where they claimed to have received the Holy Spirit through Christ, or in a different manner over here than is represented in the Bible. There is not an instance in the Book of Mormon where it teaches the receiving of the Holy Spirit in a different sense to the Bible. This is all Braden's imagination. Do not misrepresent the book to the audience. Note his answers to these, will you please?

4. Another thing. He says that my testimony of the three witnesses to the Book of Mormon is precisely like his, because I referred to the fact that Mr. Howe's purported statements from John Spaulding and Martha Spaulding had no time, place, or date, nor were they original testimony; that is, that

they were quoted from something else and not genuine. Now if you will turn to the back part of Mr. Howe's book, you will find, instead of giving the statement itself, he gives a quotation from a statement. That is not like the testimony I offered. When I turn to the testimony of the three witnesses, my criticism, he says, "is the club that knocks me in the head." But the testimony of the three witnesses which I read is their statement, not a quotation from the statement of the witnesses. There is no pretension to a quotation here, but the witnesses send it forth themselves as their testimony. "Be it known unto all nations, kindreds, tongues and people." This is our testimony. Can you find anything like that in Howe's quotation from the purported statements of John Spaulding and Martha Spaulding? The cases are not parallel in any sense. There is not nor never has been a question or reason to suppose that the statement in the Book of Mormon was not that of the three witnesses. All three of the witnesses have voluntarily since confirmed this fact; I have read you some of these later statements of them. While the others (these quotations found in Howe's book), are questioned, and they show doubt upon the face of them. Those of the three witnesses he thinks were written up by Joseph Smith. Will some of you take the trouble and examine them, and then tell me if a man who could write those statements up could be justly called an "ignoramus," if you please, that he has been calling Joseph Smith. Mr. Braden has used that language of Joseph Smith from the first. Again, he tells us that Joseph the third says that Emma says, and all of this. Ah! yes; but all there is to it, Joseph Smith wrote his mother's testimony down as she gave it. Now his evidence, so far as being direct and explicit, don't compare with this at all. So, also, of David Whitmer's evidence; it is upon record, and we quote from his evidence as given by himself, published by himself over his own signature. Braden's statements are objected to because they are not given by the parties directly. But, he says, Mr. Bonsall says, that somebody else told him so; and they thought Dr. Winters put it in writing, and they did not have the original statement. Mrs. Dunlap Rigdon's niece, who was a member of Braden's church, is said to have said, &c. That is what I object to sir; and if you can produce the original statements of these parties or a reliable publication of them, do so, and then the argument upon that point will cease. But I deny that you have any evidence from Dr. Winters, Abel Chase, John Spaulding, &c. Bring on your evidence and I will examine it, if you have any. Patterson and Howe won't do to put up evidence for me.

5. Next I notice that he has raised the old objection that the Book of Mormon contains in it the idioms which peculiarly belong to the translation of the Bible. That is a valid objection, if true to any extent, and now will he dare examine it candidly with me.

I say it is not true and ask him to cite instances which he is willing to rest his argument upon. If I do not answer objections of that nature before the conclusion of the discussion, there will be one point against me. It is a valid objection if the idioms or words peculiar to the translation of the Bible have been copied in the Book of Mormon from the Bible in a reckless, blundering way, as he says, and it is an objection that I will meet on to-morrow evening, and I want you all here to hear it, too. At this time I will proceed with my main argument.

The Book of Mormon states that the last civilization which came to this continent landed here about 590 years before the time of Christ, and existed in a civilized state here till the close of the fourth century; giving specific statements of dates, places and conditions which are quite sufficient by reason of their completeness, to either condemn or corroborate the narrative in the subsequent development of the relics, ruins, etc., of that ancient people, through the independent line of evidence brought forward by archaeologists. This was in 1827 to 1830; the developments have been made since.

* Do they contradict or confirm this statement boldly and fearlessly made? I refer you to the latest accounts given of the discoveries in this direction. S. B. Evans, of Ottumwa, Iowa, published through the *Chicago Times*, 1881, his explorations, conclusions, etc., from travels on the continent and examinations of works, and from these concludes that there have been at least two civilizations that have lived and dwindled away on the continent prior to the Aztecs or Toltecs, of Mexico; the last of which must have ceased to exist at least from a thousand to fifteen hundred years ago, and occupied the time of at least one thousand years of civilization here. Take his time and conclusions and compare with the positive declaration of the Book of Mormon made over fifty years before without the aid of these examinations and the published accounts of researches and discoveries now attainable, and you must begin to feel that its work was not that of the guesser. The civilization must have ceased to exist according to the best scientific theories the fourth or fifth century of the Christian era. The Book of Mormon says 400 years after Christ. A thousand years back from the fourth or fifth century, again gives about the time that Lehi left Jerusalem according to the record. If Mr. Smith was guessing, did he not guess well? Do you still believe he was guessing?

Oh! but Braden says he did not write in a perfect language, and before he will receive anything as of divine origin it must be in a perfect language. He asks me to state whether Peter or Paul, or any of the prophets wrote in an imperfect language. My answer to this is, that, there is not a scrap of gospel manuscript under the sun within two hundred years of Peter or Paul. Mr. Braden nor no other man can tell whether they wrote in pure Greek, or

pure Hebrew, or in the Syrian, or the Syrio-Chaldaic or what they wrote in. He does not even know what particular language they did write in, imperfect as it must have been; and it is in dispute at the present time as to the particular language Jesus himself used when he was here. And yet, I am asked to furnish something in the exact original writing of Peter, Paul, or John, so as to prove to Braden that what they wrote was not perfect grammar. Let us examine this silly nonsense a moment. It is the old objection of Howe, and Hyde, and as might have been expected without any foundation. What language known to man is perfect? Will he tell this audience what language known to man now, or that has ever been known or in use since the time of Enoch that was perfect? Can any of you think of one? Mr. Braden can you? Don't you know there has never been such since Babel's time at least. So that if you require a perfect language, God could never have spoken to the world.

We will take the English language, as that is the one more nearly connected with the question under consideration. Three hundred years ago what would have been considered good English is not now—the language is continually changing. The great Shakespeare, the master, says "I had rather," while our school ma'ams turn up their noses at it now, and correct the little one to say "I would rather." I could give you many such instances from such writers as Spencer, Cowper, etc., could I take the time here, showing great changes day by day and year by year of the English language. Pope tells us that the language changes as do the fashions. This of itself ought to be a sufficient answer to the objection that it is not in good English. The American Bible Society, I understand, claims 23,000 inaccuracies so far as minor points of language, use and construction are concerned, found in King James' translation of the Bible, and yet at the time of the translation it was put into English by the masters of literature—the best scholars of the realm. Only last night we were saluted with the remark, "Suppose Joe Smith had as good a right to make a word as Webster." Certainly he had. According to the history of the English language, Mr. Smith or any one in this audience has just as good a right to make a word as Webster or any other man; and I can cite hundreds of instances of words that have been manufactured, not by the scholarly of the age, but by men that were in indifferent circumstances in life. Don't you remember that a few years ago, only in 1840, I believe it was, in a great political convention held at the time that Henry Clay was a candidate for the Presidency, a gentleman in the convention from Tennessee—a common farmer too—who got tired of the noise and rattle in the convention, said that he believed that they ought not to tolerate the "outsiders" in there any longer; and from that very time the word "outsider" was

coined into the English language, and we now use it, and it is admitted to be a proper word—coined by a man that was among those not scholarly, as he thinks was the position of Joseph Smith. I could tell you of a hundred such cases, and taken right from the works upon the English language. If he is acquainted with the literature of the English language he knows the statement to be entirely correct.

But the objection is further urged that the Book of Mormon was translated by inspiration and should have been in a perfect language. Think a moment! For God to look ahead and use language in advance of the times would make it incomprehensible to the persons to whom it was given, and too, imperfect when compared with their language as a standard, no difference how much better in fact it might have been. This is the logic he offers. God must talk in perfect language when he speaks, although he speaks through men. Perfection so far as our language is concerned is determined by the usage of the times. The usage changes, hence perfection changes.

Therefore, if God speaks, he must so speak, that it will be good English to-day, according to the language, and good English next year, according to the standard, although the standard has changed. The fallacy of the position must be apparent to all. We must conclude that the language is but the medium through which the thought is conveyed, and the Lord uses the medium we have. The question is not one of perfect language or imperfect language. No claim is made to giving a perfect language to the world. The only sensible criticism to be made as to the language used in the book is from the standpoint of whether it is in such language as all people may understand it, who are conversant with the language in which it is given; for the message claims to be sent to all. Has he made the objection that it is in such language that all may not understand it? Every one; whether high or low, rich or poor, the educated or the uneducated? Oh, no. His objection is, that it is not in the vocabulary of we giants in the world of language and literature. If he will turn to I Cor. 1:26, he find that "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and the weak things to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not to bring to naught things that are." God's ways are not Braden's ways. That is clear. Braden's view is, just to think of the grand, good, and noble characters of the last three hundred years; of Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Campbell, etc. And then, think of the Lord choosing as an instrument the likes of Joseph Smith. No; the Lord says, "not many noble," after the ways of the world; but Braden's idea is, let us have what *we* call noble.

The untutored Galileans and poor fishermen of Judea stand a poor show with the great "Scalper of Robert Ingersol." But I will continue farther to notice the criticism. Is this an objection in fact, or is it only an imaginary one? Will not the imperfections of an original language in a strictly literal and true translation appear in the translation. If you take the writings of Xenophon, or of any of the great Greek scholars, or the speeches of Cicero in the Latin, and put them in the English language, will they not read differently from the speeches and writings of the unlearned made in the same time and in the same language in which those scholars lived and wrote! They will read differently, although they have been correctly translated into the English language. And so it would be, too, if the original writers of the Book of Mormon did not have a perfect language, or did not speak or write correctly; the imperfection would crop out when it was put into the English language; nor would it be in the fine literature that it might have appeared in, had they been scholarly men, which they say themselves they were not, as I have before shown you from the book wherein one of them states they were not mighty or efficient in writing even as in speaking. In their writings then we might expect to find many imperfections. If so, it would crop out, and the unskillful work and style be reflected in the translation into English, as it would if made from the Hebrew, the Greek, or the Latin. It is not difficult even for a novice to detect these interjected anachronisms in language in many authors. Let us examine the strength of the argument from the other standpoint: Suppose the Book of Mormon was in fact in the smooth and finished speech of a graduate of Dartmouth college, as is claimed for Mr. Solomon Spaulding, and then you should find the expression therein, that the original language in which the book was written, was a very imperfect one, as is the admission in the Book of Mormon; would not my opponent say at once that it was an irreconcilable inconsistency? And would he not have a more reasonable basis upon which to make the claim that the book was the work of the cultured clergyman of New England? There can be no doubt of it. Every position Mr. Braden takes against this book on account of its unenticing style, language, address, and compilation, exposes more fully the utter unreasonableness and absurdity of his Spaulding tale, "old come to pass," and all.

But I will examine the work of some New Testament writers:—Mark was as much inspired as Matthew, but his language of recording the gospel is quite different. Luke's style and language is not that of John, and it is easy to see that the untaught Peter is such a character from his inspired Epistles; while Paul's characteristics of culture shine out in his. But Braden thinks that, if the Lord should use Joseph Smith and inspire his mind to use the means he

had prepared to translate a language, he must not use the vocabulary of Joseph Smith.

The Lord, in translating the book through Joseph Smith, would certainly use the language of Joseph Smith so far as that vocabulary would reflect truthfully the original. If it was deficient, then of course it must have been supplied, but not otherwise. What vocabulary would he use? Of some learned gentleman who was president of Harvard or Dartmouth? Why, how would Joseph Smith understand it after he had translated, according to that? And then Satan would find some argument for his Spaulding story. Was not the message to Mr. Smith as well as to the others of the human family, and could he understand it if not, in great part, in his vocabulary? Was it not also most proper that he first of all understand this message? All must answer these questions the same. Then why object to the work upon this ground? It is but reasonable to expect that we should find in the translation the language in great part in use and understood by the translator at the time of the translation. I might refer also to the fact that there are hundreds of works written in the English language that were correct according to the best usage at the time in which they were written, but which are poor English to-day; and not only this, but the very vocabulary of those works is altogether unlike the vocabulary of other works that were in good English, written at the same time. Need I cite you to the common work that is known all over christendom, published in England a few years ago, known as Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*; thought to be a model yet, in many things, of good English, for the reason that the words that are used in it are so simple that everybody can understand it; but because of this does it follow that other works written at the same time, but in a widely different vocabulary, were not in proper form and style also? Mr. Braden's reasoning is like this: Joseph Smith was an unlearned boy, with a limited vocabulary of words, as the vocabulary of all unlearned persons is of few words when compared with the scholarly. The Book of Mormon is in the language of such an unlearned and illiterate boy; Sidney Rigdon and Solomon Spaulding were educated, able and well-informed men, and ministers—one a Presbyterian and graduate of Dartmouth College, the other belonging to the church of which "I, Clark Braden, am a member,"—orator of the great Mahoning Association, a city pastor, etc., their vocabulary of the English language was of the best at the time, rich, and especially Spaulding's, who was classical and scholarly. Therefore the learned and scholarly Spaulding wrote the Book of Mormon, in common phrase language, and the eloquent and gifted Sidney (Bro. Braden's pastor) stole it and gave it to Joseph Smith, an unlearned, illiterate, low, mean, drinking, shiftless, lazy, thieving, rascally boy, who lived hundreds of miles away, in the forests

of the State of New York, at the time when they had no news, lines, railroads, or easy conveyancing as now, and when from the very surroundings of the case it was impossible that Rigdon could, from his station in life, ever have noticed that there was such a boy living in the world so far as having anything to do with him was concerned. How do you like it? Sidney Rigdon, so far as the use of language is concerned, was one of the most eloquent men that this nation has ever produced. I can read you passages from his speeches, his sermons, and from his presentation of the case of this people before Congress and the world, that equal anything that I have ever seen in the writings or addresses of Calhoun, Webster or Clay. And yet persons will try to make out, in order to if possible connect him with the authorship of the Book of Mormon, that he was such a poor, illiterate "ignoramus" of a fellow that he did not know anything. His language was all of this clap-trap "nonsense," of unusual "verbosity," and abounding in "vulgarisms," and such as that. Well, now, it is not true. All of you who have heard Sidney Rigdon, and there are many in this audience, know it is not true. You know that he was a man who could talk, and talk eloquently; talk in one-half hour more than Braden, or I either, can talk in two days, so far as the use of fine and eloquent language is concerned. That is the kind of man he was and what he could do. And yet Mr. Braden *will have* it that these two ministers, Sidney Rigdon and Solomon Spaulding, made the Book of Mormon. It seems to me that his arguments will not tally at all when you begin to examine and weigh them. Paul says, "And I came not with excellency of speech," and yet he was inspired of the Lord, and so may be the case of Joseph Smith.

My friends, can you not all now see that such objections are really frivolous, and that the work must be tested upon its merits; of what it is; of its teachings, its doctrines, its principles, and not upon the false objections that have been raised. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and he Son." Not if their message is in good language "with excellency of speech," pure Greek, Hebrew or English; but is it so as to be understood, and when understood is it according to the doctrine of Christ. Can you see the point? I think my audience can.

But all the good there is in the Book of Mormon is borrowed from the Bible he says. Does that make it bad because it is borrowed from the Bible? Why don't he point out the bad to this audience and show where that came from? That is what you are waiting for him to do. Does he suppose you will go home and begin to kick the Book of Mormon if he leaves it like the Bible? Would it not be entitled to the respect and belief of Christians, if it did come out of the Bible? Jesus said "every good and perfect thing came from God."

But again, the claim is made that the ex-

rors of King James' translation were copied in the Book of Mormon when it was translated. Now this I deny. It is an assertion that cannot be made good. If they are let him read the passages to this audience and give me page and paragraph and prove it. That is the way to debate. Select a few he can stand by and let us have an issue. What is argument? For the negative to copy out all day what he finds in those works written against the people he has assailed, without regard to the question, or what the affirmative has produced, and then to stand and read it off at night? If that is the way I respectfully suggest that hereafter when you want to discuss with the Saints that instead of getting a professed minister of the gospel, you just buy one of Howe's or John Hyde's books against the Mormons, and when our minister has made his argument you just arise and read the stories from Hyde, or Tucker, or Howe, or Kidder, or Smucker, or Beadle, or Ann Eliza, or John D. Lee—you can't go amiss—they are all directly to the point. No difference what the question is, they will testify. But in contradiction to such a course I suggest that if my reasons are not good he ought to show such facts, and which he can well afford to do, if they are bad.

But here I will now take up my affirmative proofs. It is well known that for the iniquity of the ten tribes of Israel, God gave them into the hands of Shalmaneser, and he carried them into Assyria, since which time they have not been known in the history of nations. The tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with remnants of tribes, remained at Jerusalem until about seventy years after the coming of Christ, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans, the city was taken and destroyed together with the magnificent temple, and the Jews were scattered among the nations. Since that, neither Judah nor Israel has been an independent nation in the earth. As nations they have been blotted out from the knowledge of the world. They (they Jews) are only known in their scattered state. Their city and coveted land has, for lo, these ages, been under the feet of their enemies. This has been so truly the case that it has been a current belief in the world that they would never again be restored to their land or become a great nation. That the Lord has utterly rejected them. But Paul corrected that idea in his letter to the Romans 11:1-2:

"I say then has God cast away his people? God forbid! For I am an Israelite of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God has not cast away his people which he foreknew."

Paul was right, for God had declared as an unalterable decree, as fixed as the ordinances of heaven, that they should be remembered, and not cease to be a nation forever. Jer. 31:35, 40.

"Thus saith the Lord, which giveth the sun for a light by day and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a light by night, which divideth the sea when the waves

thereof roar; the Lord of Hosts is his name." Verse 36: "If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before me forever." Verse 37: "Thus saith the Lord, if heaven above can be measured and the foundation of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done saith the Lord." Verse 38: "Behold the days come saith the Lord, that the city shall be built to the Lord from the tower of Hananeel to the gate of the corner." Verse 39: "And the measuring line shall yet go forth over against it upon the hill Gareb, and shall compass about to Gath."

They were to be scattered and peeled; "become a hiss and a by word among the nations," but they were to be gathered again in God's own due time: hence Paul says, "God has not forgotten his people." But when will their restoration commence? The learning of men is not able to answer. But God by his prophets has made it quite clear. As if on purpose to correct this popular error, Paul writes: "For I would not my brethren have you ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that *blindness in part* has happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved, as it is written. There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." Rom. 11:25, 26.

When the time comes that God will take away the sin of Israel,—about the time that the fullness of the Gentiles should come in,—by their turning away from ungodliness, or hardness of heart—he will make a covenant with them. Jesus fixes this event at the same time with Paul, and says, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles." But how long? He continues, "Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Luke 21:24. Jerusalem was to be in the hands of the Gentiles until these predictions of Christ and Paul should be fulfilled. Then God would renew his covenant with them. But when is the time when Jerusalem shall cease to be trodden down of the Gentiles, and God shall take away the sin of Israel and renew his covenant? Let the prophet answer. Jeremiah says:

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform the good things which I have promised unto the house of Israel and the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the branch of righteousness to grow up unto David, and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem dwell safely."

That is the age and time when God will begin the work that is to effect the restoration of Israel to their ancient homes; when their sins shall be pardoned, and God's covenant established among them.

It is the same time referred to by both Paul and Jesus. So the prophet goes on to state:

"Behold the days come saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with them when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husbandman unto them saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days saith the Lord. I will put my law in their inward parts and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God and they shall be my people, and they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sins no more."

Nothing need be made plainer than this prediction in order to be well understood. When God takes away the "sin" of Israel he is to "remember their iniquities no more." He is to make with them a covenant, and the law is to be written in their hearts, not on tables of stone. "Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them, and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them forever more." Ezek. 37:26.

In view of accomplishing this event, it is written:

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said the Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but the Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north; and from all the lands whither he had driven them; and I

will bring them again unto the lands that I gave unto their fathers. Behold I will send for many fishers and they shall fish them, and afterwards will I send for many hunters and they shall hunt them from every mountain and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks." Ezek. 16:14-16.

And in order to accomplish their restoration, as thus pointed out, the Lord says: "I will direct their work in truth, and I will make an everlasting covenant with them. And their seed shall be known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people." Isaiah 61:8,9.

Here Israel is to be revealed among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people. Their lineage is to be discovered. And how? Evidently as in old time, when doubts, or no certainty was had concerning the lineage of certain of the tribes, who sought to be registered among those who were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found; "they were not to eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim." Ezra 2:63. Neh. 7:65. As the "Urim and Thummim" was the means by which ancient Israel and their lineage was revealed, it will doubtless be the means that God will employ to make their "seed known among the Gentiles, and their offspring among the people." God will work like himself; "He will reveal his secrets to his servants the prophets." Amos 3:7.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S SIXTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We will now call your attention to a radical difference between the Book of Mormon and the Bible. In the Bible the miraculous power of God was sparingly exerted, and revelations were sparingly given. God never did for man what he could do for himself, for such help would have been injurious, just as doing everything for a child ruins him. With his tendency to exaggeration, extravagance and falsehood, Rigdon, in his fiction, the Book of Mormon, has miraculous power exerted on all occasions, even the most trivial and in the most extraordinary manner. He is constantly loading his miraculous cannon to shoot some flea of difficulty. Miraculous power was as common among the Nephites as the use of speech. Their miracles are so much more wonderful than those of the Bible. At the birth of Christ the Bible tells us that a star appeared. Rigdon tells us that it was as light as mid-day all night. At the crucifixion the Bible tells us that darkness covered the land around Jerusa-

lem for three hours and there was an earthquake in Asia Minor. Rigdon tells us a horrible darkness covered the whole earth three days and three nights or until Christ arose—all the time he was in the tomb. The Bible tells us that some saints arose during the earthquake at the crucifixion. Sydney tells us multitudes arose three days after, at the resurrection. Rigdon lets King Abasuerus' horse run away with him every time he gets to fabricating miracles. Rigdon regarded miracles as the all in all of revelation, as such an extravagant visionary fabricator of lies would naturally do. The Bible teaches us that they are merely a means to an infinitely higher end, and worthless except as they accomplish that purpose, and will cease when it is accomplished. It teaches that the Corinthian Church that excelled all others in its wonders, was the most imperfect Church in the days of the Apostles. That is true to day. The lowest displays of religion are among the negroes of the South, Spiritists, Mormons, and in meeting and revivals where

there are the most claims made to supernatural power. Spiritism is a low system. Negro religion is a disgusting caricature. So is Mormonism with the gibberish called speaking with tongues, its pretended revelations, its rubbing with sweet oil. It is a childish superstition. It substitutes wonders for divine truth.

The supernatural of the Bible differs from Mormonism in every particular. The history of the Bible occurred in the midst of the world's history and was a wonderful part of it. There is no getting off into Utopia,—Nowhere, as in the case in the Book of Mormon. No studious avoiding the crucial test of connection with the world's history. No hiding plates in the ground. No clumsy contrivance of plates and bungling machinery of stone interpreters. No hiding behind blankets. No handing plates down out of heaven, that are of no conceivable use. For their contents are not read from them but are given word by word in the crown of an old hat, and seen by peeping through a stolen peepstone. No hiding of plates or manuscript when copied or translated. No concealment. No contradictory absurdities. None of the surroundings that imposture always throws around itself. There were no surroundings of previous imposture vagabondism and crime. Compare Mormonism with all other frauds and it has every objectionable feature of all them, exaggerated. The prophecies of the Bible are majestic outlines surrounded by the clouds of unrevealed mysteries out of which they appear. They arouse expectation, they cheer with promises, or warn with threats, but they give only grand outlines. The prophecies in the Book of Mormon are as minute and exact, and as full and set forth the event as completely as the first machine exhibits every detail, of all other machines made just like it. In nothing is this more apparent than in the prophecies concerning Christ. If all prophecies in the Old Testament that are claimed to be prophecies of Christ, were real Messianic prophecies, they would not foretell as much concerning him as a meagre table of contents tells of what is in a book. When we reduce the list to its proper proportions, about twenty Messianic prophecies, they do not foretell more of his career than a title page does of a book. The prophecies in the Book of Mormon begin with Christ's mother's name, and they foretell every incident of his career with the minuteness of history. They even foretell his exact language, a thing the Bible does not do in a single instance, and close with his ascension. We have as exact history as we have in the New Testament. Rigdon was determined that his prophecies should excel the Bible, and he copied the New Testament to such an extent that the fraud is as impudent as it would be to introduce a child to his father, or a man to his wife.

The writers and speakers of the Bible give their message to the world with the dignified confidence of conscious truth and inspiration. They do not stoop to hedging

against doubt and unbelief. They declare their message and leave it with the reader or hearer without argument or excuse. The writer of the Book of Mormon begins hedging on the first page, and his last page closes with hedging against objections and unbelief, anticipating them and trying to prevent them, and to answer them. We are told with painful iteration and reiteration, on nearly every page, how the Lord commanded them to make plates, to record on them this and that. What care the Lord took to have the plates preserved. How they were revised and corrected by the Lord. How they were hid up unto the Lord. How interpreters were provided and preserved. That "if there be fault, it be the mistake of men." We are besought not to condemn the record on account of imperfections. That they would have done better if they had had more time, or if they had written in another language. That a more perfect account is yet to be brought to light. The arguments of those who contended, as the Disciples did with Rigdon, that we have a perfect revelation in the Bible, are elaborately stated and answered with all the bitterness that Rigdon felt against the Disciples because they rejected his fanatical hobbies. All the objections that it is thought will be urged against Imposter Joe are anticipated and discussed. A language that no one ever heard of is fabricated as the language in which the plates were written. They are miraculously preserved and the records are engraved on plates in the most imperishable manner. In all this we see the conscious fear and guilt of the impostor hedging against detection in his fraud. It is as different from the Bible as falsehood is from truth.

We propose now to show that the Book of Mormon is destitute of every particle of evidence necessary to sustain an uninspired book. What must be proved to sustain the Book of Mormon? I. That the family of Jared emigrated to this continent from the Tower of Babel, escaping the confusion of tongues. II. That Jared's brother and Ether did, by Divine command and inspiration, engrave on plates the history of these people. III. That Limbi and King Benjamin obtained these plates and handed them down, so that Moroni abridged them. IV. That Lehi and his family emigrated to this country from Jerusalem in the first year of the reign of Zedekiah. V. That Lehi, Nephi and other prophets by Divine command and inspiration kept a history and engraved it on plates. VI. That members of the family of Zedekiah migrated from Jerusalem to the land near the Isthmus of Darien. VII. That they were discovered by the Nephites during the reign of their King Zarahemla. VIII. That Zarahemlites and Nephites were united. IX. That their history was kept by a succession of prophets by Divine command and inspiration. X. That Mormon, by Divine command and inspiration, abridged these records. XI. That Moroni finished the abridgment and buried it. XII. That in the form of an angel Moroni

appeared to Joe Smith and gave him the plates he had buried. XIII. That Joe Smith by inspiration translated the plates. XIV. That we have that translation and an abridgement of the history of Nephites, Zarahemlites and Jaredites in the Book of Mormon. Such is the claim. What attempt is made to sustain it?

How do we sustain the claims of any ancient book? Xenophon's *Anabasis* for instance? I. We show that it is the universal belief of the world, learned and critical as well as unlearned, that Xenophon wrote the *Anabasis*, and that we have in it what he wrote, and that he wrote the truth. II. We show that such has been the universal belief of each generation until we reach the generation in which it is claimed that Xenophon lived and wrote. III. We then show that the people of that generation, in their literature, mention Xenophon, his book, and that they accepted it as true. IV. We show that other writers of that age record the same events, mention the same persons and events. V. We show the places, customs, surroundings that it mentions are true; that it interlocks truthfully in geography, customs, literature, etc., with the surroundings and with the age that it describes. Such is the course we pursue to sustain the claims of an uninspired book.

How much of this proof has the Book of Mormon? I. It is not universally received by this generation, learned and critical and unlearned, as what it purports to be. II. We can trace it no further back than Joe Smith, in 1830. III. Before he gave it to the world, not a soul had heard or knew one particle of the Book of Mormon, or its contents, or a single incident in its pretended history. IV. Not another generation or book knows a particle about it or its pretended history. V. From the Tower of Babel to 1830 not a human being knew of the Book, or knew a single particle of its pretended history. VI. Mormons cannot appeal to a single book, fact, custom or place back of Joe Smith. VII. Its pretended history interlocks with no other, does not even touch it. Its places, customs, persons and events are utterly unknown to all geography, history or literature. VIII. We have neither coins, inscriptions, ruins, or any relics that can be traced to its persons or pretended history. IX. It stands upon the assertion of Joe Smith as entirely, and it is unsupported by anything else, as the Mosaic account of the creation stands upon the inspiration of Moses. Even more so, for science has shown that the Mosaic account is a correct outline of the course of evolution in creation. But there are no relics, no remains, no fossils to sustain the Book of Mormon. If it claimed to be written without inspiration, like Champollion's translations of Egyptian papyrus, it has no evidence to sustain it such as he produced. He showed the papyrus. By comparing his translation with Greek records of the same events, he proved that he had translated correctly. He proved by an appeal to other history, to literature, to customs and sur-

roundings, that his translation and its statements were sustained.

No one but the few witnesses ever claimed to have seen Imposter Joe's plates. No one ever knew whether he translated correctly or not. No one ever knew an idea that would sustain his translation or its statements. All the proof we have is certain assertions. I. Imposter Joe asserts that an angel gave him certain plates. II. That he translated them by the gift and power of God. III. That what is in the Book of Mormon is that translation. IV. The three witnesses declare that by a miracle they were showed certain plates. V. That the voice of God declared to them that Joe's translation in the Book of Mormon is true. VI. The eight witnesses declare that they handled certain plates. All they say beyond that is an assertion of what they did not know. The appearance of Moroni to Imposter Joe was a miracle. So was his giving Imposter Joe the plates. Of this we have not one scrap of evidence but that of Imposter Joe. The translation of the plates was a miracle. That the Book of Mormon contained the translation thus miraculously made we have the testimony of four persons—Imposter Joe, Martin Harris, Oliver Cowdrey and David Whitmer.

We may as well dispose of imposter Joe first. The questions we have to settle are: I. Is the point to be established susceptible of proof? We will concede that as far as Imposter Joe is concerned he is competent. II. Are the witnesses of sufficient intelligence to be competent? We will concede that Joe is. III. Is he worthy of belief? Is he of good character for truth and veracity? We will impeach Imposter Joe under this test. IV. Was he disinterested in the issue? We will impeach Imposter Joe under this test. V. Was there collusion? We will impeach Imposter Joe under this head. VI. Has his testimony the consistence, harmony and appearance of truth? We will impeach Imposter Joe under this test. Is Imposter Joe worthy of belief? For years before he told the story about the revelation and its inspiration he had spent his time in witching for water, pretending to find lost property, buried treasures and mines of precious metals. This is the universal testimony of his neighbors. It is admitted by his mother in her history (Pages 96, 97) and by the editor supposed to be W. W. Blair, an apostle in the Reorganized concern. That this was a fraud and deception no one will question. If Joe lied in his pretended marvelous hunting for water, &c., he lied in his pretended miraculous reception of plates and translation of them. Smith lied concerning the fictitious stone vault in which he said he found the plates. Smith lied concerning his pretended translation of the papyrus, now in the book of Abraham. If he perpetrated a fraud in that book and translation he did in the Book of Mormon and the pretended translation of it from pretended plates. Fifty-one neighbors and acquaintances testify that Imposter Joe was universally considered to be entirely

destitute of moral character, addicted to vicious habits, and utterly unworthy of belief. Eleven more testify that he was intemperate and unworthy to be believed. Over twenty more testify in separate affidavits to the same effect, among these his father-in-law and his brother-in-law.

Henry Harris testifies in an affidavit that he was on a jury before which Smith testified, and that in their deliberations the jury threw out Smith's testimony because they regarded it as utterly unworthy of belief. All these 80 odd persons were intimate acquaintances. Was Joseph Smith interested? He was sole author and proprietor of the Book of Mormon, according to copy-right. He repeatedly declared that he would make money out of it. He was practicing a fraud for money, just as he hunted for water, lost property, and hidden treasure, and precious metals, for money, as a fraud. Was there collusion? As we will show the pretended revelations of June 1829 were fabricated in 1835, and dated back and the testimony of the witnesses shows that Imposter Joe wrote the revelation and both affidavits and certificates.

Are Smith's statements consistent and worthy of belief? At first he told his neighbors he had found plates and mentioned nothing else. In his autobiography he adds "and a breast-plate worn by the ancients." In the Book of Doctrines and Covenants he adds Lehi's compass and Laban's sword. Which of these statements are to be believed? Imposter Joe told Peter Ingersoll that his whole story was a hoax. He had no such book. He did not believe there was any such book; but "he had got the damned fools fixed and he should carry out the fun." He told Willard Chase he was to keep his book two years and not let any one see it but himself. He told his father-in-law, Isaac Hale, the first one to see it was a young child. He told N. C. Lewis that he should see the plates and lied, for he could not show him any. He told his brother-in-law that after keeping the plates 18 months he would show them to the world. He told Henry Harris that no one could see the plates but himself and wife. He promised his brother-in-law, Alva Hale, he would show him the plates, got mad, and lied, and could not show any. He told Levi Lewis that the reason he did not show him the plates, according to promise, was that God had deceived him. He told Sophia Lewis that the plates could only be opened by his first child, which would be a male child. It was still born. We might continue his lies indefinitely. We shall show that his revelations are contradictory false, the frauds of a low trickster. That he lied in them. His pretended translation of the book of Abraham was a transparent fraud. He bought some Egyptian mummies. He pretended to translate the papyri found with them, and published the translation, claiming that the papyrus was written by Abraham, and the translation is now in "The Pearl of Great Price" as one of his

greatest revelations and achievements. A French scholar has translated the papyri—a portion of them—and proved that his pretended translation is a fabrication, every word of it. He lied in his Book of Abraham. He lied in his tale about the Book of Mormon. The pretended *fac simile* of what was engraved on the plates, that he gave to his dupes, is a most transparent fraud, made up of the letters and numerals of the English alphabet, inverted or reversed. Out of 68 characters 64 are palpably copies of our alphabet, figures and punctuation marks. But it would be an insult to follow this work further.

We will next examine the three witnesses. We object to their testimony.

I. If the Book of Doctrines and Covenants be true before they pretend to have seen the plates Imposter Joe presents them with a pretended revelation in which they are told just what they shall testify. The words they use in their testimony are identical with the words in this pretended revelation.

II. In March 1829 Imposter Joe presents Harris with a pretended revelation in which the identical words of the testimony of the witnesses occurs.

III. In that revelation Harris is commanded to lie, to say that he had seen the plates when he has not seen them and is reminded that he had promised Joe that he would tell such a lie.

IV. The testimony is not like the evidence presented to prove that Spaulding wrote the Manuscript Found, a series of independent statements, but a joint statement without date, written by Joe Smith as comparison with his two pretended revelations just named will show. It has every mark of fraud and collusion. It is prefaced by two pretended revelations, in one of which one of the witnesses is commanded to lie. And is reminded that he had promised to lie. It tells them what they shall say, and it is written out by Imposter Joe and signed by his three confederates in fraud.

The witnesses are interested in the issue. Harris had his farm staked on its success. Cowdery had months of time staked on it. Harris declares "If the whole affair was a fraud he expected to make money out of it." All expected to make money out of it. Harris was bought with the promise of a monopoly of the sales of the book. He expected to clear over \$3,000.00. Harris was noted for his absurd marvelous stories. He said that he had seen Jesus and "he was a beautiful young man."

"He had seen the devil and he was a jackass with hair like a mouse." He prophesied that the nation would be destroyed in four years if they did not accept Mormonism. If other witnesses tell the truth Harris lied to Amthon about how the translation was done. He lied about what Amthon said to him. Joe in a revelation reminds Harris that he had promised to lie and commands him to do so. In a revelation Joe warns him against adultery and

murder. He used to beat his wife. He sat by her bedside as she was dying, wrote a letter to a woman he intended to marry, brutally told his dying wife what he was doing, married his Leman in less than two weeks after his wife's death. He lived in adultery with a tenant's wife. It was this that Joe warned him against and against murdering her husband.

Harris declared repeatedly that he had as much evidence for a Shaker book he had as for the Book of Mormon. He told Deacon Morley, Maj. Gilbert, Mr. Markell, Mrs. Milliken, Mr. Milliken, Mrs. Whitney, Mrs. Hansbury, and many others that he did not see the plates with his natural sight. He saw them by faith. That is he did not see them, but thought or believed he saw them. He told Mr. and Mrs. Hansbury that he did not see the plates. He saw the box that they were in and heard them rattle. He knew Joe had them.

In the Elder's Journal of August, 1838, page 49, Imposter Joe denounces him "as so far beneath contempt that a notice of him would be too great a sacrifice for a gentleman to make. The church exerted some restraint on him, but now he has given loose to all kinds of abominations, lying, cheating, swindling, with all kinds of debauchery." That disposes of Mart in Harris.

We will now take up Oliver Cowdery. David Stafford testifies that "Oliver Cowdery proved himself to be a worthless fellow, not to be trusted or believed when he taught school in this neighborhood." Danford Booth says he was a low pettifogger, a cat's-paw of the Smiths to do their dirty work. Imposter Joe is constantly warning him in revelations of his selfishness, his ambition, his desire to be some big person. In a pretended revelation of November, 1831, Imposter Joe bears this testimony to Oliver's character: "Hearken unto me, saith the Lord your God, for my servant Oliver Cowdery's sake: It is not wisdom that he be entrusted with the moneys which he shall carry into the land of Zion unless some one shall go with him who shall be true and faithful." In Vol. I. of *Times and Seasons*, Hiram Smith charges Oliver Cowdery with forging a note against himself (Hiram Smith), robbing his father (Joseph Smith, Sr.), and plundering Joseph Smith's house. Pages 22-3, Vol. I, *Times and Seasons*, Hiram Smith says:

"Persons came to my house while I was in prison and ransacked it and carried off money and my valuables. Among those who treated me thus I cannot help making particular mention of Lyman Cowdery, who in connection with his brother Oliver Cowdery took from me a great many things, and to cap the climax of his iniquity compelled my aged father, by threatening to bring a mob upon him, to deed over to him or his brother Oliver about 160 acres of land to pay a note which he said I had given to Oliver for \$165. Such note I confess I was, and am, entirely ignorant of, and after mature consideration I have to say that I believe it must be a forgery."

Witness Oliver a robber, a thief, a forger! Joseph Smith says, in *Times and Seasons*, Vol. I, page 80:

"About this time there were several persons living

in the Far West who were cut off from the church. These characters were studiously engaged in circulating false and slanderous reports against the Saints to stir up our enemies to drive us from our homes and enjoy the spoils together. They are as follows: Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, etc."

These liars plotting robbery are witnesses to the Book of Mormon.

In a circular letter addressed to Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer and others, signed by Sidney Rigdon and 84 other leading Mormons—a circular that was authenticated in a District Court before Judge King, and which is further authenticated in a report of a committee of the United States Senate and published in the report by authority of the United States Government, constituting Congressional Document 181, A. D. 1841, Oliver Cowdery is charged with stealing, lying, perjury, counterfeiting, and that he was a leader of a gang of scoundrels of the blackest dye. After he abandoned Mormonism he openly declared his testimony was a lie. In a piece of poetry published in the *Times and Seasons*, occur these lines:

"Or prove that Christ was not the Lord
Because that Peter cursed and swore,
Or Book of Mormon not his word
Because denied by Oliver."

In this doggerel the Mormons themselves declare he repudiated his testimony. He committed adultery with a hired girl in Kirtland. He lived in adultery also in Nauvoo. Such is the Apostle Cowdery—witness Cowdery. He died an apostate, a drunken sot, a beastly wreck.

David Whitmer next. He destroys his testimony by the yarns he tells, and his contradictions. He tells that Joe took him into a field, on Whitmer's father's farm, and showed him the plates lying on the ground. He tells us that the angel showed them to his (Whitmer's) mother. That the angels sowed eleven acres of plaster to enable him to go to Pennsylvania to move Joe (Lucy Smith's history, pp. 144, 145). That he was miraculously enabled to do two heavy days' work in less than one day (id.) That the angels plowed seven acres for him in the night (autobiography of Joe Smith, p. 740). That Moroni trudged alongside of the wagon as he was moving Smith, sweating like an old tramp, lugging the plates. The person who will be fool enough to have any confidence in the story of such a man after reading such monstrous and silly lies, may do so, people of sense will not. In *Times and Seasons*, Vol. I, pages 81, 82, 83, 84 as quoted above. Imposter Joe declares that Cowdery and Whitmer were studiously engaged in circulating false and slanderous reports and plotting to rob the Saints. Rigdon and 83 other leading Mormons, as quoted above, denounce Whitmer as being a member of a gang of thieves, counterfeiters and blacklegs of the deepest dye. Page 83 of the *Times and Seasons* Imposter Joe says: "Poor Phelps, who professes to be much of a prophet, has no other dumb beast to ride but David Whitmer, or to forbid his madness when he goes up to curse Israel. But this ass (not being of the same kind as Balaam's), therefore notwithstanding the

angel appeared unto him, yet he cannot sufficiently penetrate his understanding, but that he (Whitmer) brays out curses instead of blessings. Poor ass, whoever lives will see him and his rider perish like those who perished in the gainsaying of Noah." A sweetscented witness, according to God's vicegerent Imposter Joe. Whitmer has repeatedly stated to his neighbors in Richmond, Mo., that his statement was a lie. That the only angel he saw was a man by the name of Angell.

We are now ready for the eight witnesses. Their testimony is worthless. They testify they saw and handled certain plates that Joe showed them. That the plates had on them characters of ancient workmanship, and were of ancient and curious workmanship. That they saw as many plates as Smith had translated. How did they know that he had translated the plates before them? How did they know that Joe had translated any plates? That the plates had been given to him by an angel? That the Book of Mormon was a translation of the plates before them, or of any plates? The only thing they could testify was that Joe had showed them certain plates. All the rest they could not know, and lied when they said they did know. Another fatal objection to the testimony of both the three witnesses, and of the eight, is they are all of the gang of low, villainous followers of Smith, and interested in the fraud. The thirteen are as follows: Imposter Joe, author of the fraud; old Joe, his father, a notorious drunkard, liar and thief; Hiram Smith, his brother, afterwards a leader in Mormonism; S. H. Smith, another; old Mrs. Whitmer, David Whitmer, Christian Whitmer, Peter Whitmer, John Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery, Hiram Page, brother-in-law of the Whitmers, Martin Harris, old Mrs. Whitmer and Emma Smith, Joe's wife. Six Whitmers, one member of the family, four Smiths, Oliver Cowdery and Martin Harris.

One afternoon a number of persons were playing town ball in the flat on the bank of the creek in Kirtland, while the Mormons were there. There was whiskey on the ground, and Bill Smith, brother of Imposter Joe, got so drunk that he had to sit down between the roots of a stump and lean back

against the stump to sit up. Some of the Mormons reminded him that he was announced to preach the next day, and that he would not be allowed to preach if he made such a display of himself. He roared out, "I'll be d—d if I wont preach. If they don't let me preach, by G—d I will tell all I know about them plates." *He preached.* On another occasion, while riding with Mr. Markell, he began to sing an obscene song. Mr. Markell reminded him that he was a preacher, and was to preach the next Sunday (Bill and Joe were in a quarrel then). Smith replied: "I am not going to preach any more. The whole thing (meaning Mormonism) is a d—d humbug. I am going to tell all I know about them plates." G. B. Frost swears in an affidavit made in Boston, Mass., Sept. 18th. 1842, before Bradford Sumner, J. P., that Bill wanted some money of Joe, who refused him until Bill threatened to tell what he knew about the origin of Mormonism. Then Joe gave him the money. Of the three, all three apostatized, and five of the eight witnesses apostatized. This is sufficient to show that their testimony was all a fabrication, gotten up by Imposter Joe and signed by them as confederates in a fraud that they abandoned when it ceased to be profitable to them. Another objection: In the first edition of the Book of Mormon, the eight call Imposter Joe "Author and proprietor" of the Book of Mormon. Now it reads "Translator." They allowed the testimony to be doctored to suit the point to be established. They allowed it to be fabricated by Imposter Joe, and perjured themselves by swearing to it. The two testimonies contradict each other and Mormon revelations. The Book of Mormon declares that Joe shall show the plates to three witnesses. He showed them to eleven. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares that to three and none other will God give this privilege. It was given to twelve besides Imposter Joe. It required a wonderful miracle and an angel to enable the three to see the plates. It required no angel, no miracle to enable the eight. They saw and handled them like shingles. So did Emma Smith, according to her story, only they were covered with a "thin cloth."

MR. KELLEY'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Last Saturday evening Mr. Braden made the statement that not one of the Smith family ever belonged to the Presbyterian or any church, except as he says, the Mormon. I have intended to correct it a number of evenings, but each time it has escaped my mind, so I will do so now. The history is as follows:

"I was at this time in my fifteenth year." This is the history written by Joseph Smith himself. "My father's family was proselyted to the Presbyterian faith, and four of them joined that church, namely, my mother, also my brothers, Hyrum, and Samuel Harrison, and my sister Sophronia."

That is in accordance with the statement that I made to the audience at the time he took occasion to deny it, and the statement is borne out through the history of the church; and I call for the reading of the evidence he has, if he had any foundation for the statement which he made to the contrary.

Last evening I was just reading to you an argument based upon the work that the Lord would begin to accomplish or perform in the last days, and should begin with Ephraim; and I had called your attention to the fact that in the restoration of this work and the bringing to light of the seed of Ephraim himself, the Urim and Thummim must be restored again, as was stated by the prophet Nehemiah, (7: 65) which was necessary in that time also to the restoration of certain ones before the Lord; also, that when this was done it would be through the means of the Lord working through the instrumentality of a prophet. I shall this evening first follow out these wonderful predictions of the prophets, and as I trust, interest you in one of the most hopeful and encouraging promises God has ever made to his children.

As a principal and initiatory means of inaugurating the great work of revealing the seed of Israel as they exist among the nations, and the restoring of them to their promised land, Isaiah says, when "God shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, he will set up an ensign for the nations and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" 11: 12.

The outcasts of Israel are the "ten tribes;" the dispersed of Judah are those scattered in the year seventy by the Roman Army. But the promise is that both Israel and Judah shall return. "That Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." "The adversaries of Judah shall be cut off." This has never been. A

"highway is to be cast up." And God is to smite the Egyptian sea in the seven streams and cause men to go over dry shod. The first event to transpire in this series of events, is the setting up of an "ensign to the nations." Isa. 61:10, says, "Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people."

This is just to precede the coming of the Son of God, and is the preparatory work to be performed before his coming. But what is this "ensign" or "standard" that is to be raised up? It is evidently the warning voice brought by the angel, "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, kindred, tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgement is come."

It is in the gospel that the revelation and establishment of the everlasting covenant is made which is to be written in the hearts and put in the inward parts of Israel, when "God takes away their sin." Hence Paul says, "Written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart." 2 Cor. 3: 3. It was the blood of Christ that sanctified this covenant. Heb. 10: 29. It is the gospel, that is God's standard or ensign to the people; and Isaiah says that he will "set it up." Isa. 11: 12.

Jesus said in the age of preparation that should precede the coming of the Son of Man, "And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." Matt. 24: 14.

After the Gospel shall have been preached to all nations for a witness, then the Savior will come, "Taking vengeance upon all those that know not God and obey not the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ." But, when the Lord comes he is to find Judah restored to Jerusalem: Zach. 14. Who is to take the lead in this restoration of the tribes, and the bearing of this "standard?" Let inspiration answer. "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd does a flock." "They shall come with weeping and with supplication will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by rivers of water in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble: for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born." Jer. 31: 9, 10.

Ephraim was not the first born of Joseph's sons, but the second; and for his iniquity God declared that he would blot him out as

a nation, or tribe, to the world and his lineage should be unknown. "His root dried up," Hos. 9:16.

He was to be mixed with the people, but not "utterly forgotten." The Lord says, "My heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together; I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger, I will not return to destroy Ephraim." Hosea 11:8, 9.

Not utterly destroyed, but mixed among the people. But when God makes the seed of Israel "known among the Gentiles and their offspring among the people," Ephraim is to be revealed; for they are the ten thousands of Ephraim, and the thousands of Manasseh." Deut. 33. Ephraim is the *first-born* in the great work of restoring Israel in the last days; the first revealed, and commissioned to bear the "ensign," or the "standard," to the nations, which God will set up. Ezekiel says, referring to the same work:

"Behold I will take the stick of Joseph which is in the hand of Ephraim and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in mine hand." "And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side and bring them into their own land. And I will make them one nation upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all." Ezekiel 37.

The Bible, the Old and New Testaments, are by the ablest critics acknowledged to be the stick of Judah, containing the things of God written "to Judah and his fellows." The stick of Joseph in the true interpretation must be another record containing the great things of God's law written to him and his fellows, that at one time is to be in the hand of Ephraim, removed and joined with the stick of Judah. But where is Joseph's record, or the stick of Joseph? I answer, in Joseph's land. Where is that? To the "utmost bounds of the everlasting hills," from Palestine or Egypt. "Utmost" signifies the farthest off. The "utmost" land from Goshen in Egypt is North and South America. Hence Moses says:

"Blessed of the Lord be his (Joseph's) land; for the precious things of heaven, for the dew and the deep that coucheth beneath. And for the precious fruit put forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon. For the chief things of the ancient mountains, and precious things of the lasting hills, and for the precious things of the earth and the fulness thereof." This landed blessing was to come upon the head of Joseph. Joseph's sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, inherited this land of right; God gave it to them. These children were to grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." Gen. 48:16. The younger brother was to be the greater, verse 19. This being their land of inheritance, God was able to

bring them here. That they came here about 600 years before Christ I showed on a previous evening. Hence we can understand the prophet when he declares that "When the Lord roars" the children of Ephraim "shall tremble from the west." Hosea 11:10. When shall the Lord roar? "The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem, and the heavens and the earth shall shake, but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel." Joel 3:15. Then it is that Ephraim shall be in the west, because he is on Joseph's land, in his inheritance. But the "stick of Joseph" does not mention Ephraim as coming to the inheritance, but Manasseh only, it is objected. True, but Ephraim was to be destroyed in his identity as a tribe, his lineage cease to be counted and he be mixed among the people; and be utterly lost among the nations of the earth until he should be revealed in the last days to become the first born in commencing the work of restoration. It was on this, Joseph's land (the land of America) that the "ensign" was to be raised in the last days, or the "standard set up." Isaiah says, "Ho to the land shadowing with wings which is beyond the rivers of Ethiopia." Stretched out in the shape of wings—not as a bird with wings—but as two wings stretched or spread out.

Now when you stand at Jerusalem and look beyond the rivers of Ethiopia,—beyond the Niger, Grande and Mezurado, which extend to the west coast of Africa,—the first and only land that comes to view is North and South America. The prophet continues: "All ye inhabitants of the world and dwellers on the earth see ye when he lifteth up an ensign on the mountains; and when he bloweth the trumpet hear ye." Isaiah 18. In the land shadowing with wings the ensign was to be raised; and the gospel trumpet to be blown. And as all other prophets have testified, it was to be "just afore the harvest," or "end of the world." From this land shadowing with wings the messengers were to be sent to a people "scattered and peeled," whose land the rivers, or nations, "had spoiled;" because of the decree, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the time of the Gentiles be come in." Then, "Thus saith the Lord God, behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and they shall bring thy sons into their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers." Isaiah 49:22. "And he will lift up an ensign to the nations from far, and will hiss (call) unto them from the end of the earth." Isaiah 5:26. Standing at Jerusalem and lifting up an "ensign from far" at the "end of the earth," and we are brought again to see Joseph's land. The Book of Mormon does not say that Ephraim came to America along with his elder brother to receive his inheritance; neither does it say that *he did not come*; but it

does say, that a number came whose genealogy is not given: and as Ephraim had equal rights of inheritance with his brother Manasseh, and his tribal name was to be blotted out, "his glory to fly away like a bird from the birth," and be mixed among the people and his name lost, until the mighty work of God should commence in the last days, it is clear as to why Ephraim's lineage is not recorded in that work. When the stick of Joseph was taken from the hand of Ephraim and put with the stick of Judah, and this standard raised up, then the work that is to result in the restoration of Israel is to commence. God says, "I will take them from among the heathen and gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land. And I will make them one nation and they shall defile themselves no more." The stick of Joseph says:

"But behold there shall be many at that day, when I shall proceed to do a marvelous work and a wonder among them, that I may remember my covenant which I have made unto the children of men, that I may set my hand again the second time to recover my people which are of the house of Israel. And my words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth for a standard unto my people which are of the house of Israel. And because my words shall hiss forth many of the Gentiles shall say, A Bible, a Bible, we have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible. Thou fool that shall say a Bible, we have got a Bible and we need no more Bible. Know ye not that there are more nations than one? Wherefore murmur ye because ye shall receive more of my word? Because that ye have got a Bible ye need not suppose that it contains all my words, neither need ye suppose that I have not caused more to be written: And it shall come to pass that my people which are of the house of Israel shall be gathered home unto the land of their possessions, and my word also shall be gathered into one. And I will show unto them that fight against my word and against my people who are of the house of Israel, that I am God, and that I covenanted with Abraham that I would remember his seed forever." Pages 105, 106.

Now, it is thought by some that possibly some man might have been smart enough in the inauguration of the work of the last days to have conformed his work to all of the precise prophecies in the Bible respecting that work. Can you believe that there is or has been any in the world's history who could take from the Bible the prophetic evidences in regard to the restoration of the work in the last days, and so bring forth a work and establish it in every particular, that the work itself, that he brought forth would completely and fully fulfill all the predictions that the prophets had made with regard to the same work? Yet you are called upon to believe that, "ignoramus," as they have been termed before you, have been able to do this.

"For after the book of which I have spoken (so this book says) shall come forth and be written unto the Gentiles, and sealed up unto the Lord, there shall be many who shall believe the words which are written; and they shall carry them forth unto the remnant of our seed. And then shall the remnant of our seed know concerning us, how that we came out from Jerusalem. And it shall come to pass that the Jews which are scattered also shall begin to believe in Christ and they shall begin to gather in upon the face of the land."

How did Joseph Smith and Sidney Rigdon know this, and know that the work should go forth unto all nations and be accepted by many people when it was published to the world and before any one had accepted it? They did not know that it

would be any more of a remarkable thing in the world than ten thousand other works that have been published within the same time, and yet you have never even heard the names of those works.

"And it shall come to pass that the Lord God shall commence his work among all nations, kindreds, tongues and people to bring about the restoration of his people on the earth." Book of Mormon, pages 106, 107.

The sign given that the time had come when the work of the Father should commence to effect the restoration of Israel and the renewing of the covenant with them, should be the coming forth of this work and its publication to the world. Book of Mormon, pp. 103-8. To this all the prophets of the Bible who have written concerning it testify. Ezekiel, in his 37th chapter, states emphatically, as already shown, that when the record of Joseph should be taken and put with the record of Judah, that then should commence the work that would eventuate in the gathering of Israel. Isaiah, in his 29th chapter, is specific upon this same point, and the manner in which the record should be brought forth to the world. He states that a nation which would be unto him (God) "as Ariel," should have forts raised against them, besieged and camped against, and "Thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust; and thy voice shall be, as one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust." Verse 4.

This could only take place by a nation's history being written and hid up in the earth, which after the nation had passed away and should be recovered, and then the nation would speak through its record out of the ground. This was to take place when God should remember the covenant made to the house of Jacob: and Jacob's face was to be no longer pale; but the favor of God and prosperity should be upon him. Verse 22.

David refers to the same thing, the coming forth of the record out of the earth, and as preceding the restoration of Israel, in his 85th Psalm, as follows: "I will hear what God the Lord will speak, for he will speak peace to his people and his Saints." "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other. Truth shall spring out of the earth, and righteousness shall look down from heaven, yea the Lord will give that which is good, and our land shall yield its increase. Righteousness shall go before him, and shall set us in the way of his steps."

Here it is shown that just before Israel is set in the way of God's steps, and the land of Israel shall yield its increase, that truth shall spring out of the earth. And that this shall be a means of setting them in the way of his steps." What is this truth? David says again: "Thy law is the truth." "Thou art near, O Lord, and all thy commandments are truth." Psalms 119, 142, 157. And Jesus says, "Sanctify them

through thy truth, thy word is truth." John 17: 7. Isaiah says, "Let the skies pour down righteousness; let the earth open, and let them bring forth salvation." 45:8

Here it is shown that a record of a people should be brought out of the ground; they should "whisper out of the dust," just previous to the land of Israel yielding its increase. It was to come at a time when men would be "drunken, but not with wine; stagger, but not with strong drink." Because "the Lord had poured out upon them the spirit of deep sleep, and closed their eyes." They had no prophets nor seers. All these are thought to have been "done away." Then it is that the "vision of all is become unto you as the words of a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee, and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed." Isaiah 29:10, 11. Now it is well known that when the record of Joseph (or Book of Mormon), was brought to light, that some of the characters were copied and sent to Prof. Anthon and Dr. Mitchell, of New York city. The message was taken by Martin Harris. Pearl of Great Price, page 45.

TESTIMONY OF MARTIN HARRIS.

"I went to the City of New York and presented the characters which had been transcribed, with the translation thereof, to Professor Anthon, a gentleman celebrated for his literary attainments. Professor Anthon stated that the translation was correct, more so than any he had before seen translated from the Egyptian. I then showed him those that were not translated, and he said that they were Egyptian, Chaldaic, Assyriac and Arabic, and he said that they were the true characters. He gave me a certificate certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were true characters, and that the translation of such of them as had been translated was also correct. I took the certificate and put it into my pocket and was just leaving the house when Mr. Anthon called me back and asked me how the young man found out there were gold plates in the place where he found them. I answered that an angel of God had revealed it unto him. He then said unto me, Let me see the certificate. I accordingly took it out of my pocket and gave it to him, when he took it and tore it to pieces, saying there was no such thing now as ministering of angels, and that if I would bring the plates to him he would translate them. I intreated him that part of the plates were sealed, and that I was forbidden to bring them. He replied, I cannot read a sealed book."

This statement of Mr. Harris is corroborated and confirmed by Mr. Anthon, showing that he did make the trip to New York, and presented him with the characters. In the history of the Mormons, by Howe, who wrote to Mr. Anthon and claimed to get his answer, page 272 of his work, he says, as follows: "Some years ago a plain, apparently simple-hearted farmer"—yes, that is Martin Harris—"called on me with a note from Dr. Mitchell of our city, now dead, requesting me to decipher if possible a paper which the farmer would hand me, and which Dr. M. confessed he had been unable to understand."

Don't overlook the confession of Dr. Mitchell, which is almost invariably left out of the letter of Prof. Anthon by all authors who wish to make a case against the book, whether by foul or fair means, although this is the original publication of it.

"When I asked the person who brought it how he obtained the writing, he gave me, as far as I now recol-

lect (notice the language, 'as far as I now recollect') the following account: A 'gold book,' consisting of a number of plates of gold fastened together in the shape of a book, by wires of the same metal, which had been dug up in the northern part of the State of New York, and along with the book an enormous pair of 'gold spectacles.' These spectacles were so large that if a person attempted to look through them his two eyes would have to be turned toward one of the glasses merely. The spectacles in question being altogether too large for the human face. Whoever examined the plates through the spectacles was enabled to not only read them, but understand their meaning. All this knowledge, however, was confined at that time to a young man who had the trunk containing the plates and spectacles in his sole possession. He put on the spectacles, or rather looked through one of the glasses, and deciphered the characters in the book, and having committed some of them to paper, handed copies to a person outside. This paper was in fact a singular scroll. It consisted of all kinds of crooked characters, disposed in columns, and had evidently been prepared by some person who had before him at the time a book containing various alphabets. Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters inverted, or placed sideways, were ranged in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle, divided into various compartments, decked with various strange marks, and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar given by Humboldt."

Thus the learned man admits that he was waited upon by a "simple hearted farmer," who presented him with the characters, whatever may have been his opinion about them, and the learned man's statement, though an attempt is made at derision, is in favor of the claims of the Book of Mormon, and has also been confirmed by the finding of plates fifteen feet under ground in the State of Illinois, in 1843, with characters resembling those described by Prof. Anthon. These plates were found by Mr. Robert Wiley. They were four inches in length, and one and three-fourths inches wide at the top and two and three-fourths inches wide at the bottom and covered with "Hieroglyphics." A fac-simile of which is here presented; (the fac-simile is shown to the audience).

I now show you a fac-simile of those plates that were found seventeen years after the publication of the Book of Mormon, with characters similar to the ones shown to Prof. Anthon, and not found by Latter Day Saints either—not found by Joseph Smith or Sidney Rigdon—and they are now in the possession of scientists. And yet Joseph Smith must be called a liar and a thief and everything else if he says that he got any plates, because, forsooth, he says at the same time that he saw an angel, and there are no angels in this age of the world;—so Mr. Braden would have you believe.

Here it has been shown that the prophecy of Isaiah was literally fulfilled so far as the characters being taken to learned men are concerned, and they not being able to interpret them, as confessed by both parties. But the book was to be delivered "to him that is not learned, saying, read this I pray thee, and he saith, I am not learned." The book was to be delivered to the unlearned and he was not able to read it by his own wisdom. Therefore the Lord said verse 14, "I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid."

How was the wisdom of the *wise* and *prudent* to be confounded? By God proceeding to do his own work. He would take the illiterate man and cause him to do that which the most learned and scholarly men of the age could not do. That is, read the book. Bring it to light. For the "deaf" were to hear the words of the book." Verse 18. That Joseph Smith was such an illiterate youth, is confessed by every one; and himself and other witnesses testify that he translated the book. But when was this book to be revealed? In a day when men should deny that such a thing as a revelation from God could be. When people would draw near to the Lord, "with the mouth," and with "their lips honor him," but with hearts far from him, the same as the Jews once acted in the time of Christ. But the fear of God "would be taught by the precepts of men." A dead form, "lip service," without any heart in it, all under the direction of the wisdom of men was to be the spirit of the time. Verse 13. It was to come forth just before "Lebanon should be turned into a fruitful field." Just before Palestine should be restored from its sterility to the receiving of the early and the latter rains, in order to send forth vegetation for "my people, Israel, for they are at hand to come." This *sealed* book, the Record of Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, was to be brought out of the ground, taken in the hand of Ephraim and put with the stick of Judah and raised as an "ensign," or "standard," upon the land shadowing with wings, just as God should commence the great work among the nations of the earth for the restoration of scattered Israel to Palestine again. God was to reveal his secret to his servants, the prophets, concerning the time when this work should commence, for the wisdom of men could not divine the time. The coming of the angel, Rev. 14:6, and the raising of the Gospel standard to be preached to every kindred, tongue and people, inaugurated the great era declared by Paul to be the "dispensation of the fullness of times." Ephesians 1:10. Or the dispensation that shall wit-

ness the bringing about of these things spoken by the prophets, and he crowned with the coming and glory of Jesus Christ, and the resurrection of the saints. This last dispensation is the time referred to by Peter when he said, "The heavens must retain the Son of Man, until the time of the restitution of all things spoken by all the holy prophets since the world began." Acts. 3. It is the era predicted by Jesus and Paul in which the fullness of the Gentiles would be come in, and Jerusalem should cease to be trodden down. It is the era or dispensation in which the angel would restore the Gospel to be preached to every nation, kindred, tongue and people, saying with a loud voice, "Fear God and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come." It is the time when "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come," as declared by Jesus. It is the time when the stick of Joseph should be taken from its resting place and be put with the stick of Judah, and in the hands of divinely commissioned officers raised as a standard with authority from God to say to all Israel that the day of their redemption is nigh, and God will remove the curse from their land and remember the covenant that he had made that they should not cease to be a nation before him, forever. It is the day, when the angel would say, "Run and speak to this *young man*, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls, for the multitude of men and cattle therein; for I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and be the glory in the midst of her." Zach 2:4.

There is no work on earth that answers to these prophecies or can claim to be a fulfillment of the same as pointing out the time, and the nature and character of the work that should reveal the dispensation of the fullness of times, and commence the great work of restitution, but that brought forth by the young man, Joseph Smith.

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S SEVENTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The question has often been asked: Did Joe Smith have any plates? Some think that Joe found some glyphs, like those said to be found in Kinderhook, Ills., while pretending to hunt for buried money. Some think that Rigdon obtained some glyphs and furnished them to Joe. Some think that Rigdon or Joe had some manufactured, and exhibited them to the witnesses. I assert positively that Joe never had a plate, and never showed one to anybody: that Joe and his witnesses deliberately lied from beginning to end. We have proved that Joe was a liar about his water-witching and money-hunting: that he lied about his book of Abraham: that the *fac simile* of what was on the plates was a wholesale fraud: that he said he had no plates. Pomeroy Tucker tells us that two young men, Van Dreuver and Hussey, were allowed, by Joe, to look into his box, and see what he said was the Book of Plates covered with a cloth. That, by a quick movement, Hussey snatched off the cloth, and found that it covered only a brick. The entire gang of witnesses had gone into the fraud with Joe to make money by deceiving the world. They had to help carry out the fraud. If Joe had ever had any plates they would have been exhibited most ostentatiously to the world, like the pretended *fac simile*, and the papyri that it is pretended were translated in the Book of Abraham. Joe and his twelve confederates lied. He never had anything but Rigdon's manuscript which was a revision of Spaulding's manuscript. This he read as he sat behind the curtain, or handed portions of it out at other times.

I assert that the entire gang engaged in carrying out the fraud, were a pack of liars on account of their contradictory yarns. I defy my opponent to take the stories of the fourteen witnesses separately, and select an important statement in the testimony of any of the fourteen that I cannot show that it is contradicted by other witnesses, and that in almost every instance the witness contradicts the statement elsewhere.

1. Material of the plates. We are told they are "Pure Gold," "Gold," "Looked like gold," "Were brass."

II. Description of the Book of Plates. Impostor Joe says they were fastened together at the back by three rings, each ring running through every plate, and that a part were sealed. David Whitmer says they had been cut across the middle, and the half of each plate next the rings was soldered to the others. He does not tell us whether the loose half was fastened to the half from which it had been cut or not. Martin Harris gave a dozen different descriptions. The eight witnesses tell us that the leaves Joe had translated were

loose, separated from what he had not translated. That they hefted, saw and handled what he had translated, and did not see the rest. S. H. Smith says the whole book was together, as Impostor Joe and Whitmer declared and he saw it weighed. Emma Smith says they lay loose on her table covered with a cloth, not fastened together nor sealed, nor soldered, and she felt of them in that condition.

III. Where were they kept? Joe's mother says he kept them in a hollow tree, a box, in a cooper shop, in the woods, buried in the ground. Joe had them in his possession all the time; then again he did not. The angel brought to him the entire pile when he began translating, and took it away as he ceased, each time. The angel brought each plate as Joe began to translate it, and took it away as he finished it. Joe had the plates in the book by him as he translated; he had the plates lying loose under a cloth; he did not have them by him; they were in his trunk; in the woods; in the ground; in the care of the angel; nobody knew where. He had them and showed them to the eight witnesses; he did not have them and an angel had to bring them from heaven, or some other place, and show them to three witnesses. It required a miracle, a wonderful miracle, to enable the three to see them. The eight saw, handled and hefted, without any angel or miracle. Joe could show them as he could a pile of his wife's dinner plates. Emma Smith saw them covered with a cloth, and felt of them as she did of her tin pans. It was death to look on them, unless prepared, by miracle for the sight. Emma Smith saw them under a cloth, felt of them. Whitmer saw them lying in his father's field. Old Moroni let his (Whitmer's) mother have a squint at them in the barn. The eight saw, handled and hefted them, like shingles, and nobody "hurled." When outsiders wanted to see the plates, Joe told them the angel had them. He only had them while translating, or he had only one plate at a time, while translating. Or the Lord would not let him show them. Or it was death to look on them. Or it required a miracle to enable one to see them. When the Mormon's are lying and telling that they saw them and knew all about them, then Joe had them all the time, they saw them, and handled them, felt of them, saw them weighed; they lay on the table and were handled like dinner plates.

IV. Joe at first only told of finding plates. This was his tale for months. Then a breast-plate, and interpreters. His mother says breast-plate and interpreters. She says the breast-plate was gold, Joe says brass. Then Joe told of breast-plate, interpreters, brass compass and sword. The story kept growing all the time. Had

Joe lived long enough he would have added the entire twenty-four articles mentioned in the Book of Mormon, and manufactured a perfect museum in addition.

V. What the three witnesses saw. They declare they saw the plates. They mention nothing else in their testimony. Joe in his revelation, fabricated in Kirtland in 1835, declares that they shall see the brass director, the interpreters, the breast-plate, and sword. Whitmer says afterwards they saw all this and piles of plates and other things besides. Harris says the sword was gold. The Book of Mormon says it was steel.

VI. Whose interpreters did Joe use? Joe says, the interpreters of Jared's brother. The Book of Mormon says they were not to come forth until after the conversion of the Gentiles. That Mormon had Mosiah's interpreters, not Jared's brother's. That Mormon buried Mosiah's interpreters years before Moroni buried Joe's plates and in another place.

VII. Description of the stone interpreters. Granny Smith says they were three-pointed diamonds, set in glass plates—glass at the time of confusion of tongues—the plates set in silver spectacle bows—spectacles at the Tower of Babel. Harris and others say that they were two cloudy stones, so large that a man could look through only one, and could look through one with both eyes, set in gold spectacle bows, making an enormous pair of spectacles. Emma Smith says it was Joe's peep-stone that he used in peeping for treasure. Her father says the same. Impostor Joe told Willard Chase that it was the peep-stone he stole from his children.

VIII. How translation was done. Neighbors declare that they were told when it was going on, that Joe sat behind a screen, a blanket. So Harris told Anthon. So all Mormons said at first. Emma Smith says he did not. He sat in her kitchen, at her kitchen table. Whitmer says that Joe looked through one of those opaque stones of the big spectacles, at the plates, as they lay before him. Emma Smith says that he looked into his peep stone placed in his hat. Her father says the same. She says the plates lay beside him on the table. Whitmer says before him, and he read them through the stone in one of the rims of the big spectacles. Others say that he did not have the plates by him. His father-in-law says that Joe said they were were in the woods, and he peeped into his hat crown through his peep stone. Some say the angel gave him one plate at a time, and he read it. Others, he had all of the book. Some say that as he looked into his peep stone the Lord caused the translation to appear one word at a time. When Joe called it out it disappeared, and another word appeared. That was the most common yarn. Harris said Joe copied the characters himself, as he sat behind the screen, and handed out the leaves to an outsider. S. H. Smith says he announced each word as it appeared, by miracle, before him, and the

scribe copied it. Some say he sat behind a screen and called out. Emma Smith says he sat at her kitchen table.

IX. Where the plates were found. Impostor Joe said in a hole where he had dug for treasure; sometimes one, sometimes another. Finally, years afterwards, he tells us of a strong stone vault around the plates. Where is that vault now? Where are those stone slabs? Did anyone ever see them, or tell of them until twenty years after Joe should have had his first vision?

X. Joe never told of his first vision in 1823, or until he began to tell of his second vision in 1827.

XI. He said at first he went alone and got the plates and told no yarn about an assault on him. Then he said his wife was with him. That he and his wife went in a wagon, and that he carried his spade and crow-bar that he used in digging for treasure. His mother says he went with his wife in Mr. Knight's wagon. Then Joe says he went alone, on foot, and was assaulted by two ruffians. One had a club, and he knocked the ruffian down. His mother says he was assaulted some time afterwards, as he was changing the hiding place of his plates, and one of the ruffians had a gun, and knocked Joe down with it, and he was crazy for some hours after it. Orson Pratt says he used a rail to pry off the stone top. Joe said nothing at first about a stone cover or vault, and when he did, he said he used a crow-bar.

XII. Size of the plates. Joe says they were seven inches by eight, and the thickness of common tin. The Book of Mormon covers 545 closely printed pages of solid Minion. It would require at least 2,000 closely written pages of foolscap to contain it. It would require one page of the plates to each page of the manuscript, if half of the plates were sealed, as Whitmer declares; or it would require 1,000 plates if none were sealed to contain the Book of Mormon. That would be a pile of plates over four feet high. If we reduce it by half, it would be a pile over two feet high. If gold, it would weigh 750 pounds. If brass, about 250. If gold, it would be worth \$75,000. Joe tells us that he carried this pile of plates, a sword, a monstrous breast-plate, brass compass, the big spectacles, all hid in his frock; fought off two men, one armed with a club, knocked one down, and ran two miles, with a load of more than half a ton, if plates, breastplate and sword were gold; or more than three hundred pounds if they were brass. According to his mother, Pratt, Impostor Joe, his wife and other Mormons, this pile of plates, weighing hundreds of pounds, worth nearly a hundred thousand dollars, with gold sword, a huge gold breastplate, were in a box, a trunk, in a hollow tree, a barrel of beans, in the woods. The plates were in the field, on the table, lying around loose. If they lay around, and Joe could show them so freely, why did he not hand them down to others? Why cannot we see them as we can the papyrus

of the Book of Abraham? Why not the plates instead of a scrawl fabricated and called a *fac simile* of what was on them? If Joe ever had any plates they would be on exhibition like the papyrus of the Book of Abraham in the *fac simile* scrawl.

We repeat our assertion that Joe lied when he said he found any plates. His absurd and grossly contradictory stories prove it. The fact that he never showed them to any one proves it. The fact that they are not on exhibition with the papyrus of Abraham shows it. He did buy a papyrus. It is on exhibition. The three witnesses deliberately lied. Their character, their interest in the fraud and their contradictory stories prove it. The eight witnesses lied. Their character, their interest in the fraud, and their subsequent lies and contradictory stories prove it. Whitmer's mother lied when she said Moroni showed her the plates, or he lied when he said she said so, as he lied when told of seeing the plates in a field, and told of angels sowing plaster, plowing land and tugging plates around. Emma Smith lied when she said Joe translated in her kitchen, and the plates lay on the table covered with a thin table-cloth, and she felt of them, and, strange daughter of Eve that she was, never peeked! Or those lie who say she told such a story. Every witness is contradicted in every statement by other witnesses, and contradicts his own story in almost every particular.

The Book of Mormon lacks every particle of evidence that a book claiming inspiration should have. Let us contrast it with the Bible. The Book of Genesis is composed of thirteen old books. In all of the oldest religions of the world are found fragments of these books. In some instances the books almost entire can be quoted from old religions. These fragments can be traced to the confusion of tongues. There is nothing of the Book of Mormon that can be traced beyond Joe Smith, Sidney Rigdon and Solomon Spaulding. The Pentateuch has been attributed to Moses by Israelite literature for over 3,000 years. It has been attributed to Moses in Gentile literature 2,500 years. In its names, places, customs and description of surroundings it interlocks with the history, surroundings and literature of the age to which it is ascribed. There is nothing of this kind in the Book of Mormon. Israelite customs, religion, government, and life were a series of monumental institutions, based on its events, especially its supernatural events. Nothing of the kind do we observe in the Book of Mormon. The historical books, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah recorded a history that interlocks with surrounding geography, history, customs and literature. Nothing of this kind is there in the Book of Mormon. Its literature, Ruth, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song, refer to surrounding nations, geography, customs, literature, and quote the Israelite history and the Book of Moses. There is

nothing of this in the Book of Mormon. Israelite history was a wonderful element in the world's history, prominent in it, interlocking with it at every point. The Book of Mormon is the exact reverse of this.

Our Saviour and his apostles appeared in a learned, sceptical, and critical age. They lived and worked in the most open public manner. Their work and writings were quoted by enemies, discussed, attacked by enemies, until they can be reproduced largely from them. The life and course of millions were formed by them. They revolutionized the world. As a message to the world, they were delivered in the world. Monumental institutions based on their miracles have existed from their day. The Old and New Testament contain many wonderful prophecies. Great numbers of eye witnesses of the miracles of the Bible died for their testimony. Those who claimed inspiration in the Bible wrought miracles, prophesied, displayed divine knowledge of what unaided reason could not know. Not a particle of this can be claimed for the Book of Mormon. Though full of miracles, of such a character, that Bible miracles are child's play, and meagre in number, in comparison; they are all put back into the wilds of America, and have no more connection with anything else in the world's history, or career of humanity, than Vernet's "Trip to the Moon" and its description of the wonders and the inhabitants of the Moon.

The Book of Mormon has every feature of a fraud. Mohammed, like all impostors, avoids all contact with the actual life of men, in his visions. He avoids all tests. He tells us what he saw in vision, or what was revealed to him. No one else knows anything about it. So does Impostor Joe. Swift in his "Gulliver's Travels," Baron Munchausen; Moore in his "Utopia," Wilkins in his "Flying Islanders;" all avoid mentioning a place, a person or an incident of which anyone knows a particle. They avoid contact with history, geography, literature, known surroundings. So does the Book of Mormon. Spaulding dropped the fiction that the aborigines of America were Romans, as dangerous; because it brought him too near to actual history. The absurd tale that plates were hid by Divine direction, revealed by Divine revelation, to such a character as Joe Smith, in such surroundings, stamps it as a fraud. The clumsy machinery of plates, the clumsy contrivance of stone interpreters, their needless use, the needless contrivance of plates, when each word was caused to appear before Joe by a miracle, stamp it as a clumsy fraud. Why did God not give it by inspiration, as he did the Bible to its prophets? Or reveal it in vision? What need of plates when Joe did not look on them at all? According to some he did not have them in the house with him. What need of stone interpreters when a miracle gave the translation word by word?

It is evident that finding glyphs suggested

the idea of pretending to find plates. That Joe's lying tricks, with his stolen peep stone, suggested the idea of pretending to translate the plates by means of the peep stone, which was enlarged into Jared's interpreters, two great diamonds, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, set in plates of glass, before glass was dreamed of, and and these set in spectacle bows, thousands of years before such contrivances were thought of. Such is Granny Smith's yarn.

The atmosphere of fraud, money-hunting, lying, and contradictions in which the Book of Mormon began, stamps it as a fraud. The trickery of concealment behind a curtain, the use of a peep stone, the lies about plates, that never existed, Joe's lying revelations to keep up the cheat—to keep his dupes and confederates at work, the absurd lies of Joe, of his mother, of his father, of the Whitmers, of Harris, show that it was a fraud of the lowest and clumsiest character. Spiritism resorts to cabinets, dark circles, concealment, tricks, and every device of fraud. Impostor Joe resorted to machinery, concealment, and every device of fraud. Spiritism has its dark circle, its cabinet. Joe had his blanket screen. Spiritism has its tin horns to whisper through, its writing in the dark, its mediums to act through. Joe had his needless plates, his needless interpreters, and his lies about the impossibility of persons seeing plates or interpreters. Just as spiritism has its lies about spirits not being able to manifest themselves in the light. There are just the same evidences of lying, fraud, concealment, selfishness, meanness, desire of gain, power and gratification of lust, in Mormonism that there is in every fraud.

Was Joe Smith a prophet? Did he display superhuman power? We defy our opponent to give a single instance. Did he display superhuman knowledge? I defy my opponent to mention one prophecy, one idea that he gave to the world, that it did not have. Did he attest his work by miracles? Not a single one. Does prophecy foretell him or his work? Not in a single instance. Does he fulfill prophecy? Not unless it be that which celebrates that liars and deceivers shall arise and deceive men. Was his character such as God would choose to inaugurate work. A Noah, an Abraham, a Moses, a Samuel, an Elijah, an Isaiah, an Ezra, a John the Baptist, a Paul, a Luther, a Calvin, a Wesley, a Campbell? Did God choose as his last and greatest agent to give to the world the last and best dispensation a lazy, loafing, lying, drunken, stealing, swearing, money-hunting fraud, an ignominious, a notorious liar, venter of absurd petty ghost stories, an obscene blackguard, a notorious libertine? Did Jehovah through such a character give revelations about Joe's house, his wife's work, his stores, farms, and every contemptible little emergency as the "Fullness of the Gospel?" Was Jehovah the lackey of Joe Smith to keep him supplied with scribes, a house, to transact his business, to run stores, shops, land offices and speculations, printing houses, taverns?

Who will dare to blaspheme the infinite Jehovah by suggesting such blasphemy?

While Smith was living in Kirtland, a showman visited Kirtland with some Egyptian mummies. There were papyrus rolls and other articles with Egyptian characters on them, that had been found with the mummies. As soon as he saw them Joe was seized with a spell of revelation. He declared that one of the mummies was Pharaoh's daughter. Joe had evidently not learned that Pharaoh was no more a proper name, than Czar is a proper name of a Russian Emperor. He announced that one of the papyri was written by Abraham. He once gave as proof of this, the statement that papyrus had not been used since Abraham's days. Joe translated one of the papyri. The showman, who knew as much about it as a goat, gave Joe a certificate that he had translated it correctly. Joe gave the showman a certificate that his mummies were genuine, and the farce was completed, when Showman Joe bought of the other showman his mummies, and sent his mother out to exhibit them and lecture on them. Joe published, under the title of the "Book of Abraham," his pretended translation of the papyrus. Unfortunately he published with it fac-similes of certain cuts and paintings that he had translated. An Egyptologist got hold of it and shows that Joe's translation is a humbug and not correct in a single particular. Joe's Book of Abraham is a shameless fraud, and so is his Book of Mormon.

Mormonism has been cautiously and constantly revising this work of inspiration. The work was engraved on the plates by the Divine command of the Lord. Its engravers assure us that they were inspired, full of the Spirit, in this work of engraving. The Lord, by miracle, gave each word of the translation to Impostor Joe. Inspired Joe announced each word separately to Inspired Oliver, who wrote each word down. Inspired Joe, Oliver and Hiram read the proofs. If ever a work should be perfect it should be this Book of Mormon. But Mormons have been revising it, in every edition, and will continue such revision until Mormonism is dead. On the title page of the Palmyra edition we have "Joseph Smith, Jr., Author and Proprietor," also "Printed for the author." The revised edition reads, "Translated by Joseph Smith, Jr." The copyright of the Palmyra edition says Joseph Smith is "Author and Proprietor," and he signs himself "Author" to the preface. He is called "author and proprietor" in the testimony of eight witnesses. Thus in four instances, written by Smith himself, he is called "Author" in flat contradiction to the assertion that he is merely translator. This blunder of Inspired Joe is corrected. Moroni's epistle or introduction is, in violation to all printer's rules, put on the title page. This was done by Divine command against the protest of the printer. That blunder of Inspired Joe has been corrected.

In Moroni's introduction we have nine

words altered. Second line, Palmyra edition, "which;" revised edition, "who." The Lord is learning grammar. End of paragraph 1st, Palmyra ed., "Book of Ether;" rev. ed., "Gift of God." Second paragraph, 1st line, Palmyra ed., "which;" rev. ed., 2d line, "who." Palmyra ed., 4th line, "how;" rev. ed., 5th line, "what." Palmyra ed., 7th line, "be fault;" rev. ed., 9th line, "are faults." Palmyra ed., 8th line, "it be the mistake;" rev. ed., 9th line, "they are the mistakes." In the testimony of the three witnesses, Palmyra ed., 6th line, "his;" rev. ed., 6th line, "their." Palmyra ed., 7th line, "which;" rev. ed., 7th line, "who." In the testimony of the eight witnesses, 2d and 3d lines, "Joseph Smith, Author and Proprietor;" rev. ed., 3d line, "Translator." In the Palmyra edition is a ridiculous, blundering "Preface," by the inspired "Author." The Mormon Deity had not yet learned what had become of the 116 pages lost. He inspired Joe to tell how he circumvented a trick nobody ever thought of by substituting a translation of the plates of Nephi for the translation of the plates of Lehi, that had been stolen, until he reached the point in the plates of Lehi where the stolen translation ceased, and then finishing with the plates of Lehi and telling a barefaced lie in publishing the whole as a translation of the plates of Nephi. The Mormon Deity has learned that Lucy Harris burnt 116 pages, and that he had made a fool of himself in his lying trickery, and that lying blunder is revised out.

The revised edition has an index of eight pages, a caption over the first book, paragraphs are numbered, and at the top of each page the chapter is printed. The Mormon Deity is learning the printer's trade as well as grammar. Chap. 1st, in the heading, 17th line, Palmyra edition, "They call the place;" rev. ed., "they called the name of the place." First paragraph, 10th line, Palmyra ed., "to be true;" rev. ed., "is true." Seventieth paragraph, 6th line, Palmyra ed., "is;" rev. ed., "are." Nineteenth line, Palmyra ed., "after that I;" rev. ed., "after I." Paragraph ten, 5th line, Palmyra ed., "is over all them;" rev. ed., "are over all those." Eleventh paragraph, 2d line, Palmyra ed., "sayeth;" rev. ed., "said." Paragraph thirteenth, Palmyra ed., "and he departed;" rev. ed., "and departed." Palmyra ed., 7th line, "which

was;" rev. ed., "which are." Fourteenth paragraph, 2d line, Palmyra ed.; "beside a river;" rev. ed., "by the side of a river." Palmyra ed., 4th line, "he made;" rev. ed., "made." Fifteenth paragraph, 9th line, Palmyra ed., "because that he was;" rev. ed., "because he was." Palmyra ed., 10th line, "that he had led;" rev. ed., "and had led." Palmyra ed., 10th line, "and to perish;" rev. ed., "to perish." Palmyra ed., 20th line, "sought;" rev. ed., "who sought." Paragraph 16th, 5th line, Palmyra ed., "did do;" rev. ed., "do." We have now cited each change of a word, with other changes, and many important changes, and we have not finished the fourth page. If the changes continue in the same ratio throughout the book, they would amount to over 5,000. Think of the Almighty revising himself in any such style—the Almighty learning grammar and composition. Some of the blunders thus corrected would be outrages on the good sense of a savage. Paragraph 40, Chap. III. of the Book of Nephi, Palmyra ed., reads that the Lord will not suffer that the Gentiles shall destroy the Nephites; nor that the Gentiles remain forever "in that state of awful woundedness which thou beholdest." In the rev. ed. it reads "awful state of blindness." The sense is changed as well as the words, and the blunder could not be a printer's mistake, but is one of Sydney's spread-eagle blunders. Palmyra ed., page 382, has "the numerority of our forces;" 387, "the enormty of our numbers;" 260, "if ye do arrest the scriptures." These atrocities that were given word by word to Joe by the Mormon Deity the Mormon Deity has corrected. The truth is that the ignoramuses Rigdon and Smith perpetrated these atrocities, and would not allow the printer to correct them. In their intercourse with men they learned better, and the assailants of the book pointed them out, and Joe and his successors have revised them out. This one fact that over 5,000 corrections have been made in grammar, composition, thought and teaching in the Book of Mormon, explodes the idea that it was written by inspired men and translated by inspiration. Couple with this the fact that after all this revision the book still remains a monstrosity in its errors, and the claim of inspiration in writing and translating is transcendent blasphemy.

MR. KELLEY'S EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I will first call your attention to one or two things that have been mentioned by the negative, and then proceed to finish my argument, and take up afterwards and more fully examine the objections that have been made.

It seems to me that the difficulty with my opponent is that he is not himself conversant with what is in the books. For instance, he makes considerable sport of the fact that glass should be referred to so far back as the time when the Book of Mormon places it. Why, I took up Dr. Smith's Bible Dictionary to-day and opened at the word glass, and he put it at the time of Joseph in Egypt the first thing, and said that doubtless it went back farther than that; but to that time they were positive having discovered the means that were used as far back as that for blowing glass. And yet, Mr. Braden is making objections here. It seems to me that if he will be a little more critical and inform himself better on some of these points, it will be more to the satisfaction and edification of the audience.

Again, he estimates that a book written closely, (after the manner of the English language, of course), would comprise two thousand pages of manuscript. He forgets to tell you that the plates did not pretend to be written in the English language, and that it was a phonetic system of writing used. Now to contain all of the books, all of the words, that were upon those plates in the phonetic system that the Reporter before me is using, or some other phonetic system, it would not take two thousand pages nor anything like two thousand pages. Yet, that is the way he gets his mule's load. But how about Spaulding's 48 sheets, if it would take two thousand pages? I asked him to explain this before by showing the inconsistency in the Spaulding claim, but he has never noticed it. I have showed clearly from Howe's own words that this 48-page manuscript which came into Howe's hands, was the "*Manuscript Found*." It purported to have been found. I did not misrepresent the language of either Howe or Hurlburt. Braden misrepresented me—that is all there is to that. Another way he gets his mule's load is this: He estimates a chunk of solid gold to be so much. Well were the thin leaves of the plates solid gold? And would a book of gold leaves weigh like solid gold? In order to get his 250 pounds he stretches everything. Then he starts out with his mule's load, (250 pounds) and wonders if there is any man in the world that could have done as Joseph Smith says he did. At the same time he takes up the Bible and reads where Samson carried off the gates of Gaza, where he slew his thousands and tens of thousands, where he leaned against the pillar,

and the whole edifice in which they were came down; and he swallows that down easily, and that is certainly a thousand times bigger thing than the 250 pounds load. But he says, there has been so many stories told about this: Well here is the trouble with Mr. Braden. He hunts up these stories that have been told about how they got the plates, and how the plates were translated; goes to all the persons he can find who will tell stories, (but who know nothing) instead of opening the standard works and accepting the statements of those who do know something about it. I could go around and hunt up stories enough that have been told by one people or denomination against others in this country when there has been a conflict, to sink anybody; because when a person gets a little miffed at somebody, it is quite natural to begin to tell stories about him. I remember meeting a gentleman a short time ago, as I was going to Willoughby, (there was also, in the company a Baptist and a Congregationalist Minister,) who was berating Alexander Campbell, and telling all kinds of stories about him; and in order to prove that Campbell was bad, he said that when he went back to Scotland to visit his own home, they would not even allow him to preach in their churches. I said to them, "That is no evidence to me against Mr. Campbell, for as good men as ever lived have been traduced and prohibited from preaching to old neighbors when there was nothing against them." But I can find men who will tell stories about this one and about that one, and often persons who prefer to believe them to the truth, and there are right here persons who have told me since last evening, that some of the parties to whom he referred last evening as knowing certain things against the Saints, they would not believe on oath; but is that any reason that I shall drag their characters before this audience and begin to berate them in that way? That is not the manner to discuss questions properly. Neither is it proper to even make attacks upon the character of parties from stories; because, as you have been shown time and again, the facts of history are such as to show that as soon as you assume that position you destroy the foundation of the Bible which is the agreed standard of truth in this controversy. Now there were and are now, just as many different stories told with regard to the resurrection of Jesus, and the way that the Disciples moved along in their work as ministers after his resurrection, as there is about the plates and the angel that visited Mr. Smith. There were many different stories told about what Paul said when he was converted, and we have two different stories as to some things which occurred then handed down in the Bible. And yet

he wants one straight forward story with regard to the plates from which the Book of Mormon was translated, notwithstanding the fact that the same evil power is in the world to make stories to-day as in the first century. I could take up the seventh chapter of Kings and read to you a story from that single chapter, which is in fact bigger than any in any two chapters in the Book of Mormon. It states that Elisha died and after he was dead he prophesied to the king and got mad because the king did not do to suit him. There was more power in his bones after he was dead than there was when he was alive, because they let a dead man down into his grave, and the corpse touched the bones of Elisha, and the man arose and stood upon his feet as soon as the bones of Elisha touched him. It makes Elisha out to have died twice. Makes him talk after he did die to the king who came to visit him. Gives to his dead bones more power than it did to them while alive. And yet we have "stories." That is no argument, no way to debate. The things that I cite are in the standard—the Bible. I am yet with that. If Mr. Braden's style of telling stories and asserting is the way that this question is to be tried, I might as well go away from my argument and the clear proofs that I have brought, because all the answer he makes to them is, why there is not a prophecy that says anything about it, right in the face of the fact that I have cited more than 40 prophecies that are directly in point, and he has not shown that I have misapplied a single one of them. Another thing: He says that David Whitmer told different stories. I deny that he ever did. I know persons say that he did tell different stories, but they are the same kind of persons who told different stories about Joseph Smith. They believed that he was an impostor, and in order to put it down they believed that anything that they could do against him would be proper; and they were ready to lie or even steal, and willing to hatch and tell stories to put the impostor as they called him down, or to do anything else to put him down, no difference how or what it was. I will now read you the statement of David Whitmer made quite recently, and you will see that the statement that he once denied his testimony is entirely false.

The statement that Oliver Cowdery denied his testimony and he did not confirm it upon his deathbed too, is wholly false. The statement that Martin Harris had denied his testimony at some time was false. Martin Harris ever stood by his testimony, and confirmed it the last act and speech of his life. David Whitmer's statement September 15th, 1882, to Wm. H. Kelley, G. A. Blakeslee, of Gallen, Michigan, and others is as follows:

"Elder Whitmer remarked that he did not feel much like talking as he had not been feeling well for some time. He appeared feeble. He is now upwards of seventy-six years of age, having been born January 7th, 1805. He is of medium height, and rather of a slender build; but this appearance may be on ac-

"count of age and recent illness. He has darkish brown eyes, and his hair is white and thin. Has a good head and honest face. He talks with ease and seemed at home with every subject suggested; and without an effort, seemingly went on to amplify upon it, so that we had nothing to do but question, suggest and listen. His intellect is far more vigorous and retentive than we expected to find. He is careful in his speech, for he studies to express himself in such a way as not to be misrepresented. A reporter called to see him some time ago, asked a few questions and went off and published that he had denied his testimony concerning the truth of the Book of Mormon. This hurt him so that he is very careful now to have some known friends present when strangers call to see him. This accounts for the presence of others when we were there."

Speaking of Joseph Smith the Seer, he said, and this is very nearly his wording:

"It makes no difference what others say I know Joseph Smith was a prophet of God, and he translated the Book of Mormon by the inspiration of God from the plates of the Nephites."

Let me say in this connection that all these assertions that there was a curtain between these parties, and that he was secluded, are false in all their particulars, and the statements that one told this thing to a certain one, and that thing to a certain one, are simply the lies that were conjured up against these parties in New York by those who wished to injure them. The parties never told any such thing as that themselves. And yet that is what we have before this audience. He further said:—

"Some people think if they can only make it appear that Joseph's life and character were not perfect and that he had human weaknesses, that it would prove that he was not a prophet, yet the same persons will believe that Moses who killed the Egyptian, and David who had Uriah killed, and who took a multitude of wives, and Solomon who was a polygamist and idolator; and Peter who lied and cursed, etc., were all prophets, and should be honored and respected. What the individual life of Joseph Smith was after he translated the Book of Mormon, has nothing to do with the question as to whether he was, or was not inspired to bring that book forth."

"Do you know anything against his character?"

"I know nothing against him. I have heard some things, these I know nothing about. I have nothing to say about the character of any one only as I know."
1. Is not my mission to talk about the character of any My mission is to testify concerning the truth of the coming forth of the work of God."

"What kind of a man was he when you knew him personally?"

"He was a religious and straightforward man. He had to be: for he was illiterate and he could do nothing of himself. He had to trust in God. He could not translate unless he was humble and possessed the right feelings towards every one. To illustrate so you can see. One morning when he was getting ready to continue the translation, something went wrong about the house and he was put out about it. Something that Emma, his wife had done. Oliver and I went up stairs and Joseph came up soon after to continue the translation, but he could not do anything. He could not translate a single syllable. He went down stairs, out into the orchard, and made supplication to the Lord; was gone about an hour—came back to the house, asked Emma's forgiveness and then came up stairs where we were and then the translation went on all right. He could do nothing save he was humble and faithful."

He could do nothing save he was humble and faithful—as reputable a man as there is in the United States to-day—David Whitmer—as I shall show you by the statement of more than twenty-five witnesses, a Judge of the Courts of the State of Missouri, and men living where he lives in Richmond, Ray county, Mo.

His statement concerning the vision they had of the plates and the angel was as follows:

"I was plowing in the field one morning, and Joseph and Oliver came along with a revelation, stating that 'I was to be one of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon. I got over the fence and we went out to the woods, near by and sat down on a log and talked awhile. We then knelt down and prayed. Joseph prayed. We then got up and sat on the log and were talking, when all at once a light came down from above us and encircled us for quite a little distance around; and the angel stood before us."

This was in the day time. No jugglery, no slight of hand about this. Martin Harris was not present at this time, and he was not present when the other two saw what they declare here. Now he describes the angel.

"He was dressed in white, and spoke and called me by name, and said: 'Blessed is he that keepeth his commandments.' This is all that I heard the angel say. A table was set before us, and on it the records were placed. The records of the Nephites from which the Book of Mormon was translated, the brass plates, the ball of directors, the sword of Laban, and other Plates. While we were viewing them, the voice of God spoke out of heaven saying the book was true and the translation correct."

I now offer you the irrefutable testimony of David Whitmer as published in the Chicago Times in the year 1881, which will fully refute the false and slanderous stories which so many have sought to circulate against him, and which my opponent deals so largely in. Also what the first men of the county in which he lives say about him. It is headed "*A Proclamation*," and reads as follows:

"Unto all Nations. Kindred, Tongues and People unto whom these presents shall come:

It having been represented by one John Murphy, of Polo, Cadwell county, Missouri, that I in a conversation with him last summer, denied my testimony as one of the three witnesses to the Book of Mormon.

To the end, therefore, that he may understand me now, if he did not then, and that the world may know the truth, I wish now, standing as it were in the very sunset of life, and in the fear of God, once for all, to make this public statement:

That I have never at any time denied that testimony or any part thereof, which has so long since been published with that book, as one of the three witnesses. Those who know me best, well know that I have always adhered to that testimony. And that no man may be misled or doubt my present views in regard to the same, I do again affirm the truth of all my statements as then made and published.

"He that hath an ear to hear let him hear; It was no delusion! What is written is written, and he that readeth let him understand.

And that no one may be deceived or misled by this statement, I wish here to state that I do not endorse polygamy or spiritual wifeism. It is a great evil, shocking to the moral sense, and the more so because practiced in the name of religion. It is of man and not of God, and is especially forbidden in the Book of Mormon itself?

And if any man doubt, should he not carefully and honestly read and understand the same, before presuming to sit in judgment and condemning the light which shineth in darkness, and showeth the way of eternal life as pointed out by the unerring hand of God.

In the Spirit of Christ who hath said: "Follow thou me, for I am the life, the light, and the way." I submit this statement to the world. God in whom I trust being my Judge, as to the sincerity of my motives and the faith and hope that is in me of eternal life.

My sincere desire is that the world may be benefited by this plain and simple statement of the truth.

And all the honor be to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, which is one God. Amen.

DAVID WHITMER, SR
RICHMOND, MO., March 19th, 1881.

TESTIMONIAL OF CITIZENS.

We, the undersigned citizens of Richmond, Ray county, Missouri, where David Whitmer, Sr., has re-

sided since the year 1838, certify that we have been long and intimately acquainted with him and know him to be a man of the highest integrity, and of undoubted truth and veracity:

A. W. Doniphan.

G. W. Dunn, Judge of the Fifth Judicial Circuit.
T. D. Woodson, President of Ray Co. Savings Bank.

Back.

J. T. Child, Editor of Conservator.

H. C. Garner, Cashier of Ray Co. Savings Bank.

W. A. Holman, County Treasurer.

J. S. Hughes, Banker, Richmond.

James Hughes, Banker, Richmond.

D. P. Whitmer, Attorney at Law.

Jas. W. Black, Attorney at Law.

L. C. Cantwell, Postmaster, Richmond.

George I. Wasson, Mayor.

Jas. A. Davis, County Collector.

C. J. Hughes, Probate Judge and Presiding Jus-

tice of Ray County Court.

George W. Trigg, County Clerk.

W. W. Mosby, M. D.

Thomas McGinnis, ex-Sheriff, Ray County.

J. P. Quisenberry, Merchant.

W. R. Holman, Furniture Merchant.

Louis Slaughter, Recorder of Deeds.

Geo. W. Buchanan, M. D.

A. K. Reburn.

Given at Richmond, Mo., this March 19th, 1881."

Also the following terse statement from the Conservator a newspaper published in the State of Missouri, and opposed to the religion of Mr. Whitmer:

AN EXPLANATION.

"Elsewhere we publish a letter from David Whitmer, Sr., and old and well known citizen of Ray, as well as an indorsement of his standing as a man signed by a number of leading citizens of this community, in reply to some unwarranted aspersions made upon him.

"There is no doubt that Mr. Whitmer, who was one of the three witnesses to the authenticity of the gold plates from which he asserts that Joe Smith translated the Book of Mormon (a fac-simile of the characters he has now in his possession with the original records), is firmly convinced of its divine origin, and while he makes no efforts to obtrude his views or beliefs, he simply wants the world to know that so far as he is concerned there is no variability or shadow of turning. Having resided here for nearly a half a century it is with no little pride that he points to his past record with the consciousness that he has done nothing derogatory to his character as a citizen and a believer of the son of Mary to warrant such an attack upon him, come from what source it may and now with the lilies of seventy-five winters crowning him like an aureole and his pilgrimage on earth well nigh ended, he reiterates his former statements, and with leave-futurity to solve the problem, that he was but a passing witness of its fulfillment. His attacks on the vileness that has sprung up with the Utah Church must have a salutary effect upon those bigamists who have made adultery the corner stone in the edifice of their belief."—Conservator, March 24, 1881.

Let me call your attention now to another thing that has been stated with regard to the manuscript of this book, as it was when carried to the printer, and it was Major Gilbert's statement, so Mr. Braden said. I showed you what Major Gilbert's statement was as it was published two years ago. Yesterday I telegraphed to David Whitmer, who has in his possession the original manuscript from which the Book of Mormon was printed, and asked him to examine that manuscript and telegraph to me whether in it the proper names and the sentences began with capital letters, and whether there was any punctuation marks; and this is his answer:

RICHMOND, MO., FEBRUARY 20.

"E. L. Kelley, Kirtland Ohio:—There are capital letters beginning proper names and sentences, and all necessary punctuation marks in the original manuscript.
(Signed) DAVID WHITMER."

And yet, we have been told here that there was no such thing, and a witness cited to prove it. It makes no difference how many stories have been told about this, by one person and another, when a man goes and looks at the original manuscript, that was in the printer's hands he can certainly tell how it was, unless the telegram gets crooked on the way.

I had just closed with Paul's declaration of the fullness of times that is to be ushered in, recorded in Ephesians 1:10, or the dispensation that should be crowned with the coming and glory of Jesus Christ and the resurrections of the Saints; and was showing by the prophets the time of this handing out of God's word and will, or dispensation, when my time expired. This argument I will now conclude.

The stick of Joseph was to be brought to light in a day of storms and tempests, and floods and fires, and wickedness all over the land; and of earthquakes and famines and disease; of distress and perplexity; of pride and vanity, of wickedness and defiance of God; of denying the principle and the power of true religion. A day when the sea and the waves would roar and sweep beyond their bounds, and men's hearts would fail them for fear, looking after those things coming on the earth.

Bad men may scoff and slander and devils may oppose, but the decree of God is, it shall go forth, and "none shall hinder it."

Lebanon has already begun her increase, and the work described must be in progress some place, unless the entire prophecies have failed.

This evening I will introduce the evidence I referred to upon a previous occasion upon the fact of the return of "the *early* and *latter*," rains to the country of Lebanon, showing that within the last few years the event spoken of in the prophecies must have taken place. The "ensign," "the standard," "the stick of Joseph," "the everlasting gospel," the book which would contain this Gospel has been published with the message, "Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgment has come." This is the message of the Book of Mormon. Is it a bad thing? The following is the statements of good authorities upon the condition of Palestine:

"It (Palestine) has the same bright sun and unclouded sky, as well as the *early* and *latter* rain, "which, however, is diminished in quantity owing to the destruction of the trees."—Chambers Encyclopedia, vol. 7, page 11, Palestine.

"I arrived in India a few days since, from the Eastern continent. I stopped at Joppa for nearly the whole winter. For my part I was well pleased with the country. It is certainly a land of most wonderful fruitfulness, with a delightful climate, producing everything, if properly cultivated, and from two to three crops a year. They have grain, fruits and vegetables all the year round; in fact I never was in such a country before. I have seen much good country in Europe and America, but none to compare with Palestine: its fruitfulness is uncommon, and the climate is the most delightful; even in the winter I did not see the least sign of frost, and vegetables of every sort were growing in profusion in gardens. It is a fact that the rain and dew are restored; recently in 1855, the former and the latter rains were restored to the astonishment of the natives. The Jews have been returning to the Holy Land for some time

"and are increasing, going to their beloved Canaan from many parts of Europe, Asia and Africa. They are making preparations to rebuild cities and (build) railroads. The fruit in Palestine is better than in Europe and America. They have camels, mules, horses, asses, cattle, sheep and goats; but I saw no hogs. The natives are generally friendly."—Louis Van Buren, Sen., Nov. 14th. A. D. 1867.

These are ample to satisfy the most skeptical upon this point.

Now I will take up the supposed objections that he has cited and examine them, and should I omit a single one that you wish still further examined and considered, any person in the audience will do me a favor by calling attention to the fact, and I shall yet notice it. I have already shown the weakness of the criticism upon the word "thereof," that he has tried to make against the book. Wherever it is used it is plain to be understood, and the worst criticism that can be made against it, is that the brother of Jared in his description of the vessels and narration of what he did, does not seem to have conformed to Mr. Braden's ideas of "excellency of speech." Evidently the brother of Jared was a true mechanic as he is represented in the book. It don't make any difference to Braden what habits of talking or writing the brother of Jared had, whether he used a superfluous, modifying or other word; when it is translated into English the correction must be made in the original. Now, sir, I will show the absurdity of this profound criticism upon the translation of the Book of Mormon. I will ask you this question: Had the translator a right to leave out a word, put in a word, or change anything in the original, that it might appear with "excellency of speech" in English? Again, had it been done, could not the translation have been questioned with more propriety and upon stronger grounds, than in its present shape? And would not you yourself have criticised it for that very reason; claiming that the translator, Smith, in order to put it in the best English left out some superfluous modifier, word, phrase or sentence in the original, and you did not know whether such modifier, if left to remain, would have changed the sense or not. Will you answer these questions? But Braden says, that the errors in translating from the Greek, Hebrew, etc., do not appear in the English when translated. If the error consists in omissions, superfluous words or phrases, why do they not? Will he answer this? Is it not because the translator into English left the same out or added a word to make the reading smooth in English thus Anglicizing it? Herein lies the difficulty of Bible translators, and we have different translations. There is not, neither, always a corresponding word in the original to the English word and vice versa. The Book of Mormon claims to be a correct translation of what was written upon the plates; not a translation of the writings of the plates corrected. And hence for Mr. Braden to object to the use of the word "thereof," in the book, he must, to be able to make a point against the translation, show that the error was not in the original and that the

word "thereof," as translated is not the English word corresponding to such original word. By a careful reading of the Book of Mormon we readily see that this is the correct position. Where there is given a description or narration of a matter by the writer in his own language, we are met with common expressions upon which so much silly criticism has been made. But where we have the translation from other records as the prophecy of Isaiah which the people brought with them to this continent, "the words of Jesus," etc., as given in his own language, the errors do not appear, unless per chance there was an error also in the writing down of the original. The translation in the Book of Mormon of Isaiah's words, was not from the Bible original remember, but from an original made about the same time the Bible original was made; whether a copy, duplicate, or how taken, we are not told, nor does it matter; certainly they are sufficiently distinct in translation to show clearly to a critic that one was not copied from the other. Take the 48th chapter of Isaiah which has been referred to; if copied either by Smith or Rigdon, they being the poor scholars that Braden claims that they were, they would have most certainly copied the words thrown in by the translators of King James' version. But upon a comparison there is found to be a difference of nearly fifty words in this single chapter, and in the verse he cited you to prove the copying, there is a difference of eight words. Yet the language in the Book of Mormon that he claims was copied or changed by these unlearned, illiterate persons is strictly proper and correct English.

I will read a single specimen and compare the two:

1. *From the Bible.* "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was, there am I."

2. *The Book of Mormon.* "I have not spoken in secret from the beginning; from the time that it was declared have I spoken."

Here, the idea sought to be expressed, is brought out full and clear; and it is evident that something had been changed or expunged in the Bible original, or that the translation of the sentence was an improper one.

The translation by Robert Lowth, D. D., Bishop of London reads:

"From the beginning I have not spoken in secret: Before the time when it began to exist I had decreed it."

The Bishop of London agrees with the translation in idea and sentiment as in the Book of Mormon. And yet he claims that these "ignoramuses," put it in the Book of Mormon, and makes his objection upon that. Isaiah then was not copied into the Book of Mormon from King James' translation of the Bible. Try again Mr. Braden.

Why does he object then to the rendering of the remainder of the sentence the same as it is in King James' translation, since those who translated it believed they did

so correctly, and they were doubtless as good, if not better Hebrew scholars than we have now, and especially, since the sentiment is correct, and he knows nothing to the contrary than that it accords strictly with the original from which it was taken.

Then he still insists that I shall point out where Peter, or Mark differed in their style in the original, and did not at all times write and speak correct Hebrew. Let him put in my possession some Hebrew written by Peter, or Mark, or Luke, and then it will be time enough to make his wise test.

The idea that is thrown out to this audience that any book of the Bible can be traced away back to the writer is one that cannot be maintained, and he knows that very well. The best that we have is the copies that have been handed down, none of which extend back to within a hundred and fifty years of the writers. And when I quoted from the same persons, through whom they came, on the doctrine of "Laying on of hands" at Wilber, Neb., the same parties in part who must have copied the manuscripts, he denounced the men, and would not believe their statements in history.

The gospels were transcribed by learned men and put into the Greek, and Latin, and in some things changed in the original, in doing so, as I believe and can prove, and will in the proper place. Notwithstanding this, scholars can still detect a difference in the writers in the use of language, etc.

Adam Clark in the manuscripts he was able to examine could detect the difference in style and language, and they were the copies which passed for original; and Paul, though a learned man says, "When I came unto you it was not with *excellency of speech*, or enticing words of man's wisdom;" and this is enough to show me that the language, or speech, of Joseph Smith will not condemn him, nor stand as a criticism against the Book of Mormon.

Paul talked under the power and inspiration of the Holy Ghost to those very people, and yet he says it was not with "excellency of speech," in fine style after man's wisdom. Oh no, but brother Braden wants excellency of speech in the Book of Mormon. "Not with enticing words of man's wisdom," Paul says. But we must reject the Book of Mormon if not in that style of language, according to Braden.

Again it is claimed that the errors, Anglicisms or idioms peculiar to King James' translation of the Bible are copied in the Book of Mormon. This I deny, and will prove to you it is not true.

It is claimed by the Book of Mormon that they had the writings of Moses, Isaiah, etc., on the brass plates which were brought from Jerusalem. If so, in translating into English, the same English word might be used if correct in the translation of the same as used in the Bible, providing the two originals were alike. In translating the Bible there had to be words supplied in order to make smooth English, which were

not in the original language from which the translation was made. Any of you taking your Bibles will soon see what they are, for they are the *italicised* words. These italicised words were supplied by the translators into the English, and were not found in the original. Now in the translation of Isaiah, or the words spoken by Jesus upon this continent, these words, supplied by our Bible translators, are not used by the translator of the Book of Mormon in such a manner as to indicate copying in the least. I have diligently compared chapter after chapter in the Bible and Book of Mormon, and found that such words are very seldom the same in both, and when so, it is in such cases as different scholars translating from the same language, although not known to each other, would necessarily use the same. Besides, evidently the originals slightly differed. In the comparison the proportion of use of such supplied words was forty-eight dissimilar to eleven similar, and nearly every one of the eleven were the pronouns in the first person, or the present tense of the verb to be—words which would have been selected the same, by independent translators, whether they lived as far apart as the continents. The test proves beyond a doubt to the honest examiner that there was no copying unless done by a person thoroughly conversant with both languages, and then it was not a copying of the translation. The scholar who will take and diligently compare the words of Isaiah as translated in the Book of Mormon, with the same book in the Bible, must come to the conclusion that there was no copying and changing unless it was done by a person who was versed in both languages, and he has claimed that neither Smith nor Rigdon were scholars. He must again fall back upon his pious Presbyterian preacher to copy and change the prophecies of Isaiah. The translations show they were independent. And remember, the common expressions of "more history part," etc., do not occur in the translations of the words of Moses, Isaiah, or Jesus, but of the language Moroni used when he was copying the account of the history of the Nephites. Yet, notwithstanding the difference in the wording of the translation in the Book of Mormon and the Bible, the teaching does not differ. What scholar put it in this elegant language? My friends, compare the two for yourselves and you will find that I am right. Then the idea that there are quotations in there from Hebrews and other parts of the New Testament before they were given is not correct. It might be expected that if the same Holy Spirit worked with men and spoke through them on this continent, as wrought upon men on the Eastern, it would in all instances teach like things, and in many give the exact words; and so he may find in scurrying and dividing verses and sentences that there are in a few instances those in the Book of Mormon as in the Bible, or a line in Shakespeare or Cowper; but that proves nothing. In the New Testament we often find words and expres-

sions that were before used by the philosophers and teachers of other nations, and our infidel friends claim them to have been borrowed. But does he believe it? Did Jesus take the sentiment, and in great part the wording of the golden rule from the great Chinese philosopher who lived and wrote 600 years before? I think not. God may reveal a like thing or sentiment to two different persons in the world, and does often, as in the instances of Cornelius and Peter, and Paul and Ananias, and this is a proof and a sure test of a correct claim to inspiration, instead of being against it. But, he says, actually they had the English word Bible before it was in existence. But how? Had he done his duty in stating how, I should not have had to refer to it again. The prophet foresees what would be the mind of the people toward the Book of Mormon, and makes the prediction that when it is brought to light in the last days that its enemies would call it a "Bible;" see Book of Mormon page 105. Not its friends, but its enemies—and how could he have seen otherwise, were he a true prophet? Could it have been a truth had he said they would call it an almanac, or a dictionary? Is not the prophecy a true one? How did Smith know when he was the means under God of translating the plates, and when the work was to be sent forth under the name and title of the "Book of Mormon," that the people would change the title and call it a Bible?

What becomes then of his assertions that Isaiah 2, 14, 21, 48, 50, 52, 54, and Malachi 3 were copied in the Book of Mormon? The statement is entirely without foundation, and contrary to the facts, and untrue; and he had the means in his hands of proving it untrue if he had only compared them with a view of ascertaining the truth of it, instead of trying to find an objection.

But, he says, Matthew 5, 6 and 7 are copied. Why? Because the Book in giving Jesus' instruction on this continent gave it the same as it was given upon the other, and it appears the same, with a few slight changes in the wording. But would he have Jesus talk differently on this continent from what he did on the other? He mentions I Cor. 13 as another; but this does not appear in the Book of Mormon, nor does any quotation from the New Testament Scriptures appear there; nor is there a quotation in the Book of Mormon from any part of the Bible. There are quotations by these writers from their own writings, which, in some instances, were the same as those in the Bible. And these they had as good a right to use as did Peter or Paul, when they quoted from them. The question is, while in using these like words was the sentiment preserved, and is it in all things in harmony with the teachings in the Bible.

Here is where the fallacy of his pretended argument lies, upon these quotations. He jumps at the conclusion that God never spoke to any person except to the Jews on the other continent, and from that wrong conclu-

sion he makes the argument that there has been copying. Remember the conclusion itself is in dispute, and under controversy here, and he has only wasted his time in that supposable, logical argument.

When he shall have proven that God never spoke to anybody but the people called Jews, on the other continent, no one will ask him to take up his valuable time comparing to see if there has been copying or quotations made. Such a course of making assertions without a particle of evidence, as he has done, may be argument to Messrs. Hull and Howe, or to some one who does not know, nor does not want to

know how to reason; but it will hardly do for this audience. It is to be presumed that if there was inspiration on this continent, the same God speaking here as upon the other, and by the same Spirit, there would be like wordings and sentiments in the communications; and it would have been a proof that the Book of Mormon was not inspired had it claimed to have had the same Holy Spirit through which its inspiration was committed as the Bible, and there had been found therein no resemblance in language, sentiment and phraseology.

(Time expired.)

MR. BRADEN'S EIGHTEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Kelley gives the statement of Joseph III, of what Emma Smith said. We have Whitmer's statement. We have Mrs. Salisbury nee Smith's statement, in regard to Rigdon's presence at Smith's in New York. Would it not be well to introduce some one not interested in the fraud? Give us somebody besides Smith's and Whitmer's, for if what these two gangs tell of each other be true, as we shall show by reading their statements, the testimony of all the Smith's and Whitmer's would not establish a claim to a "yaller dog." Their testimony that they did not see Rigdon, will not set to one side the statements of Chase and Sanders that they did. Mrs. Salisbury, to show that she had means of knowing whether Rigdon visited Smith or not, says that Smith was at his father's all the time he was translating, and did the translating there. That is a lie, if her mother, Joe himself, P. P. Pratt, and Whitmer tell the truth. Lucy Smith says he went to Pennsylvania in the fall of 1827 and before he began his translation, so say Pratt and Whitmer; Lucy Smith and Whitmer says that he went back to New York after wheat sowing in 1828, or one year afterwards. Whitmer says he brought Smith to Whitmer's father's. Mrs. Smith says to Waterloo, and that Whitmer lived in Waterloo. She says that Joe finished the translation in Waterloo and showed the plates to the witnesses there. Joe did not translate a word at his father's. He did not live there while translating, but miles away, part of the time over one hundred miles away. If Mrs. Salisbury lied, as we have proved in saying Joe was where he was not, she would lie in saying Rigdon was not where he was.

Impostor Joe gave Martin Harris a scrawl that he said was a *fac simile* of some of the

writing on the plates. Harris carried it to Prof. Anthon of New York City. Prof. Anthon describes it: "It was indeed a singular scrawl. It consisted of all kinds of crooked characters, disposed in columns, and had evidently been prepared by some person who had before him at the time, a book containing various alphabets. Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes, Roman letters inverted or placed sideways, were arranged in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle divided in various compartments, decked with various strange marks, evidently copied after the Mexican calendar given by Humboldt."

There used to be in the archives of the church in Kirtland and Nauvoo, a scrawl, that is now in Utah, pretending to be a *fac simile* of a couple of lines or columns of the writing on the plates. There are 68 characters. Any one can see by examining them, that 64 of them are merely our alphabet, our numerals and marks of punctuation varied a little, or placed in unusual positions. If Joe lied in these scrawls, if his *fac similes* were frauds, he lied in regard to the plates and the Book of Mormon. The whole thing is a fraud.

In 1830 Smith and Rigdon began a translation and correction of the Scriptures. It was finished in 1833. Mormons say it was done by direct revelation of God. It was done by inspiration. Every word in it is the word of God, as much as what he engraved on stone for Moses. It changes King James' version in thousand of places. It adds phrases, sentences and whole paragraphs to King James' version. Where it adds to King James' version, Mormons claim that version was faulty in the original text. Where it changes the translation that version is a mistranslation. By com-

paring the quotations from the Bible in the Book of Mormon, with the inspired translation, and King James' translation it will be seen that the Lord in revealing the Book of Mormon, in scores of places, copied King James' version, and did not correct the errors, as he did afterwards in the Inspired Translation. The Lord inspired Joe to translate the Book of Mormon. In it the Nephites and Jaredites, quote from King James' version, which is erroneous, if the inspired translation be true. In his speech to the Nephites, our Savior quotes over thirty such errors of King James' translation, if the Inspired Translation be correct. Yet my opponent has the audacity to declare that the Book of Mormon does not quote the errors of King James' translation. Will he explain this? The Inspired Translation changes names and language in some places, and leaves them unchanged in others.

In his speeches last night, my opponent told you that Jared's barges, as long as a tree, and sharply pointed at each end, were so large that the eight excelled the capacity the ark. If sharply pointed, and seventy or eighty feet long, they could not have been more than ten or twelve feet wide, and high in the center. It would take over 2,000 such barges to equal the ark. The preposterous idea that these idiotically constructed barges, were constructed like our scientific life-boats, is too ridiculous for refutation. Will my opponent tell us how many families, animals of all kinds, fishes, birds, together with food for all for 344 days, can be put into eight life-boats, not more than seventy feet long, and sharply pointed at both ends? How did his eight barges keep together for 344 days? He took the dodge I expected him to take? He claims that Jared took only domestic animals and fowls with him.

Why should he take the horse, ass, sheep, hog, and cows, and oxen, and animals for the use of man, when the country was full of them already? Had the Mormon Deity, when he got over into Asia, in his troubles over Jared's barges, and his corrections of his mistakes in regard to ventilation and light, forgotten that there were horses, cows, sheep, asses, hogs, and all animals for man's use in America, and that by miracle he had changed a portion of the cattle into oxen for Jared's use. If he had not forgotten this, why burden poor Jared, with providing food for them, feeding them, and the inconvenience of the effluvia in his barges, all needlessly, for the land was full of them before he got there.

My opponent says the Book of Mormon does speak of rivers, lands and seas. Does it give the name of a river, sea, mountain, or city that is found in ancient geography or describe them so they can be identified?

The Bible says, as a fact, that the speech of all was confounded at Babel. The Book of Mormon says that the speech of part was not confounded. A flat contradiction. My opponent says that the statements and affidavits in Howe are mere quotations. On the contrary, the affidavits and state-

ments of Palmyra and Manchester witnesses are in the first person and signed in due form, and not a quotation mark. The Conneaut statements are in full, in the first person, and signed by the parties. The printer by mistake has put quotation marks to the statements of John Spaulding, Martha Spaulding and Artemus Cunningham. The statements of the other four have none. All the statements are in the first person and signed separately and by the person making the statement. What does my opponent hope to accomplish by such reckless mis-statements? My opponent gave us what Joseph the Third says, his mother said. Can not Mrs. Irvin tell what her father said? Rev. Bonsall tell what his stepfather said, as well as Joseph the Third tell what his mother and stepfather said? Or Kelley tell what Gilbert or Howe or Mrs. McKinstry said?

A man may be illiterate and a talker. Tecumseh did not know a letter, yet he was not only a talker far better than Rigdon, but he was a reasoner which Rigdon never was. Rigdon's letter to the *Boston Journal* showed, in misspelled words, grammatical blunders, lack of capitals and punctuation, that he was illiterate. That Rigdon preached the peculiarities of Mormonism for two or more years before he joined them is notorious. Darwin Atwater mentions it. So does Campbell, Bentley, Zeb Rudolph, John Rudolph, and A. B. Green and Dille. He advocated community of goods, and especially the idea that a restoration of the apostolic church must include spiritual gifts, miracles and revelations, the pet hobby of Mormonism. My opponent himself has stated that Rigdon had a contest with Campbell over these peculiar doctrines of the Book of Mormon before he joined the Mormons, nearly eighteen months before that time if my opponent be correct in the time. These facts are as notorious as that Rigdon was a Baptist preacher, before he joined the Disciples. My opponent undertakes to excuse the tomfoolery of the assembling of the Jaredites, and afterwards of Nephites from all over North America, for a Kilkenny Cat fight, so as to leave plates in the right place for Imposter Joe, by reading about military works found in North America. Does that prove that the people who built them ever did such an idiotic thing as Nephites and Jaredites are said to have done.

The prophecies that my opponent quoted, have no more reference to Nephites in America than to New Zealanders. His fanciful farfetched supposed references, would apply as well to the man in the moon.

We will now review his archaeological argument.

We remind the reader that the Book of Mormon consists of two parts.

I. An assumption of certain general ideas common to all lands and people. That the continent has been peopled in former ages by civilized peoples. That there have been two civilizations, only two, for the Nephites and Zarahemlites are substantially one.

The general ideas of cities, governments, wars, and what all civilized people have are assumed.

2. The part peculiar to the Book, that one Jared led people into America just after the confusion of tongues. Their history, cities, wars, chiefs, governments, customs, etc. My opponent has not offered a scrap of evidence that this, that is particular to the Book of Mormon is true, in a single particular. That Lehi and sons of Zedekiah led two peoples out here that united. That the Lehiters divide into two races. The wars and career of each. He has not brought forward one scintilla of evidence for this. Not a ruin, city, person or incident has one particle of proof. What he appeals to is common to all men. What needs proof he has not touched. What the Book of Mormon says in general assumptions can be applied to ruins in Ceylon, India or Ireland, or any land where there are prehistoric ruins.

The language of the Book of Mormon will describe any prehistoric ruins, as well as those in America.

We showed by an appeal to Priest and scores of witnesses who lived long before the Book of Mormon, that it was known that there were ruins of prehistoric races to be found all over North America. That a civilized people inhabited the land before the Indians. This assumption that civilized people inhabited the continent before the Indians, was an old idea, before the Book appeared. We showed that Cortez found a civilized people in Mexico, and that the Aztec Empire extended from the Isthmus of Darien to what now is the Southwestern portion of the United States. They had great cities, temples, and public buildings. We have proved that the Mexicans declared that their country had been inhabited by Aztecs, who were in possession when Cortez conquered it, by the Chicimas, who preceded the Aztecs, and by the Toltecs, who preceded the Chicimas, and that the Toltecs describe a prehistoric civilization before their occupation of the land. That Pizarro found a civilized people in Peru, and that the civilization of the Incas had been preceded by other civilizations, some of which are prehistoric. All this was known to educated men hundreds of years before the Book of Mormon. All this Spaulding knew. It suggested the assumptions of his romance.

We have proved that Cortez conquered Yucatan; that it was inhabited by a civilized people, with great cities; that his companions and other Spaniards, such as Diaz and Herrera, describe great cities that were inhabited at the time of the conquest of Yucatan; that educated men who had read the history of the conquest of Mexico and Peru knew these facts; that Spaulding knew them. He had his people come to America from Southwestern Asia, by sea. He had them land at the Isthmus of Darien, which he called the land of Zarahemla. This the witnesses prove. We have proved that all that my opponent can cite in the

Book of Mormon, as sustained by research, is just what the witnesses say Spaulding knew and put into his romance. The witnesses are not witnesses that manufactured their evidence, as was the case with Mrs. Salisbury and the witnesses of my opponent, or they would have claimed to know more than they did. They repudiate the religious portion of the Book of Mormon as an addition to Spaulding's romance. They do not mention the Jaredite portion; but one mentions the Zarahemnite portion. They do not exaggerate their recollection of the historic part of the Nephite portion. If ever there were cautious, conscientious witnesses they are.

This explodes all his archaeological reading. He has sustained those general assumptions of the Book of Mormon that are common to all civilized people that need no proof, certain facts that were well known before the Book of Mormon appeared. But he has not furnished one particle of proof for those things that need proof—the history, the historic statements in reference to persons, places, battles, etc. If necessary we could show, as Mr. Ward of Denver did in his controversy with Joseph III, that American archaeology flatly contradicts many statements in the Book of Mormon, but it is not needed. My opponent tries to deny that the absurd statement of arming children is in the Book of Mormon. On page 531 we are told "All that were on the face of the land were gathered into two armies," not a soul left behind, and it adds, "both men, women and children being armed with weapons of war, having shields, breastplates and headplates, and being clothed after the manner of war, they did march forth against one another to battle." If that does not declare that children were armed with headplates, breastplates, shields and weapons of war, and went out to battle, language cannot make such a statement. It is idiotic nonsense, but that is just what the Book of Mormon utters.

My opponent made a poor out in howling over the objection that the Book of Mormon, in quoting the Bible, quotes King James' version, the only one Rigdon—who interpolated the religious portion into the romance of Spaulding—knew. That it put into the mouths of Nephites who lived 2,000 years before King James' translators, the brogue, the errors of King James' translators. We give two instances, one from Cor. 13-5. King James' translators interpolated "easily." The Book of Mormon does the same. Again, in Isaiah 16-7, it quotes the blunder of King James' translators, and says "The Lord and his Spirit hath sent me," instead of "the Lord hath sent me and his Spirit." Instead of quoting only readings of the original, that were in existence before A. D. 400, when Moroni buried the plates, it quotes readings found in King James' translation, that have come into existence since Moroni's day. It quotes the punctuation of King James' version. Not only so but it quotes the misquotations.

that were common in Rigdon's day, Chapter 5, paragraph 26, lines 33 to 36, we have "fiery flying serpent." The serpents referred to were "flying." The "fiery" is a popular misquotation, Page 540 we have "bonds of iniquity," instead of "bond of iniquity." Another universal misquotation. We have "sins of the world" instead of "sin of the world." These expressions are quoted as Scripture. They are not. Doubtless it was the fact that he had heard them quoted as Scripture and thought they were, that led Rigdon to quote from Shakespeare's Hamlet, "from whence no traveller can return," and from Pope's Essay on Man, "look through nature up to nature's God." This quotation of the errors of King James' version, in original, in translating, in punctuation, its obsolete grammar, its obsolete words, its obsolete style, proves that Rigdon used that, because he knew no other. Why did not the Lord use some other version, especially where they are correct and the version of King James is not? Why did not he correct that version? Why did he use an erroneous version, in this fullness of the gospel, and then correct its errors afterwards, in the Inspired Translation? Why did he not give the correct version in the Book of Mormon. Why corrupt it with errors? The fact that the Book of Mormon contains perversions of the Bible common in Rigdon's days shows that it belongs to that time. I did not urge that the language should be perfect in the Book of Mormon, but I urged that the Lord would not dole out word by word such atrocities as we find in the Book of Mormon. Since the Lord, by miracle gave it, word by word, Joe's illiteracy could affect it no more than a telephone or an echo can put blunders into what it utters. The illiteracy of Joe has nothing to do with it. If there are blunders the Mormon Deity made them.

My opponent, with a fatuity that is miraculous, tells us that language changes, and that what is correct in one generation is incorrect in another. That is true, and his Mormon Deity in giving a revelation does not use a language that is correct in the time of the translation, but goes back and uses language of two hundred years before that time, that has become grossly incorrect, and exaggerated and caricatures into a monstrous burlesque, those errors. Why did not the Lord use what was correct when he made the translation? Why did he use what had become grossly incorrect? The reason is evident, Spalding and Rigdon wanted to imitate the Hebrew idiom. They were so ignorant that they did not know that a large proportion of the peculiarities of the Bible were the brogue of the translators, and they inserted into their fraud and into the mouths of Israelites, in America, the brogue of the English of King James' translators, hundreds of years before there was any English language. We have proved that the Lord has been improving his grammar, has corrected thousands of errors. Why did he not make

it right at first? My opponent can not see the difference between Rigdon's blunders in English? Joe's blunders in English and errors in the original. I do not think the Nephites made blunders in English.

The blunt Greek of Peter, the blunt Hebrew of Amos are not full of atrocities in grammar and composition. Let us have a list of such atrocities in the Hebrew or the Greek of the Bible. Bunyan wrote a clear, simple style, but it is free from grammatical atrocities, and atrocities in composition. His style is a model for simplicity, purity and accuracy. All these excuses are utterly bootless. These features of the Book of Mormon show that it is an attempt of an ignoramus, to imitate the Hebrew idioms of the Bible, who blunderingly caricatured the brogue of King James' translation, as Simon Pure Hebraisms. There are one or two contradictions of the Bible that we will give. The Book of Mormon claims to be the "fulness of the Gospel." The Bible says "Christ came in the fulness of the times. That the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily. All authority in heaven and earth was his. The church contains the fullness of him that fills all in all. The church is perfected to the fullness of the stature of Christ. Christ gave to the apostles all things that pertain to life and Godliness." The Book of Mormon claims to be the fullness of the Gospel, and to be added to what the apostles had. It is a flat contradiction of God's word. Mormons claim revelations, visions, prophecy now. Daniel ix. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision of the prophecy, and to anoint the most holy.

"Know therefore from the going forth of the decree to restore Jerusalem, etc." Cyrus issued a decree, but said nothing of rebuilding the city. Darius Hystaspes issued a decree, but not concerning rebuilding the city. Artaxerxes Longimanus issued a decree but said nothing about rebuilding Jerusalem. In the twentieth year of another Artaxerxes a decree to rebuild Jerusalem was issued. From the one who was high priest when the work was done, we learn it was in the reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon. The twentieth year of Artaxerxes Mnemon was B. C. 385. 490 years Daniel's seventy periods of seven years minus 385, leaves A. D. 105, as the time when the vision and prophecy was to be sealed or revelations were to cease. The last one to whom one apostle had imparted these gifts died, and prophecy, visions, revelations ceased. We have not noticed the infidel attack of my opponent on the Bible for I am examining Mormonism, not defending Christianity. I want his infidelity to be stereotyped in the debate, and let it, like the fly in the ointment, send out its stinking odor. The book will be read by preachers all over the United States. They

will see the infidelity of Mormonism, that tries to drag Christianity to its vile level, when it cannot rise to the level of Christianity. If my opponent dares to affirm, in a separate debate, his assaults on the Bible, I will defend it, and expose his infidel attacks, in all their shallowness, and his hostility to the Bible.

We will now notice some of the pettifoggings of my opponent's last speech. He insults the intelligence of the audience, when he assumes that his talk about the omission of words will so befog their minds that they will loose sight of the gross grammatical blunders that we exposed. Reading pages does not remove the blunder. "The Lord spake unto my father, yea even in a dream, and sayeth unto him." "Lord" in the third person is made nominative to "sayeth" in the second person and "spake" in the past tense is joined to "sayeth" in the present tense. "Stabbed by his brother by a garb of secrecy" his brother stabbed him by a garb of secrecy. What a hole it must have made in him. With my manuscript before him, he deliberately falsified my quotations. My manuscript does quote it "I ought not to harrow up in my desires the firm decrees of a just God." Omitting "I ought not" does not cause the sentence to talk balderdash. The fustian is in the words "Harrow up in my desires the firm decrees of a just God." He finds that "arrest" is used in the sense of "check" or "stop." Will he show how it can have that meaning in the sentence "If ye do arrest the scriptures." Sydney did not know the difference between *arrest* and *wrest*, the word he wanted to use. We need follow his twaddle no further. He finds in the older books of the Bible ideas that resemble the palpable quotations from the New Testament and quotations from modern authors that we have exposed. Unfortunately for him, it is not ideas that resemble each other, that we cited, but quotations of entire sentences *verbatim*—the exact words.

He admits that quotations from the Bible in the Book of Mormon are free from the atrocities in speech, that occur in other portions of the Book of Mormon.

That proves the truth of our assertion that the Book of Mormon, aside from what it steals from the Bible, is an awkward attempt to imitate the Bible. Kelley's assumption that Rigdon could not adapt his fraud to meet the objections that the Disciples had urged against additional revelations, is ridiculous. The fact that what the Disciples said to Rigdon in refusing to accept his teaching, is bitterly assailed in the Book of Mormon, proves that Rigdon wrote it. When one remembers that I have cited over five hundred quotations from the

New Testament found in the Book of Mormon, scores of verses and even whole paragraphs and chapters *verbatim*, Kelley's denial that there are any quotations is colossal in its impudence. He coolly asks me "Do you know that they are not quotations from Israelite books, older than the Book of Mormon, that the Nephites had?" As well ask me "Do you know that they are not quotations from books on the dog star Sirius?" We find the language in the New Testament alone. That proves that the Book of Mormon was written by one who quoted them from the New Testament, and, of course, after the New Testament was written. Did Lehi, *alias* Rigdon, quote from "Whence no traveller returns" from an edition of Shakespeare, in the hands of the Nephites? Did a Nephite quote "Through nature up to nature's God" from an edition of Pope's "Essay on Man," in the hands of the Nephites? Did Nephites quote Rigdon's baptismal formula, his revival expressions?

He staggers fearfully under the charge that the revisions, that the Mormon Deity has made of himself, as seen by comparing the first and last editions of the Book of Mormon, average nearly seven to a page, and over 5,000 in the aggregate, seventeen corrections being made on one page. He gabbles weakly about printers' mistakes. J. H. Gilbert, who set up every word of the book and who is one of the best compositors in the country and a man of superior literary and critical ability, did not insert blunders of whole lines, omit whole lines. He did not change sentences so as to entirely reverse their meaning. The Mormon Deity inspired Mormon and Moroni to write, doled out to Smith word for word, the translation, gave Cowdery a divine gift to write, and the proofs were read by the inspired Joe and Oliver, and then the Mormon Deity had to revise himself, omitting lines, inserting lines, reversing the meaning, make seventeen changes on a page, seven on the average on a page and over five thousand in the aggregate. It is disgusting for my opponent to call on me to prove that the atrocities in speech were not on the plates. It is like calling on me to prove that the telephone is not the author of blunders in a message, it carries. Will he prove there were any plates? When he presents the plates and shows that these blunders were on them, we will notice such talk.

Even then, if we found on the plates hundreds of quotations *verbatim* from the New Testament and modern authors, thousands of gross blunders, we would be compelled to conclude that the plates had their origin with some such modern ignoramus as Smith or Rigdon.

MR. KELLEY'S NINETEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I call your attention to a statement that was made by my opponent to the effect that I had stated in the debate at Wilber that some eighteen months before the Book of Mormon appeared, Sidney Rigdon and Alexander Campbell had a passage at arms over the religion of the Mormons. I stated no such thing. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. What I gave to the audience upon that, I read from their own book, "The History of Discipleship on the Western Reserve." I will read it to you. Instead of being eighteen months before, it was a passage at arms between them, as this says, two and one-half months before, just as I read it at Wilber.

What answer will Mr. Braden have to this misrepresentation of what was said, when it was said, and also who said it, at Wilber? The statement is as follows, p. 209:

"The discomfiture he experienced at the hands of Mr. Campbell, at Austintown, when seeking to introduce his common property scheme, turned him away mortified, chagrined and alienated. This was only two and one-half months before he received, in peace, the messengers of delusion."

The idea is carried here in their own history that Rigdon joined the Saints two and a half months after this affair at Austintown because he got a back-set from Campbell and was mad. This alienated him. Well, if this did it, clearly then it was not because Rigdon was in any way mixed in with our faith before. This was only two and a half months before he "received, in peace, the messengers of delusion."—Campbellite testimony.

Remember that they were not in controversy over any principle of what he calls the Mormon faith. There is no community plan or common property plan in the faith of the Latter Day Saints, nor in the Book of Mormon. That only exists in the minds of those who could not, or did not wish to understand our faith. It is not only not according to the faith of the church, but is contrary to its principles and the faith as the church believed in 1830. You will have to change again, Mr. Braden, upon that, and find something else from which to make out your case.

Last evening when I closed, I was exposing the fallacy of his reasoning in trying to make an argument on the assumption that quotations from the Bible are contained in the Book of Mormon. There is no such thing in the Book of Mormon, but if there was such, he could not make use of it as an argument until after he had established the proposition that God had not also spoken to the people on this continent, because that is the question in this controversy. If He did speak to them, the presumption must

be that the instruction would be much the same as upon the other, and it could appear without any copying.

In the translation of the prophecies of Malachi, Isaiah, etc., and the account given of the instructions of Jesus to the people upon this continent, there is such a difference in the general use of the anglicisms, as I have before shown, as to place beyond the possibility of a doubt the fact that these were not copied. It was either done by inspiration, as claimed, or by persons acquainted with both languages. But he persists that because of the general wording of the sentiment, even if expressed by the Holy Spirit, that it must convict the work of plagiarism. The objection is on a par with his argument associating the Corinthian Church with "Mormons, Spiritualists and negroes" in order to try to burlesque the church because of its spiritual gifts. "They are persons subject to low manifestations of the spirit," he says. He admits, then, that these gifts exist with persons in this age, viz: Mormons, Spiritualists and negroes. Where is his argument, then, confining them to the first century? I have found a lower spiritual manifestation than this, it seems—that of no manifestation at all. That is where the Disciple Church comes in. They do not claim any at all; and it is lower, certainly, than the Corinthian saints. But, my friends, we are in good company—the company of Jesus and all the apostles and prophets and prophetesses of christianity; and I thought when he so absurdly divided up the spirit the other night into the miraculous, the indwelling, the sealing and the resurrecting powers, and then facetiously tried to put the saints on a par with Baalam's ass because it spoke with the miraculous, as he said, that he as much lowered the standard of Jesus, Peter and Paul, as he did that of the Latter Day Saints; for they, too, had this miraculous power; and Paul says, "I speak with tongues more than you all."

Mr. Braden seems to get into a corner upon every position he takes. The only hope he now has, however, is to try to make so many objections that I shall not have time to take them up and examine them at all. True, a man can make a running fight, and throw dust and dirt in his style for a time, but this will all wash off if the investigator will only permit the application of a little pure water.

But he is wrong again—should I take up by item and examine these pages in the Book of Mormon which he claims are quotations. Let me now candidly consider them: He reads a passage from the Book of Mormon and says, "A quotation from Shakespeare's Hamlet, before written;" but how does he know? This is on a par with this continual asserting, without any

proof. Why did he not say that Shakespeare took it from Job, who wrote 3,000 years before Shakespeare's time, and in whose book the same thought and wording in great part occurs. "Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death." And again; "Man goeth to his long home." Job 10: 21 and 16: 22. The wording in Nephi and Shakespeare are not the same, nor more alike than the Bible and Shakespeare, or the Book of Mormon and the Bible. This shows conclusively that Mr. Braden did not know what he was talking about when he charged the plagiarism. He had to follow John Hyde's criticism made thirty years ago, however.

Another; "Shepherd hath called and art calling" Book of Mormon, page 223. He left out seven words in this one sentence in order to make it read badly. He quotes again: "Stabbed by a garb of secrecy," Book of Mormon, page 402. "Oh! what a stab," he exclaims. Yes, but the stab is not as bad, after all, as the perversion by Braden. The true reading is, "Stabbed by his brother by a garb of secrecy." How do you like such grand arguments thrown into your faces, my friends, by this Reverend gentleman? Why did you, Mr. Braden, leave the words "by his brother" out? Was it to deceive?

Again: "They buried their weapons of peace." Page 272. He left out the explanation, "or they buried the weapons of war for peace." Again, "No afflictions save swallowed up in joy." Page 298. It reads, "He also gave them strength that they should suffer no manner of affliction, save it were swallowed up in the joy of Christ." Do you say it is contrary to Christian experience, when rightly read? "I ought not to harrow up in my desires the firm decrees of a just God." Page 288. No, nor should Mr. Braden harrow up in his desires such a strong disposition to misquote these men.

Again he says: "Episcopalians preach from high pulpits and have liturgies." Read the text, my friends, and you will find he has put in all of this. "Episcopalians," "pulpits," "after their style" and "liturgies." Who could not find objections after this style of argument? It is too weak for a ten year old boy. Again, on page 322 he says: "An inspired prophet scalps his enemy, just like any other big Indian who likes heap much scalp." Yes, just like big Indian Braden misrepresented it. It reads: "As [Zerahemnah] raised his sword [against Moroni] behold one of Moroni's soldiers smote it, even to the earth; and he [the soldier] smote Zerahemnah that he took off his scalp and it fell to the earth." What have you to say to this?

Again, he charges imitation of incidents, and cites the deliverance of the three Hebrews from the furnace as being played in the book; but an examination shows that the cases are not so similar as to indicate any imitation or copying whatever. The entire history of the two is dissimilar.

Thus, I might go through the entire list

exposing the spuriousness of the criticisms; but shall I so waste my time? Are you edified by criticisms that will, in no way bear examination? You, doubtless, wish him to give such, that, hereafter, you will be able to give a reason for not believing in the teachings of the Book of Mormon when questioned upon it, do you not? Not to have something put into your minds that will make you look ridiculous in the eyes of a person posted, if you should give it for a reason.

He again takes up the Book of Mormon and gets off this: "For do we not read that God is the same yesterday, to-day and forever, and in him there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." "Yes," he says, "we read it in the New Testament;" and then he tries to make you believe the writer (Mormon) was quoting from that. Had he turned to Alma 5: 3; 2 Nephi, 12: 7; Nephi 11: 1; Mosiah 1: 8 he would have seen that it was here where the writer read it, and not from the New Testament. He argues that because the expression is similar to that in the Bible it must have been taken from it. This is not correct. In the Veda, which bears a date 1,200 years before Christ, we read, "O God have mercy! give me my daily bread!" Rig-Veda 6: 37. Did Jesus steal it when he put it in the Lord's prayer? Take another, (Rig-Veda 9: 113, 8) "Where life is free, in the *third* heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal." Did Paul steal this idea to get material for his Corinthian letter? According to Braden's way of reasoning he must have done so. Of the ancient Zend-Avesta, Dr. Haug remarks: "The Zoroastrian religion exhibits a very close affinity, or rather identity with several important doctrines of the Mosaic religion and Christianity." Chips from a German workshop, page 125.

He objects to the use of the word Christ and Christian over here before the birth of the Savior. Eusebius Eccl. His., page 21, 22, says: "The very name Jesus, as also that of Christ, was honored by the pious prophets of old. * * * Moses attaches the name of our Savior, Jesus Christ; * * * the prophets that lived subsequently to these times, also plainly announced Christ before by name." Paul says: "Moses esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt."

It may be the Campbellite idea, that Christ was not known at all and not doing anything for humanity till he was born in Judea, and that he was not in the Church; but it is not Bible. It was Rigdon's idea, however, until his conversion to "the faith once delivered to the saints," in the year 1830; and, therefore, he could not have put the reverse of it in the Book of Mormon. "Without this (this same Jesus) there was not anything made that was made." "He was as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." He began his work for man that early. "Was in the Church in the wilderness." He had a Church under Moses and was there. He was preached to

Abraham and Noah, and was known of Enoch, for his is "the only name under heaven whereby man can be saved," and Enoch was saved, saved through the name of Christ! "Before Abraham was, I am," said Jesus. "And they did all drink of that spiritual rock, which rock was Christ," says Paul.

These are the teachings of the Bible; they are also the sentiments taught in the Book of Mormon. They are not the teachings of the Campbellites, nor were they ever such; nor of Sidney Rigdon till after his conversion in 1830. Rigdon therefore, had nothing to do with the getting up of the Book of Mormon, or its publication. He was as distant from that scene as Braden himself. He tries to make a point against the work because Mormon said that he did not know what change was effected in the three disciples who should remain and not die. Yet he says: "Christ said they should remain 'mortal.'" Christ said no such thing. He said: "Ye shall never endure the pains of death." Then, there was to be some change wrought in them. This was done when afterwards Jesus touched them; and Moroni, referring to this change said that he did not know whether they were "mortal or immortal," (he knew they could not die), without, in the least referring to the grand clothing upon and "abundant entrance" which would superabound over this change in the time when Christ would come in his Kingdom and glory, and all should be changed like unto him. He next misrepresents the record on p. 137, Book of Mormon, in making Mosiah and his people meet Coriantumr, whom he says must have been, at least, 500 years old. The record makes the people of Muluk and Coriantumr meet, and not the Nephites and Coriantumr; and these Mulukites came out from Jerusalem near the time of Lehi, and landed on that part of the continent and are, several hundred years afterward, found by the Nephites; and Mosiah gets and reads the record of Coriantumr instead of meeting the man. In the late writings of explorers they have found the word "Muluc" right here where the Book of Mormon located these people. See *North Americans of Antiquity* by Short, pp. 436 and 438.

Why did he pervert it in order to take my time up with an explanation?

Again, "What is the use?" he says, "of the Jaredites bringing over the animals when they found them here?" That is another misrepresentation of the record. It was the people of Lehi and Muluk, who came near two thousand years after, who found the animals already here; these animals having been before brought by the Jaredites; but which were found by another people, and they found them without care on the continent, as stated by Jeremiah in the 49th chapter of his prophecy.

He would like to dodge the irrefutable proof of Jaredites' account of bringing the animals first to the continent, 4,000 years ago, as the book sets out; and this, because

I have so fully corroborated by science that it was done.

Again he says: "There were two nations spread over the entire continent at the same time, and yet they knew nothing of each other." The record gives the particular parts of the continent on which those nations existed, and shows directly contrary to Braden's statement, giving particularly an account and description of the territory that divided these peoples, (The Nephites and Mulukites), and shows why they did not discover each other sooner. Yet, he wants me to give my reason of how they could have remained so long without the knowledge of each other. Does he expect me to give a different reason to that stated in the book itself? That is ample, full and satisfactory. If not, why did he not attack the reason given instead of mis-stating the history?

Again, he tries to show that Moroni wrote 47 pages of the book after he had no plates upon which to write. Turning to page 494 of the book I find the objection is not found in the book, but only in Mr. Braden's crooked reading. Moroni says: "Behold my father hath made this record, [account of the history and destruction of the people,] and he hath written the intent thereof; and behold I would write it also [the same account] if I had room upon the plates, but I have not, and ore I have none, for I am alone." This is the plain statement which he tries to twist. Not that he had no plates to write upon, but "no room upon the plates," for that account. He then writes the things for which he had room. Can you see the point now, Mr. Braden? If not I will take to rubbing them in a little.

He goes back to the barges and says it would take 2,000 boats with sharp points to hold as much as the ark. Who, except himself, said they had sharp points? The book says they were peaked. Does it say they were peaked after the manner of the torpedo boat, or after the style of the Great Eastern, that would of itself, doubtless, hold as much as the ark? Will he say that the ark was not peaked? Here is a fair sample of his reasoning:—If the cubit spoken of in the description of the ark was the same as the sacred cubit, (which he admits he does not know), then the ark was so long and would hold so much. Just so, Mr. Braden. Now let me apply your mode of reasoning to the other side. If the tree which these boats were likened to in length was as long as some of our trees, and the animals which went in at the door as large as some of our animals, and the boat builded in proportion to the length, which is to be presumed,—then the eight vessels that brought the Jaredites here would equal the probable capacity of at least two arks. Is not this fairly his style? This profound logic reminds me of his wise interpretation of Mark 16. Here it is verbatim:—"Go ye (Who? The eleven?) Preach the gospel to every creature" (Who preach? The eleven?) "He that believeth and is baptized," (by

whom? The eleven?) shall be saved; and these signs shall follow them that believe; (Believe what? The preaching of the eleven?) Anybody else? No. Nobody but the eleven." What about following the believer in the preaching, which Matthias should do, he was not one of the eleven. Oh, he will leave him out! You will! What about the preaching of Paul and Barnabas? They were not of the eleven; yet those who believed their preaching received the Holy Ghost, and the signs followed? What about Ananias? He was not one of the eleven, nor an apostle either, yet Paul received the manifestation, (miraculous, too,) of the Holy Ghost under his hands. This solution of his reminds me of the darkey's discourse upon which he was interrogated by another gentleman of color. A few such questions as these would spoil Braden's entire theory. This is after his interpretation of 1 Cor. 12: 13. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body." He says that Kelley does not know the difference between baptized by the spirit and baptized by the command of the spirit." Let us see if Braden does. The following is Jesus' language: "Except a man be born of the water and of the spirit"—Oh, no, Jesus! Braden says you do not understand it. You should have said: "Except a man be born of water and of the command of the Spirit." Yes, that is very clear; Kelley cannot understand it.

Take another:—Paul, Titus, 3. "By the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Hold a moment, Paul! Braden says "by the command" of the Holy Ghost ye are renewed. My friends, whether Kelley can understand or not, he has it just as Jesus and all the apostles did. But Braden has the effrontery to add to the word of God and insert in the plain teaching of Paul, the words, "the command of," in order to keep up his Disciple theory, that the baptism of the spirit is not for our time.

Again, he takes up the text: "My words they are spirit and they are life." Here it is, no spirit except through the medium of the word; yet they received the Holy Spirit on Pentecost day, shed through Jesus Christ and not the word. Philip preached the word at Samaria, but the word did not give them the Holy Ghost, nor they did not receive it through the medium of the word. But when Peter and John laid their hands on the believers in the word which Philip had preached, then the Holy Spirit fell upon them. "And when Simon saw that by the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money." Again, Paul says to the Ephesian saints: "After that ye heard the word of truth, ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, after that ye believed." O, no, Paul! when they believed the word they had it, Braden says. The scripture is plain without his torturing it. Jesus says: "The words that I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life." Observe to the words which bring forth the life, is the idea right. "I know that the commandment is life

everlasting," says Jesus again. Not if a man has it and does not keep it, however, but if he keeps it, it will bring him into life. It is the royal road. So of the spirit. If he follows the commandments he will receive the spirit, the seal of adoption shed abroad into the heart by Jesus Christ as a comfort and acknowledgment for having kept the word. But if he hears and believes the word and then does not comply therewith, he does not get the spirit shed abroad from on high, and enabling us to cry "Abba Father" any more than if he believed the word and will not comply therewith he will get the life spoken of therein by Jesus.

Mr. Braden objects to the Book of Mormon because of the use of the word "arrest." Do not try to arrest the scripture. Yes, arrest. Webster says, in defining the word, "anything by power, physical or moral." And Bishop Taylor uses the word in that sense: "Were sad arrests to his troubled spirit." You can select a more appropriate word according to the usage now, but the idea conveyed is the same if the other is used.

He still, for want of argument, infringes upon the modesty of this audience with his smart turn, borrowed from Howe, on the word *or*; but I took up your school dictionary to-day and copied as follows: "When wild animals are spoken of (such animals as are found in the woods) *or* is very often applied to both male and female." When I quoted this the other night he shook his head. But that is nothing. He has shaken his head at a number of other facts during this discussion. The audience, I judge, can likely see the points made during the debate without he or I having to shake our heads at them. So much for his jack and bull criticism.

But he says, that Joseph Smith said some hard things about the actions of David Whitmer and Oliver Cowdery in 1838. Yes, he wrote a letter after lying in jail for weeks surrounded by as wicked and foul-mouthed a guard as, perhaps, ever kept any man, and from which he suffered abuse each hour, and at a time when there had been a misunderstanding between these parties and some others, as to the proper thing for the church to do; there had, likewise, arose a division, and a hot one too,—just like it was between Paul and Barnabas at Antioch, when they got so mad at each other they would not travel the same road; like Elisha 2 Kings, 13: 19: "And the man of God was wroth," but he is there represented to be prophesying all the time; and when the friends of one of these parties had told their side of the story to Joseph and Hyrum Smith while they were thus jailed and treated as dogs, it was more than humanity could endure; and they right lively retorted back. But what has that to do with the truth of the Book of Mormon, or to show that Mr. Smith was trying to build up a rotten church. He fearlessly turned his own witnesses out when they were charged with doing things which, years

after, were proven to be entirely false so far as implication in counterfeiting, roguery, etc., was concerned. A little different to the way some churches do now, I know. They keep those charged with bad conduct for fear of an exposure. Mr. Smith must have been honest or he would have feared an expose too, from them in the matter of their testimony. He would not have dared to do what he did, had this their testimony not been true. They were honest in their testimony, or they would have gone back upon it after this treatment; and so, instead of being an argument against the credibility of the testimony of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, it is in its favor and highly so. These men had every inducement possible offered them to make them go back upon their testimony:—Money, popularity, political fame, etc., but they would not; and they have, through as terrible persecutions as the world has ever seen since the days of the spike and the rack, maintained the truth of their statement and taught it to their children's children; their families to-day being members of the church, and abiding in the doctrine of Christ as set out in their testimony of being contained in the Book of Mormon and the Bible. Every trying circumstance in which these witnesses have been placed is a standing monument, attesting the truth of their testimony as first given to the world; for they have stood the test as does the solid rock.

There is nothing in the argument then as to what Joseph Smith may have said about these witnesses for Braden's side.

Here, I will notice that "gordian knot" of his. It is simply misstatements and misrepresentations that confuses my opponent, however, in this. The brother of Jared was not commanded to bury his record up in the ground, as my opponent stated, but to seal it up. It does not say that Jared's history should not be made known until the Gentiles were converted. It was brought to light after Christ had been crucified. The account was re-written by the Nephites on plates and sealed up along with the record of the Nephites. It was this part of the plates, or book, that Joseph Smith did not translate, and is not to be translated until the Gentiles repent. My opponent has the two distinct periods and writings and circumstances confounded, which, by the way, is quite a habit he has of doing things—dull scholar that he is. The people of Limhi did not get the plates that were sealed up by the brother of Jared, or the interpreters so far as we have an account, but they obtained the record of Ether written on twenty-four plates. The last Jaredite king lived a long time with the Mulukites, and Mosiah discovered them at Zarahemla. From Coriantumr, the last Jaredite king, the plates of the brother of Jared and interpreters came into the possession of the Mulukites, and from them to Mosiah. This appears evident from the fact that the interpreters are not spoken of until that time. The Book of Mormon does

not state just how the sealed part fell into the hands of the Nephites, but this is the way in which it could very naturally have come into their hands. There are many things that were not written; indeed, the record only claims to give an abridgement of the things done. The interpretation of engravings by the "gift and power of God," Book of Mormon, page 137, is the same as translating by stones, page 200. The stones were of no benefit only as God would manifest his power and wisdom in the same. Just as with the Urim and Thummim, a stone which was in Aaron's breast-plate, that shone by the power of God and through which the high-priest obtained revelations. Josephus says: "It ceased to shine one hundred and fifty years before Christ,"—i. e., the power of God ceased to accompany the stone; hence no revelation; and in that case the stone was worthless as an interpreter or instrument through which to gain knowledge. Is this his only "Gordian Knot?"

But he next objects, that the book ought not to be believed because the printer did not do his duty:—There are typographical errors, and grammatical errors and errors "*et punctu-at-em*." Just so. I begin now to see that my opponent means business. Did any of you ever see a book that did not contain such errors? I never have. When last in Chicago I paid nearly \$10 for the best Oxford print Bible, printed upon silk paper and with all the care, it seems, that could possibly have been taken to get it correct; with the advantages of all the various editions of that book, and skilled help, at the command of the publishers, and I have noticed in it since my return home a typographical error. I refer to this to apprise you to begin with, of the difficulty in the way of issuing a publication of the size of this book, and having it absolutely correct.

The Book of Mormon was printed at a small office in a little village of Western New York, 55 years ago, by men who were not scholars, and not much printers either; and he expects to find everything just right even when examined in the light of the progress in these things, made since that time. My opponent has his mark set high. He wants to see one of the impossibles.

He says he can find two thousand mistakes in the book. Suppose he can, what of it? The American Bible Society make the claim, so I understand, that there are twenty-three thousand errors in the Bible of this character; but does this interfere with the divine claim of that book, or so change the sentiment, or reading that it was not entitled to the respect and belief of all people? Certainly not.

In the publication of the Book of Mormon he wants God to furnish the means of translating the work; then to write down the translation as made into English, set up the type, read the proof, and be responsible for all poor or worn out type, blunders of copyists, etc., and then, doubtless, he would have the heavy press work done by inspiration. "Just to think," Bra-

den says, "of the Lord correcting himself; revising his own proof reading." He certainly ought to be reasonable if he is not. Does he not know that the chances are ten to one against the scribe of Mr. Smith getting all of the words just as they came from the lips of the translator, to say nothing of the copy from this. The translator had to change scribes often during the time of translating, on account of the persecutions against him,—the violence of mobs—and to *not* have had many mistakes of words and punctuation, would have required a miracle each day equal to that of the raising of Lazarus. Before he has made any point at all against the translation he must show that the original manuscript was wrong and that, too, in sentiment and doctrine. Not simply in the dropping of a word, or the misuse of a word. Such an objection is entirely frivolous when considered by thinking people.

The process of translation, as described by those who witnessed it, is clear and reasonable. The power of inspiration was with the unlettered, yet humble boy, during the work of translation. It was as Aaron gazed upon the Urim and Thummim when he received the divine will. But it did not write down the words. Mr. Smith had to procure a scribe who did this. Is it an argument against the truthfulness of it that he did so? The result of the work is a translation that is plain, simple, easy to be understood; correct in sentiment and thought; pure and elevating in teaching; fully instructive and enlightening, in morality and religion,—to both the unlearned and the wise. Who shall demand more?

He has presented no mistakes of teaching or thought, neither has my opponent shown a single material difference in the corrections in thought or sentiment in the later editions. There have been corrections of grammatical and typographical errors.

Again, he states, that Martin Harris told somebody, so somebody told him, that he (Harris) saw the plates by the eye of faith. Suppose he did, what of it? Did he mean by that to convey the idea that he did not see them? On no! he wanted to show that a person was only privileged to see them through the exercise of faith in God. Does any man object to that? That is the way Peter, James and John were permitted to be the especial witnesses of the transfiguration in the Mount, and is certainly sensible.

Remember that Martin Harris never went back on his testimony in regard to his viewing the plates and witnessing the manifestation of the power of God upon the occa-

sion, but affirmed the truth of the same, and the truth of the work all through his life to his enemies and his friends, his neighbors and his own family. But I ask, What is the point to be gained in this discussion by so viciously attacking the character of these witnesses, and that of Joseph Smith, or Sidney Rigdon? Has it been pertinent in answering my argument? Have I attempted to *crash* you with what any of these parties said about it, and thereby undertaken to prove the Book of Mormon true? Have the Saints ever so held out the claim to the world that men and women should believe in this book because these witnesses said it was true? Does the book so hold? No, sir. All these questions must, in truth, be answered in the negative. No more have we done so than the apostles asked the people in their time to believe in the religion they brought, simply from their statements.

The witnesses were for the purpose of offering to the people a *prima facie* case, such as would require them, if honest, to hear and investigate the matter, and be sufficiently forcible to hold them responsible for refusing to entertain and consider the message. But their testimony was not all that the people were to be able to test the matter by—far from it. That would have been the way for most men to work, but not our Heavenly Father. He says, "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20. This is the divine rule, and ministers ought to abide it. The apostles so proved their faith by the law already believed in by the people, besides being witnesses, and thus presenting a *prima facie* case to the world. Hence Paul says of the citizens of Berea, "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily whether those things were so." Acts 17:11. And Jesus says: "They (the scriptures) are they which testify of me."

The true test, then, of the faith of a people, is not in the stories told about them by their enemies, or the false witnesses that are so often set up to destroy a good man, as witness the 6th of Acts, 12 to 15 verses; but it is in the consideration of principles, and by the attainment of knowledge through the divine promise. "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God"—a higher, grander and more exalting plane than that of harkening to the voice of the slanderer, or following in the trail of the *tale-bearer*.

MR. BRADEN'S NINETEENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Was Joe Smith the originator of Mormon polygamy? The last argument that we present in refutation of our opponent's claim that Joe Smith was a true prophet of God, and that the Book of Mormon that he gave to the world is of Divine origin, and worthy to be accepted as a revelation, is the damning fact that Smith was the originator of the abomination Mormon polygamy, and the author of that blasphemy entitled, "A Revelation in Regard to Celestial Marriage." This damning fact that after wallowing in lewdness for years, without even the pretended sanction of that profanation of marriage, polygamy, he gave to the world that infamy, blasphemously entitled "A Revelation in Regard to Celestial Marriage," and was the originator of that abomination Mormon polygamy, is enough to sink him and every pretended revelation from him below the vilest depths of the most infamous corner of the lowest hell. On no other topic have the "re-organized" done so much lying to the square inch as in denying that Smith was the originator of Mormon polygamy I propose to end the controversy for ever on that topic. Dr. McIntyre, family physician of the Smith's in Manchester, N. Y., declares that the house of Joseph Smith, Sr., was a perfect brothel. Ezra Pierce, Samantha Payne and other schoolmates and associates of the Smith's, testify that Smith was lewd, and so were the family and the entire money hunting gang, and that the digging was done at night by a gang of low men surrounded by lewd women, who loafed in the daytime and prowled around at night, and that the Smiths were the worst of the gang. A sister of Joe left New York enceinte and unmarried.

Levi Lewis testifies that while Smith was pretending to translate his pretended plates he tried to seduce Eliza Winters and defended his infamous attempt, declaring that adultery was no sin. Dr. John Stafford, a schoolmate, testifies that Joe was a great admirer of Mohammed and the Koran, and defended Mohammed's polygamy and the Koran in teaching it; and that he heard him repeatedly declare that polygamy was right, and that nature and the Bible taught it. In March, 1832, Smith was stopping at Mr. Johnson's, in Hiram, Ohio, and was mobbed. The mob was led by Eli Johnson, who blamed Smith with being too intimate with his sister Marinda, who afterwards married Orson Hyde. Brigham Young, in after years, twitted Hyde with this fact, and Hyde, on learning its truth, put away his wife, although they had several children. Lyman Johnson, another brother of Marinda Johnson, and a leading Mormon, repeatedly declared that he knew that polygamy was practiced by Smith and others in

Kirtland. Martin Harris told J. M. Atwater, Mr. Clapp and many others that polygamy was taught and practiced by Smith and in Kirtland under the name of "spiritual wifery." Lewis Bond and Ezra Bond have repeatedly stated that their father and mother, who were amongst the first Mormons in Kirtland, repeatedly declared that Smith practiced polygamy in Kirtland, and that he followed a girl into a privy and committed fornication with her. Mrs. Bond made such declarations to Mrs. Hansbury and others. Lewis Bond says his father is so disgusted with the dishonesty of the Josephites in denying what he knows to be true, that he will not affiliate with them.

Fanny Brewer testifies that Smith had serious trouble in Kirtland, arising from his seducing an orphan girl living in his family, and that Martin Harris told her that Smith was notoriously lewd and untruthful. Mr. Moreton one of the first Apostles, told his daughter, Mrs. Hansbury, and her husband that Emma Smith detected Joe in adultery with a girl by the name of Knight, and that Joe confessed the crime to the officers of the Church. W. W. Phelps stated that while Smith was pretending to translate the papyrus, for his book of Abraham, he declared that polygamy would yet be a practice of the Saints. Martin Harris told J. M. Atwater, that the doctrine of spiritual wifery was first positively announced as a revelation, by Rigdon, before a meeting of the officials of the Church, in an old building that used to stand southwest of the Temple, W. S. Smith and others testify that the practice of sealing women to men was so much talked of at Kirtland, while Smith was there, that it became a by-word on the streets; and that common report said, that a bitter quarrel between Rigdon and Smith shortly before they left Kirtland was because Smith wanted to have Nancy Rigdon a girl of 16 sealed to him. In the article on marriage on pages 239, 330, Book of Doctrines and Covenants, adopted, Mormons say by the annual conference in Kirtland, April 1834, we read: "Inasmuch as this Church of Christ has been charged with fornication and polygamy." This proves that the acts and utterances of Mormons had been such, before April, 1834, that outsiders charged them with polygamy. R. M. Elvin and other leading Josephites have admitted that Rigdon and Smith have taught Spiritual wifery or "sealing women to men in time for eternity." They claim that it confers none of the privileges of marriage, but when a woman allows another man, besides her husband, to get such control over her, as to be sealed to him in marriage—call it spiritual, or celestial, or what not—she will allow him the privileges of terrestrial marriage. Such was the result in Smith's case always. In the "Elders' Journal," edited by Joe

Smith, No. 2, page 38, published in Kirtland, November 1837, in an editorial, Smith publishes some questions that he says "Were asked daily and hourly, by all classes of persons while we were traveling." The 7th is "Do Mormons believe in having more wives than one?" Smith himself confesses that the acts and utterances of Mormons had been such, that all classes of persons asked him daily and hourly, while he was journeying between Kirtland and Far West. "Do Mormons believe in having more wives than one?" Scores of persons who were prominent among the Mormons in Missouri, have declared that Smith confided to his confidants, that he had received a revelation in favor of polygamy, but that it was not prudent to make it public. The time had not come to make known the will of the Lord. In Nauvoo, while discussing the extraordinary power conferred by the charter they intended to ask from the Illinois legislature, Smith said that they needed such extraordinary powers, for the Turk, with his harem, would come to Nauvoo, and they must have power to protect him in polygamy. Smith declared in a sermon he preached in 1840, that polygamy was right. It was right, in the sight of God, for a man to have as many wives as he pleased. People of polygamous countries would be converted and want to come to Zion, and Mormons must have polygamy as an established institution, and then they could bring their polygamous wives with them. He made the same argument from the Bible that Brighamites now make. This sermon raised such a storm he became alarmed, and tried to lie out of his revelation of polygamy, by declaring that he was only trying them (the Mormons). But he rebuked them for their rebellious spirit in daring to oppose what he said, and told them that their hardness of heart prevented the will of the Lord being revealed and carried out. He practiced polygamy himself and taught it to other leading Mormons, who also practiced it in secret and taught it to others.

His intimacy with Julia Murdoch, his adopted daughter, caused trouble with his wife, who sent the girl to her father. At one time he had in the Mansion House eleven girls, that he called his *daughters*, saying that he had adopted them to take care of them. His wife left the house and he had to dismiss his harem, to silence the scandal, and get his wife back. Rushton, who was a sort of factotum about the Mansion House, testifies that while Mrs. Smith was in St. Louis on business, the wife of a leading Mormon took her place in Joe's bed, and that he saw her there when he went to Joe's room for some keys. The complaisant husband was made an apostle for his submission to the will of the Lord. Did space permit we could give the sworn statements of Orson Pratt's wife, Wm. Law's wife, Dr. Foster's wife, Wm. Mark's daughter, Nancy Rigdon, Martha Brotherton, Melissa Scindler, and a score more of as respectable women as ever lived in Nauvoo,

that Smith tried to seduce them into spiritual wifery. We could quote the affidavits of scores of men and women that positively swear that they knew of his lewdness with scores of women. We could quote the revelations of Van Duzen and his wife and others in regard to the orgies of the Endowment House. The fact that these revelations made before the death of Smith, are an exact description of the orgies of the Endowment House as practiced in Utah, proves that they were practiced in Nauvoo before Smith's death, as these parties declare, and that Smith was their author as Utah Mormons now declare.

In the fall of 1842 Joe secretly performed the first plural marriage ceremony. He married Wm. Noble to his first plural wife and Noble united Joe to his sister. Joe had had scores of spiritual wives before this, but without the farce of a ceremony of marriage. Soon after he took the beautiful wife of B. H. Jacobs as a plural wife as she and others testify. In the winter of 1843 Smith gave to S. H. Jacobs an article presenting the usual arguments for polygamy. Jacobs published it in the "Wasp" and in pamphlet form. Joe was trying the Saints again. The opposition to the infamy alarmed him again, and he tried to lie out of it, and pretended to oppose polygamy. He told the people again that their rebellious spirit would not let the will of the Lord be made known. In the spring of 1843, however, matters had gone so far, so many had gone into polygamy, Joe's wife was making so much opposition to his course, that he could wear his mask no longer. June 12th, 1843, he dictated to William Clayton "A Revelation in Regard to Celestial Marriage." N. K. Whitney, who has done more of Mormon official writing than any other man, declares he heard it dictated to Clayton, and that he copied it from the copy taken down by Clayton. Joseph C. Kinsbury testifies that he heard it dictated and copied it also.

When the original copy, taken down by Clayton, was presented to Smith's wife, she declared it was from the devil and burned it. David Fullmer and others who were Apostles and high Councillors testify that Hiram Smith presented the revelation to the Apostles and the Council, and that it was adopted and sanctioned. In the Spring of 1844 Marks, Higbee, Law and others seceded and held meetings. In these meetings, ladies of the highest character, positively testified that Smith and other Mormon leaders had tried to seduce them into polygamy. Scores testified to the polygamy of Smith and Mormon leaders, and to the abominations of the Endowment House, and other secret meetings of the Mormons. In June 1844 the malcontents issued a paper called the "Nauvoo Expositor." In it were affidavits of sixteen as respectable ladies as were in Nauvoo, that Smith and other Mormon leaders had tried to seduce them into polygamy. Joe's answer was to send a mob of his too's to destroy the press and compel the publishers to fly for their lives. They swore out war-

rants for the arrest of Smith. He was put in jail at Cartage and murdered, not by Missourians and Illinoisians, but by men whose wives and daughters he had tried to ruin. He fell, not as a martyr to religion, but as a victim to his own crimes, as he himself declared when going to Carthage. Such are the facts in regard to the career of Smith in his connection with Mormon polygamy.

We prove our statement by the testimony of intimate acquaintances of Smith in New York, leading Mormons and citizens in Kirtland, leading Mormons in Missouri, leading Mormons in Nauvoo. We have cited the statements and certificates of scores. We prove that Smith was the author of the revelation in favor of Polygamy by Clayton to whom he dictated it. Whitney and Kingsbury who heard it dictated and copied it. By Fullmer and other apostles and councillors to whom Hiram Smith presented it, and by whom it was sanctioned. We cite the testimony of Edwin Hunter, presiding bishop of Utah church, in an affidavit dated Salt Lake City, September 1st, 1883. He solemnly swears, "Since 1842 he has held most intimate relations, personal and official, with the leading men of the Church. President Joseph Smith was his warmest personal friend, he was herald and armor-bearer to Joseph. From this very intimate and personal relation and intercourse he knows that Joseph Smith both taught and practised the celestial and eternal order of marriage from the beginning of our acquaintance to the time of his death." This is but one of scores that can be cited, scores to whom Smith taught polygamy. The testimony of Eliza R. Snow, Eliza Partridge, Emily Partridge, Lucy Walker, Mrs. Jacobs and others to whom Smith was married in polygamy.

The testimony of others who saw him married in polygamy among the rest, the oath of his niece, the daughter of Hiram Smith, that she saw him married in polygamy. The oaths of persons for whom he performed the ceremony of plural marriage. W. Noble, J. B. Noble, J. D. Lee, and others. The reply to all this array of evidence is an impudent denial, without one particle of rebutting testimony, and abuse of the witnesses as liars and perjurers. As the persons who now pour out such abuse did not make such denials when the facts were recent, and make them now when they think the evidence can be weakened by such denials, on account of lapse of time, these denials are merely the retort of the cornered ruffian, "You are a liar." It is amusing to read the weak efforts of the Josephites to get rid of the damning fact that Impostor Joe was the originator of those abominations, Mormon polygamy and the revelation in favor of it. They remind one of the lawyer who was defending a man charged with stealing a kettle and failing to return it. He said I. The plaintiff never had a kettle. II. We never borrowed his kettle. III. We returned the

kettle. IV. The kettle was worthless. V. We paid for the kettle. VI. The kettle was ours in the first place. In like manner, I. T. W. Smith suggests that in giving Impostor Joe that revelation in favor of polygamy, the Lord did not do different from what he did in his revelation to David through Nathan; thus tacitly admitting that Joe did have such a revelation and that it is all right. II. The leading editorial in the first number of the *Saints' Herald* says that the Lord gave that revelation to Joe to punish Joe and the Mormons. III. In the same number Isaac Sheen says Joe had such a revelation and that it was from the devil. IV. Joe lied and said he received such a revelation, when he did not. V. It is a lie and a forgery gotten up by Utah Mormons. VI. It is a lie told by the Gentiles.

As the "clodings" peddler tells us, "you takes which you likes." It is all the same material—lie—throughout. When the Josephites started, they did not dare to deny that Joe was the originator of Mormon polygamy, and the author of that revelation. The facts were too recent and there was too much evidence to be lied down. Forty years have elapsed since the revelation was given and over fifty since Joe first taught and practised polygamy. Now they impudently try to lie out of it. We will stop all such lying attempts by quoting their own testimony, given when they started, and when the facts were recent and the evidence so palpable that they freely admitted the truth themselves. On page 26 of the *Saints' Herald*, Vol. 1, No. 1, William Marks, one of the leaders in the re-organization movement, one of their founders and a leader till his death, declares that June 1844 he was presiding elder of the Stake at Nauvoo, and presiding officer of the High Council. At that time the Church had in a great measure departed from the pure doctrines and principles of Jesus Christ. It was revealed to him that the only way to purify the church was to dis-organize it. A few days after this revelation to him, the Prophet Joseph sought an interview with him, and said to him in these words, *verbatim*, for they were indelibly impressed on his memory:

"He had for a long time desired to have an interview with me on the subject of polygamy. It would prove the overthrow of the church and we would have to leave the United States on account of it. He would go before the congregation and proclaim against it. I must go before the High council and proclaim against it. He would prefer charges against those in transgression, and I must sever them from the Church, if they would not make complete satisfaction."

From this clear, positive and circumstantial evidence of one who was high in authority at Nauvoo when Smith's influence as a prophet was omnipotent in the church—one who was intimate with Smith—one who knew perfectly all that was going on in the church—one who was one of the founders of the Re-organization and a leader till his death, as given in the first number of the official organ of the Re-organized, we prove:

I. That while Smith was living, and when his influence as a prophet was omnipotent in the church, this abomination was so prevalent that Marks, presiding elder at Nauvoo, declared that the only way to purify the church was to dis-organize it.

II. That this abomination, polygamy, prevailed to such an extent that its author, Smith, became alarmed and declared that it would be the ruin of the church, and that the Mormons would be driven out of the United States on account of it.

III. The testimony of Marks and of Smith himself substantiates the charges of the witnesses we have cited, that polygamy was prevalent in the church when it was under the control of Smith, and when his influence as prophet was omnipotent in it. Also the statements of witnesses in regard to the orgies of the Endowment House and other secret meetings in Nauvoo. The church had become corrupt in polygamy and lust.

Marks does not state how far Smith was responsible for the horrible state of affairs that so alarmed him, but as he had been and was the great prophet, and as his influence was omnipotent, so startling an innovation as polygamy could not have become so prevalent unless, as hundreds of witnesses testify, he was the originator of it. Josephites appeal to Marks' statement that Smith told Marks that he and Marks must oppose it. True, but it was because he found that the people of the United States would drive the Mormons out of the country on account of it, and thus ruin Mormonism.

We quote from page 27 of the first number of the official organ of the Josephites a statement of Isaac Sheen, one of the founders of the Re-organization, and one of the leaders till his death:

"Joseph Smith repented of his connection with this doctrine (polygamy) and said it was from the devil. He caused the revelation on that subject (polygamy) to be burnt. When he voluntarily came back to Nauvoo and surrendered himself into the hands of his enemies, he said he was going to Earth or to die. At that time he also said that if it had not been for that accursed spiritual wife doctrine he never would have come to that" (condition.)

By this positive statement, published with approval in the first number of the official organ of the Josephites, and made by one of the editors, a founder of the Josephites and a leader till his death, we prove:

I. That Joseph was the author of the vile pretended revelation in favor of polygamy.

II. That the statement made by Mormons in Utah is true, that the original of the revelation was burned. Sheen tries to give Smith credit for burning it. Utah Mormons tell the truth and say that his wife burned it.

III. That Smith publicly and openly confessed that he was the author of it, and that the death he feared would be caused by his crimes in polygamy.

We will now clinch the matter by quoting from the leading editorial in the first number of the official organ of the Re-organized, written, it is said, by Z. H. Gurley, one of

the founders of the Josephites and a leader in that body, and an editor of that official organ from which we quote, pages 8 and 9:

"This adulterous spirit" (of polygamy) "had so captivated their hearts" (the hearts of the Mormons), "that they" (the Mormons) "desired license from God to lead away captive" (in polygamy) "the fair daughters of his people." Could the Lord do anything more or less than Ezekiel hath prophesied? The Lord hath declared by Ezekiel what kind of an answer he would give them. Therefore he answered them according to the multitude of their idols. Paul had also prophesied "for this cause God shall send them strong delusions that they might believe a lie, and that they all might be damned." In Ezekiel the Lord also says "I will set my face against that man, the prophet, and I will cut him off from the midst of my people, and ye shall know that I am the Lord." The death of the prophet (Joseph Smith) is a fact that has been realized, although he repented of this iniquity (polygamy), "and abhorred it before his death."

By this leading editorial of the first number of the official organ of the Re-organized, written by one of the founders and leaders of the Josephites, one familiar with Smith, and what transpired in Nauvoo we prove.

I. That Smith was the author of the revelation in favor of polygamy, and that his death by violence was caused by his connection with the iniquity of polygamy.

II. That Smith repented of this iniquity before his death. This confirms Sheen's testimony.

These three declarations of founders of Josephites made in the first number of their official organ ought to palsy the tongues of the Josephites with shame, when they are trying to lie out of the truth in regard to Smith's polygamy. The Josephites assert that these men have since retracted their statements. If that were true it would merely show that in the first number of the "Saints' Herald," when the facts were recent, they stated what was true, because the evidence could not then be gainsayed; and that since then, when they think that the evidence has disappeared, they are trying to lie out of the truth they once confessed. But we defy Josephites to produce evidence that they have ever retracted these statements. These statements stood for years unquestioned and admitted. Now Josephites try by cheek and impudence to lie out of the damning fact that Joe Smith was the originator of Mormon polygamy. The evasions of Josephites when forced to face this crushing array of testimony are contemptible in their weakness. They heap abuse on the one who presents the evidence. That is as sensible as it would be for a pettifogger to abuse the lawyer whose array of evidence he could not meet. It matters not what the lawyer may be. That does not affect one particle the evidence of the witnesses he presents. They abuse and villify the witnesses. They are liars, slanderers, &c., although they are

most of them Mormons, and were leaders among the Mormons before they gave their testimony. Calling them names will not set aside their evidence.

They appeal to the denials of Smith and others. The cheek displayed in such a plea colossal. On the same ground every scoundrel arraigned for crime should be declared innocent because he denies it. If persons who accept such denials were judges in criminal trials, they would set every scoundrel free the moment he set up the plea, "not guilty." If men commit so infamous a crime as polygamy, they will not hesitate to lie out of it. The Pratts, Taylor, Richards and others, who united with Smith in such denials, now admit that they and Smith were practicing polygamy, when the denials were made, and that they and Smith lied in denying it, because it was not then prudent to avow it. Smith's revelations and teachings contain many instances where concealment and deception were commanded under similar circumstances. Smith's character for fraud, lying, cheating and deception were notorious all his life. The impudence of persons who will appeal the denials of such a person in the face of hundreds of witnesses whose testimony is clear and direct, is idiotic in its silliness.

When the clear positive testimony of O. Pratt, P. P. Pratt, Taylor, Richards, Kingsbury, Clayton, and scores of others is quoted to the Josephites, that they saw Smith unite in plural marriage many persons, that they saw him married in plural marriage, that he united them to other men and women in plural marriage; that he dictated, in their presence, the revelation in favor of plural marriage; they howl "Brighamite" "Polygamist", and sneer at the one quoting the testimony, for uniting with Utah polygamists in defaming the character of martyred Joseph. The Josephites publish and use as their standards, the works of the Pratts and other Utah Mormons. They quote their testimony in their books, and accept it unquestioned, on all topics, except their positive declaration that Smith was the originator of polygamy. If these men and women are worthy of perfect credence on all other topics, as the Josephites show, by the way they quote them, they are worthy of as much credence, when they declare that Smith was the author of polygamy. The course of the Josephites in this is absurdly contradictory, and is an insult to the good sense of all people of sense. They quote these parties with absolute confidence on all other matters, and they cannot reject their evidence on this topic merely because it contradicts their lying attempt to lie out of Smith's connection with polygamy.

Young Joseph appeals to what he says his mother told him. If Emma Smith ever made such statements to him she lied in the face of what she knew hundreds knew of her troubles with Joe in New York, over Eliza Winters, and in Kirtland over the Knight girl and several others, that she

herself charged Joe with adultery in Kirtland, and that he confessed it to her and the Church, that she sent Julia Murdock to her father because of Joe's intimacy with her, that she left the Mansion House in Nauvoo on account of Joe's harem of girls, and that she knew of his polygamy, and was present at his marriage to four of his plural wives. She either lied in the face of all this evidence, or young Joseph lied in manufacturing that evidence. I have heard several persons who were intimate with her and her history, make this statement. Finally they appeal to the teachings of the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrines and Covenants.

The Book of Mormon condemns secret societies in scores of instances, far more positively than it does polygamy, yet Rigdon, Smith, and leading Mormons become members of such societies, and instituted them, in the face of these scores of positive condemnations of them.

Several as glaring violations of the teachings of the Book of Mormon can be cited. The teachings of the standards of the church do not amount to a feather's weight in the face of such an array of evidence of the facts; especially when Smith trampled them under foot in scores of instances.

But the Book of Mormon leaves the door open to polygamy. Immediately after the passage quoted to prove that it condemns polygamy, occurs this language. After declaring that the people must keep the commandment against polygamy, just given to them, it adds, "For if I will raise up a seed unto me, saith the Lord of hosts, I will command my people. Otherwise they shall keep my commandments." (against polygamy). This means just this, "If I will raise up a seed unto me, I will command my people to practise polygamy. Until then they are to keep my present commandment against polygamy." That this is what it means is evident from the fact that in the pretended revelation in favor of polygamy the great object of polygamy is declared to be to "raise up a seed unto the Lord." In that sentence following the commandment against polygamy the door is left open for polygamy, when Rigdon and Smith chose to introduce it.

This is confirmed by Smith's language in an entry in his diary under date of October 5th, 1843.

"Gave instructions to try those persons who were teaching, practising and preaching the doctrine of plurality of wives. For according to the law; I hold the keys to this power (to teach and practise polygamy) in the last days. For there is never but one on the earth, at a time, on whom this power (to teach and practice polygamy), or its keys are conferred. And I have constantly said, that no man shall have but one wife at a time, unless the Lord orders otherwise."

Smith does not order persons to be dealt with because polygamy is wrong, but because they are rushing ahead with it without authority from him. They are making it too public and leading others into it, when he alone has that power. He teaches that men shall have but one wife, unless the Lord, through him, gives permission to

have more than one. Joe had given the revelation in favor of polygamy, but he had not allowed it to be publicly taught yet. Persons could avail themselves of the license it gave, only as he, in person, allowed them to do so. Such are the facts in the case in regard to Smith's polygamy.

There is not as clear evidence in favor of any pretended revelation Joe ever gave, as in favor of this revelation in favor of polygamy. The Josephites have no more warrant to reject this, than any other revelation.

We defy the Josephites to present as clear evidence that Smith dictated any other revelation, as we have presented for this. As clear evidence that he gave any other revelation, or as clear evidence that Smith practised any other practice, as we have given that he practised polygamy. Let

them select the revelation or practice and undertake it. As intelligent a Mormon as the writer ever met declared to him that she was disgusted with the duplicity of the Josephites in denying the palpable facts of history. The only true course was to acknowledge the truth that Smith was guilty of licentiousness and polygamy, and was the author of the revelation in its favor, and then claim that it no more affected the Book of Mormon than Solomon's polygamy affected his writings.

Will Joseph Smith and his followers cease to deny the plainest facts of history and own the truth in regard to Smith's connection with polygamy. They are lying for no purpose, for no one believes them, and the only result is to cover them with infamy for their impudent falsehood.

KELLEY'S CLOSING SPEECH ON FIRST PROPOSITION.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is with no little gratification and pleasure that I am again permitted to claim your attention in the consideration of the question, "Is the Book of Mormon of Divine origin, and are its teachings entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people?"

This is also my last thirty minutes upon the proposition, and after answering the objections and assertions last presented by my opponent, I shall pass to a review and general summary of the arguments and positions upon the questions by both disputants.

I am surprised to find my opponent at this late time in the discussion, telling the audience how much he *can* prove. He has now had ten evenings in which to do this, and he has not done it. I suggest that it will look better for him to first do something if he can towards proving his stories, or meeting the argument of the affirmative, and then tell you what he *has* done.

I have been waiting and listening with patience too, these ten evenings for some testimony to meet, or arguments to reply to, but nothing has fallen upon my ears except bundles and scraps of the most dogmatical assertions, bound up with statements of what he can prove by Mr. Rudolph, or by witnesses from Mr. Howe's book, or Mr. Tucker's; or what Mr. Campbell, Mrs. Amos Dunlap or somebody else has said. Of these persons named by him, are Mr. Rudolph, a minister of his own denomination, who lives but three miles away, and Mr. Howe who lives but nine. Of these

I took the firm position from the very first, that I had myself had conversations with both within the past few months, and that neither of them in fact knew a single thing that was in the least contradictory to my positions upon this question, and invited him to put them upon the stand here for examination, the latter at my expense. Has he done so? Has he *tried* to have them appear? Will I find him after this discussion has closed, traveling the country through, and telling what he can do, or what his witnesses knew? But he says now, that he don't claim Mr. Howe as a witness, only as a lawyer who compiled the evidence. But I have attacked the compilation itself,—the manner of the work and what it contains. Shown the gross perversions and misquotations in it, and demanded that Mr. Howe first satisfactorily account for this, and the destruction of the originals of the purported statements and affidavits contained in that book, and the original manuscript of Mr. Spaulding before it is proper under any view of the case to use them before this audience. This is the only basis Mr. Braden has for these stories. All pretended authors, in all their publications of these, either took them from Howe's book or some other work that had taken them from his book, and the entire list when examined, have gone down as having been concocted in the same spirit and manner as the story of the guards of the sepulchre who were made to say, "His disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept." But he now has another witness on what Rigdon said in 1826.

Suppose it to be true that Sidney Rigdon did take the position in 1826, or 1827, that the Apostolic religion could not be introduced in full, unless it was with the gifts accompanying and following the believer in Christ, what of it? Was it not a truth readily ascertained from the reading of the New Testament?

He would not in this have been adverse to Charles Wesley. The same doctrine was taught by Mr. Wesley. And yet he could not claim for a moment that Mr. Wesley had anything to do in connection with Mr. Smith in getting up the Book of Mormon. Such statements as this which he has placed before you for argument, only lay bare the terrible weakness of his positions.

Again he has tried to run something in the discussion this evening—at the last hour—in the hope that he might possibly be able to throw me off the main argument and get me to leave the question under discussion, as he has done, and debate a new issue. What other reason could he have had for charging polygamy at the last hour? Was it because he thought I had not the time to answer him, and also make a summary of my arguments, and he would thus further prejudice your minds against Mr. Smith? What has polygamy to do with the debate upon the present question? Does he suppose that I cannot answer the false and slanderous charge of polygamy against Joseph Smith? and does he not know that I have answered in this country abler men, and those better posted upon that charge than is Mr. Braden or any preacher of the so-called Christian church? (Applause.) Those, too, who have had far better opportunity for knowing as to the truth of the charge. It is a comparatively easy matter to answer to that charge under a proper question and at a proper time. I have only to refer to my books and the many citizens of Kirtland here to show that the parties who have been peddling on the outside that the Saints believed in polygamy while here in Kirtland, or any kind of marriage in any relation contrary to the one lawful wedlock in monogamy, have told absolute falsehoods—having no reasonable basis whatever for such assertions.

The people of Utah themselves who believe in and practice polygamy, pretend to no such thing. And persons who are so given to tale-bearing as to insidiously hawk about such things against a people innocent of any such charge are in a far more deplorable condition than any classes of the Saints whom it has been my lot to meet.

The law of the church was then, and is now, specific upon this question. In paragraph 2 of section 42, in a Revelation to the church in 1831, the instruction is emphatic: "Thou shalt love thy wife with all thy heart, and shall cleave unto her and none else, and he that looketh upon a woman to lust after her shall deny the faith and shall not have the spirit; and if he repents not he shall be cast out."

Again, in section 49, paragraph 3, it is written:

"I say unto you that whoso forbiddeth to marry is not ordained of God, for marriage is ordained of God unto man; therefore 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*; and that it might be filled with the *measure of man, according to his creation before the world was made.*"

This is the strongest sentence expressive of but a single person of each sex in proper wedlock that I have ever met with in any book, and it came in a revelation to the church here in Kirtland, through Joseph Smith. Yet he seeks to lug into this discussion the question of polygamy to arouse the mean sense of prejudice of the people.

His own arguments, however, completely decapitate him. He says that "Elder Wm. Marks stated in a letter that Joseph Smith told him in the year 1844, just before his death, that he (Smith) would prefer charges against those in transgression, and that he wanted him (Marks) to cut them off from the church." That being true, it certainly could not be true what he stated but a few moments before, that Joseph Smith was in transgression while here in Kirtland. It was six years before this that Mr. Smith was in Kirtland, and yet he has him making charges against the transgressors. Braden wants you to believe that Mr. Smith was himself in transgression and was to prefer charges against himself. The absurdity of that conclusion has only to be referred to in order that it be exposed. Who does not know that Mr. Smith could not have been guilty of any such a thing for six years while right with these parties without their knowledge? And such being the case, it is perfectly absurd to think that he would have dared to instruct Elder Marks, the President of the High Council in Nauvoo, that he would prefer charges against the transgressors and Elder Marks should cut them off. And to do also as he did in February of that same year, cut a man off from the church for that same crime, *publicly and fearlessly*.

In connection with Elder Z. H. Gurley of Iowa, I met this question of the origin of polygamy among the Latter Day Saints before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives during the first session of the 47th Congress, and we were able there, and in our "memorial," and "argument," presented to the President and each Senator and Representative, to maintain our case in opposition to those versed in the theory of those people who believe in polygamy; and do you think I could not sustain my position here?

Mr. Braden: Do it, do it.

Mr. Kelley: I am ready and prepared to do it if you wish to take up that question. But I shall not leave the question now under consideration to do it. I am in the affirmative here.

Suppose that Mr. Smith did have more wives than one, what has what *he* did, after the publication of the Book of Mormon, to do with the question of whether it is true

or not? There is no dispute by anybody of the fact that his first, and as we claim his only marriage, took place in the year 1827, the same year he began the translation of which this book is the result. He was then but twenty-one years of age. But further, I open the Book of Mormon here at page 116, and read as follows:

"For behold, thus saith the Lord, this people [the ancient inhabitants] begin to wax in iniquity; they understand not the scriptures, for they seek to excuse themselves in committing whoredoms, because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon, his son. 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. [Joseph in Egypt.] Wherefore I, the Lord God, will not suffer that this people shall do like unto them of old. Wherefore my brethren, hear me, and hearken to the word of the Lord: for there shall not any man among you have, save it be one wife, and concubines he shall have none: For I, the Lord God, delighteth in the chastity of women and whoredoms are an abomination before me: Thus saith the Lord of Hosts."

Polygamy then is clearly condemned by this book under discussion.

I open to other works of the church and I find that it is absolutely denounced; and I fail to find a single word, scratch of the pen, or fully established act of Joseph Smith, in any place during his life, where he ever in any manner or way approved or countenanced in any form, at any time a sentiment or thought contrary to, or in disregard of, the veritable teaching of Jesus Christ upon the sacred rite of marriage, wherein he says: "Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female; and for this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh." Matt. 19:4, 5.

Some pretend to believe that he practiced polygamy privately; but after a careful and candid examination of what they have claimed as evidences for this, I have found that they have invariably fallen far short of what would honestly be called, under the laws of evidence, proofs. Whereas, on the other hand, I have also noticed that the claim has either been made by persons who would like to have it so, in order to (in a manner) excuse their own evil practices, or by those who desired it so, in order that they might have a weapon with which to assail the faith of the Saints.

Then there is no foundation for, or reason in any shape why Mr. Braden should make his polygamic assault here to claim my attention.

Now there have been a great many stories told here by him; and a great many things asserted and reasserted with regard to character, and he has jumped from one conclusion to another, in order to dodge the real question at issue, prejudice your minds, and save his falling cause. But in fact he has only succeeded in proving one instance to this audience as yet, to show that there has been lying and stealing going on, as he has charged; and that was the instance where he proved that his

Campbellite Minister, whom he put upon the stand (Mr. Moss) stole a revelation from Martin Harris' Hat. (Applause.)

When my time was called I was discussing the manner of honorable debate and showing you how persons might respectfully prove or disprove the claims of the Book of Mormon, or any other work making a claim to inspiration. Showing that these things are brought to the attention of the people:

First: In the form or character of signed statements, or petitions which are properly used to set forth the truth of a matter, and when in harmony with established rules may be said to establish a *prima facie* case. This is not such a class of evidence however, as will enter with any degree of force in determining the truth of a matter at issue.

Second. The evidence to be afterwards introduced to prove the case set forth in these statements, or duly prepared petitions. The joined issue is ascertained by an examination of the points in these orderly statements. The positions taken and the claims made by the parties. But, in this discussion, my opponent has tried to make the issue upon the *characters* of the *signers*; which position I have certainly proved cannot be tolerated under the divine rule, as it makes no difference in the argument whether a man comes from the mean city of Nazareth, is called a "wine bibber," "gluttonous," "stirrer up of sedition," or a "deceiver," the rule is: "If I say the truth why do you not believe?" Never mind if they do say I am the carpenter's son, and Mary is my mother, and Joses and Simon, and Judas and James are my brothers; nor whether I eat with "publicans and sinners," or wash before or after eating. "Which of you convinceth me of sin," (by the word.) "He that is of God heareth, (receiveth, abideth in, judgeth by,) God's word."

But aside from this I told you from the outset of this discussion that I offered the statements signed by these witnesses for the purpose of setting forth the object, character, and claims of the work, under the rule requiring me to present my case. I showed in this way that I had upon all points complied with the law in this regard and then proceeded to bring the evidence as provided in the law to prove my case.

There were three ways in which I could do this, and prove it beyond a reasonable doubt; I could follow one or all; but if I proved it in either way, I would be entitled to the verdict, which would be, that the Book of Mormon is of divine origin, and its teachings are entitled to the respect and belief of all Christian people.

1. By the internal evidences of the book itself. Examining them under the rule in the constitutional and accepted standard, the Bible: "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. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed."

From the first I read copiously from the Book of Mormon to show that in doctrine and teaching it was absolutely in harmony with the New Testament, and that whosoever in faith and doctrine was a believer in the principals taught in the Bible, was already a believer in the doctrine and faith set forth in this book. Further I affirmed that the sentiments which I read were in perfect harmony and keeping with all other sentiments contained in the Book and held out as a rule of faith and practice; and called upon my opponent to produce a single paragraph of bad instruction contained in the book if he could. What was his answer to these proofs? "Impostor Joe," and a "set of rascals," "Mormonism, and the Mormon Deity," "We have all the revelation God ever intended the world should have in the Bible." We think God spoke to Peter and Paul, but as for this book we don't want it. Just because! That has been his strongest argument all the way through the entire ten evenings. Then when this was stale he referred you to what Aaron Wright said what he heard read twenty years before he said it. And, ditto, Henry Lake, John Miller, et al. in Howe's book, beautifully closing the argument with "and it came to pass."

2. The second way in which I could under the law prove my case was by taking the things written in the law *prophetically*, and prove my claim by comparing it with the prophetic utterances, and if the book in its object and character was in agreement with them, and no other reasonable interpretation of these prophecies was adverse, I would be entitled to a judgment of having sustained the question upon that.

I cited these prophecies and showed their fulfilment, and that the book was well fortified with these from Genesis to the Apocalypse, a summary of which I will give you this evening, and he answered me with "the Koran will apply as well to the passages." And then it was Sidney Rigdon, and again the character of the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, and the Spaulding story." What had all of this to do with my argument upon the prophecies? I was not asking him to take what the witnesses said about it. I only offered them as the signers to a respectable paper showing that I had a *prima facie* case. What has he to say about the evidences I bring from the prophecies in support of the work? "If you believe in Moses and the prophets ye would believe in me, for they wrote of me." This is the position of the Savior upon the question of how to test a case by the prophecies. My claim here and the claim of the Saints for this book is strictly in harmony with this instruction of Jesus and it should be so examined:—Moses and the prophets, and Jesus Christ, and some of the apostles spoke and wrote of it.

3. The third line of proof was by the prophetic evidence contained in the book itself and demonstrated to be such:—

First. By showing that the statements made in the record of the habitation, char-

acter, condition, nativity, enlightenment and final termination of the ancient races of man (and in many instances of classes of animals), of the continent were such that if true, the work must be of a divine origin, for when published a knowledge of these things had not been attained by the world. This could be attested by the introduction of such evidences as have, since the publication of the book, been brought to light through research and discovery.

Second. By the occurrence of certain remarkable events in fulfillment of prophetic statements made in the book, and which have taken place within the knowledge of the people since the publication. To substantiate this I presented the attested greatness of the ancient civilizations of America by their works, monuments and ruined palaces and cities, discovered and explored since the publication of the Book of Mormon. And secondly, gave the history and narration of certain things which had occurred in fulfillment of predictions in the book, showing that as predicted therein on page 103, the blood of the Saints had gone up into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth in the diabolical butchery of their men, women and children in Missouri and Illinois; that the devouring fire, and fierce and vivid lightnings, earthquakes, and smoke in foreign lands, so as to crimson the rays of the sun itself, had taken place as foretold by one of the prophets on page 496; that the book from the first had been fought as and called a *Bible* by its enemies as predicted in it on page 105; that the historical *early* and *latter* rains had returned to refreshen and bless Palestine, and prepare for Israel's return there soon after its publication, as foretold on pages 102 and 107; that the peculiar work of the cyclone had taken place to the astonishment of all people, as declared in the book in the figure of the "tempest," and many other predictions and the fulfilment that I might name.

To all of this what has been his answer? 1. That Joseph Smith could have gained this knowledge of the habitation, greatness and civilizations from things already known to the world of the antiquities of America, and as a proof, cited Priest's work that was published before the Book of Mormon, he said. I took his (Priest's) work, and showed that what he had cited you as a prior publication of Mr. Priest was not a work upon antiquities at all, but a book of tales entitled, "The Wonders of Nature and Providence." He made a great display of the names of authors Priest quoted from, mentioning Boudinot, Edwards, Elliot, Cotton Mather, et al.; but failed to read to you a single thing these men had said upon the subject; and, indeed, they had said nothing except as to enter their speculations upon the subject of whether the American Indians were the descendants of the "lost tribes of Israel." I had preceded him, however, in this, showing there were such speculations; but what had all this to do with the great civilizations, works of art, location of cities, skill and mechanism, towering

cliff dwellings and cities, and the grand, enlightened and populous nations described in the Book of Mormon and since verified by discovery? I asked him. And so far as answering is concerned he has sat dumb and speechless throughout the ten evenings. But he could talk about Solomon Spaulding, Mrs. Dunlap, Dr. Winters, Alexander Campbell and Pomeroy Tucker, and try to villify Sidney Rigdon and others.

But again, I pointed him to the prophecies in the book and their fulfillment, and he could only cry, "Impostor Joe," "Sally Chase," "Money digger," and "such abominable trash and stuff."

What had all of this to do as to whether these prophecies had actually been fulfilled or not? I refer to his kind of weapons and methods of warfare to show you how he has effectually *escaped* making an argument touching the issue. The book is here, and the question presented for proof under the agreed standard between us (the Bible) is, Does it fulfill the requirements of the law? He has only referred to this, however, by asserting that not one of the prophecies apply. But my judgment is that they do apply, and I have given you my reasons for applying them and claimed that they can be properly applied to nothing else, and the time is past for the fulfillment of many. He has stood before you under the name of a theologian and has not even dared to take a position as to what they did refer to, lest he be caught. He told you some person in London applied some of them in one way, and Mahomet applied some in another; but when I ask him to examine them and meet the issue here, he goes back to hurling epithets at the witnesses to the Book of Mormon, who are called for an entirely different purpose.

I took up the other line open to me and showed that the statements made in the work upon the ancient state and civilization of the continent as developed by writings within the past fifty years were corroborative, and convincing of the truth of the work; and he at once takes the ground that all this development in the ancient civilization is but a reproduction of what was known before the publication of the book.

The finding of the fossil remains of the animals which had ceased to exist when America was discovered by Columbus, and which were not known to have existed upon the continent till after the publication of the Book of Mormon, and I am referred to Cortez' invasion of Mexico, where he found the people in such a state of barbarism that they were sacrificing human lives to gods made with their hands for a solution. To the march of Pizarro in Peru, who met with the Incas in their rudeness; but was this an indication that two highly cultivated and civilized peoples had lived and died in these very countries? No, sir; nor has such a deduction ever been made from the then condition of the peoples. The facts of the great civilizations arise from the researches among their ruins. Before, it was only a

speculation as to whether the Aztecs and Toltecs and Incas, or either of them, had ever been a civilized and enlightened people. It was only ascertained by explorers through the distinct character of the sculpture and paintings, roadways, and ruined palaces and temples, and buried cities, that these three distinct civilized peoples had existed here, the discoveries of which were subsequent to the published record in the Book of Mormon. Then he goes back again to his tub of vilification and slander, and attacks the witnesses offered to make the *prima facie* case. But what of the main evidence? Not in the least referred to by him. Suppose our case was before a court in the shape of written pleadings and signed. There we would respectively present our cases as we have presented them here. As the one affirming, I begin and introduce my evidence to prove my case, as set out in my pleading, and rest. My opponent, when his time comes, instead of introducing evidence on his side, contents himself by vilifying the signers to my petition which I have never introduced to prove the main issue. I would go on and prove my case, and my opponent would content himself with an attack upon these same witnesses. The result would be that at the close of the trial he would find himself sitting with his chair from under him.

Now look at the kind of proof for the Spaulding story from this standpoint of the evidence. He first introduces his witnesses to make his *prima facie* case, viz: to show that Spaulding wrote a manuscript. That is all right; they can do that by their mere statements or affidavits. But when he comes to his main case he has only these same statements—only this and nothing more; and he introduces these same statements to show what was in the manuscript they say was written, and they burn the manuscript itself. Can you swallow their story, then? All of his statements and affidavits have first gone through the hands of Howe, who I have shown you so fully (that even Braden has not denied it), filched and garbled from our books to try to make his points. Were the statements clean then, after having passed through this sickening sewer? Who will say that they were? Then we were told that the Whitmers and Harris and Smith expected to make money out of this thing. The lie is given to it from the very first by the public writings. They were distinctly told as early as 1823 that they should not make money out of it, and that was published and of record from the first. Why should these plain, published facts be contradicted by his witnesses of easy reputations? And why should he continually harp on character? Is his faith so based upon frail humanity that he judges mine to be? He has examined into the private lives of these men as though he expected we were to be saved through or by their acts. What has their acts to do with our faith? Does he violate respect of Jesus' unblemished life by pretending to compare the wayward life

of mankind with it? Of any person? Does not Jesus stand out alone the model and pattern in life to the children? Do we take any of the apostles' or prophets' private lives as an example to model after, except so far as they followed Christ? Oh no, the Saints do not; but my opponent's ire has been aroused; it is "*war to the knife, and the knife to the hilt*" with him; and he will open his mind and heart to nothing good unless it perchance comes through the small glasses through which his vision is alone lighted. Man can never reach truth in any sense by such a course, and I advise him to change, and now.

SUMMARY.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I shall now briefly summarize the arguments adduced in the investigation of the proposition, as I have contrasted the proofs of both the affirmative and the negative, and the methods pursued by each in the examination of evidence. I showed to you:

First, That the standard by which men and revelations are to be tried, and their teachings and claims to divinity determined, is the doctrine and words of Jesus and his servants, viz: "to the law and the testimony."

This is the advice of the prophet Isaiah to the people when testing the teachings of the professors of his time. Not by their pretended supernatural works, their characters, or the lies told about them. Isaiah 8:20. Jesus submits this *same rule* to the hypocritical Jews as the one holy and just, as the rule by which he would submit and be tried as to his claims when they would fain attack *his character*; submitting that "He that is of God heareth God's words. Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." John 8:47. "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, 9th verse.

Second. By this DIVINE rule, I showed that the writings of the Book of Mormon must be tried, and its claims to a *divine origin* must be determined. By this rule the book stands approved, its teachings being in strict harmony with those of Christ, the prophets, and apostles, as attest the contents of the volume entire—and as proof of which, I cited certain passages found on pages 99, par. 16, 224, par. 4, 242, par. 4, and 249, par. 8, and which were cited as but reflecting the sentiment of the book throughout. By the Bible, therefore the claims of the Book of Mormon to a *divine origin* upon a doctrinal basis are found to be true.

Third. The avowed object of the book in its being brought to light to convince the Jews and the Gentiles that Jesus is the Christ, the Savior; as witness the preface of the work, and pages 441, and 290, read the first evening, is a good one and in harmony with the Bible. By the voice of two or three witnesses shall every world be established.

Fourth. I also presented as bearing upon

the investigation of this question, the *great and divine* truth, enunciated by the apostle Paul and Peter, that God created the *nations* of the earth, and determined the *bounds of their habitation*, for the *express purpose* of being sought after, *felt after* and *being found* of them. And the only way any nation has been able as yet to really find him, is by seeking him *through the revelation* he has given to them. They could only work righteousness to acceptance with him by conforming to the law of righteousness, (the gospel,) as it is *therein* that his righteousness is *revealed*. See Acts 17:26—27; 10:34, 35. Evidence does appear both in the Book of Mormon and in the accounts of modern scientific investigation, and archaeological discoveries on the American continent, showing that the ancient inhabitants of this continent knew of and worshipped God, and therefore the claims of the Book of Mormon to containing a record of the gospel as revealed to the ancient inhabitants of this continent is both scriptural and reasonable. This great fact is of importance in this controversy, illustrating the thought, that He who *Scattered* the people from the Tower of Babel, abroad "upon the face of all the earth," (and hence some were brought to the Western continent,) as is affirmed by the Bible and twice stated in Genesis, chapter 11, verses 8 and 9, left them not without providing for their moral and spiritual welfare. This the Book of Mormon teaches regarding the Jaredites who journeyed to this land from the tower, and were blessed here with a revelation of God's will to them—and here again the Book of Mormon and the Bible agree in thought.

Fifth. The Book of Mormon teaches that the branches of the tribe of Joseph of Egypt emigrated to this continent about 600 years before Christ, and here became a great people, and were blessed with manifestations of God's will. To this agree the prophetic blessings of Jacob upon the sons of Joseph, Manasseh and Ephraim, when blessing them *concerning things to come*. He predicted they should become "*a multitude in the midst of the earth*," geographically locating them on this continent when taking our stand in Egypt, and extending our measure to "the midst of the earth." Not only this, but the descendants of Joseph alone were to become a multitude of nations, whereas the entire twelve tribes became but two nations, so far as the Bible informs us, on the Eastern continent. Gen. 48:14-19. On this continent the multitude of nations is fully represented in the aborigines, and in the different nationalities congregated here since the time of the discovery. And the Bible bears out the Book of Mormon in its claims again.

Sixth. In Genesis, chapter 49:21-26, Jacob blesses Joseph with a land situated beyond the sea, or "over the wall," and to which Joseph's descendants were to emigrate; and not only this, but this landed blessing prophetically given to Joseph was to far exceed *in geographical boundaries and ex-*

tent the land of Canaan, the land of Jacob's progenitors; for he said, "The blessings of thy father have prevailed *above* the blessings of my progenitors, unto the *utmost bound of the everlasting hills*. They shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that was separated from his brethren."

Moses also, when blessing the tribes of Israel for the last time, marks Joseph distinctly with a landed estate that in none of its leading characteristics refers to their little portion of Palestine: A land blessed with the deep that coucheth beneath; great inland seas or lakes of fresh water; the precious things of its everlasting mountains and its noted hills, the ores and minerals of which Canaan is devoid; the great variety of fruits, indicative of varieties of temperature, which was not true of Joseph's little portion in Palestine. But the land of America fills this prophetic description of Moses to the very letter, thus confirming the Book of Mormon in its claims that Joseph's descendants came and inherited this land anciently.

In the history of the Book of Mormon I showed you that two companies of Israelites came to the continent, one landing upon the western coast of South America and the other in Yucatan, and that afterwards these peoples were united. From the discoveries and explorations since made, I showed you that this was corroborated in the fact that the cities builded in Yucatan were quite different from those builded by the Jaredites in other parts of Central America. That such a people did exist is proven also by Mr. Short, pages 436 and 438, where he says they still preserve in history the word "Muloc," and as used by them it means "union." The Mulockites of this part of Central America were the very people the Book of Mormon says united with the people of Nephi; and to maintain that the evidence from the explorer and linguist is corroborative of the narrative in the book, is entirely reasonable and legitimate.

Seventh. I showed you that the fact that Ephraim should be hidden, mixed and unidentified with the people, until one should

stand up with the *Urim and Thummim* to declare him was entirely scriptural; and the fact that the one who translated the record of the Book of Mormon had this instrument by which the positive light was turned upon the prophetically *first born* of Joseph in pushing the work of gospel progress, in the last days, was a convincing evidence of the Book of Mormon and its agreement with the Bible.

Eighth. That the people to whom Jesus referred in John 10:16 were emphatically of Israel, and that they did hear his voice and were those whose record we have in the Book of Mormon.

Ninth. That the "ensign to be lifted up" in Isaiah 18; the message represented by the writing upon the stick of Joseph in the 37th chapter of Ezekiel; "the book," which was to contain the doctrine of Christ set forth in the 29th of Isaiah, and the "gospel," which John witnessed committed by the angel in Revelations 14:6, all pointed to the culmination of a certain thing, and the inauguration of the same work, at a time in the world's history, "just afore the harvest," when "Lebanon was to be turned into a fruitful field," "in the hour of his [God's] judgment, in the time when the "Son of man shall come;" and that these prophetic descriptions are fully and completely answered in the coming forth, object, character and work of the Book of Mormon, and that it is therefore a light indeed to the people and the precursor of the glory of Israel.

Tenth. That the work was not to commend itself through its excellency of speech or words of man's wisdom, but absolutely as declared by the prophet, be blessed to those who should seek after the wisdom and power of God; "for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." Isaiah 29:14—all of which is fully answered in the message brought by the Book of Mormon.

(Time called).

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your patient hearing. (Applause).

MR. BRADEN'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :—The proof that Impostor Joe was the author of Mormon polygamy seems to have completely unbalanced my opponent. He howled and ranted and talked against time till his chagrin, anger and evident consciousness of defeat were pitiable. The argument is this. The Re-organized denounce polygamy as from the devil. God would not give such a revelation. If Joe did give to the world such a pretended revelation, it was from the Devil and not the Almighty, according to the Re-organized themselves, and he was a prophet of the Devil and not of the Almighty. We take them on their own grounds. We presented the testimony of William Marks, intimate with Joe and high in authority under Joe, and one of the re-organizers of the Re-organized, one of their founders and teachers, one of the editors of their official organ, that when the power and influence of Joe Smith was omnipotent among the Mormons as their prophet, polygamy prevailed to so fearful an extent that Marks had a revelation that the only way to purify the church was to utterly dis-organize it. Also that even Joe himself, the author of the abomination, was alarmed, and said that polygamy would be the ruin of Mormonism. This was while Smith was living and his influence was omnipotent. Will Kelley deny the statements of Marks, one of the founders of his re-organized concern?

We read the declaration of Zenos H. Gurley, in the first number of the official organ of the "Re-organized" written by Gurley, one of the editors, and one who was intimate with Smith in Nauvoo and who was one of the re-organizers of the Re-organized, one of the founders of Kelley's organization, who declares, positively, that the Mormons wanted to go into polygamy, and that Joe gave them the revelation, and that he repented of the iniquity of giving this revelation and was punished for it by a violent death. Will my opponent deny this statement? We presented the positive statement of Isaac Sheen, one who was intimate with Smith and knew all that transpired behind the scenes in Nauvoo, one of the re-organizers of the Re-organized, one of the editors of their official organ, one of the founders of the organization, that Smith was the author of that abominable, so-called revelation, that he declared himself that he was the author of it, and that, if it had not been for the practice and teaching of polygamy in which he had indulged, he would not have been involved in the troubles that cost him his life. Will my opponent deny this positive testimony of three of the re-organizers of the Re-organized, the three

editors of the official organ of his organization, three of the founders of his so-called church? Does he dare attempt it?

His appeals to the Book of Mormon and Book of Doctrines and Covenants amount to nothing. The Book of Mormon is full of the anti-Masonic rant of the times of its origin. Yet Rigdon and Smith afterwards became Masons. Joe never had a pretended revelation that he could not contradict by another pretended revelation. We have proved that from infancy he was a notorious liar. We have proved that he and his confederates repeatedly lied in denying the most palpable facts. Mormons lied for years in denying that spiritual wifery and polygamy were practised and taught among them, when the testimony of hundreds of persons who saw and heard it, proved that they were lying.

The facts we have proved, that Smith advocated polygamy before he left New York, that he tried to practice it in Pennsylvania, and said adultery was no sin, the declarations of Mormons who were behind the scenes in Kirtland, that he practiced it secretly in Kirtland, that he practiced it in Missouri, that he declared in Kirtland that it would be the practice of Mormons, his declarations to his confederates in Missouri that he had such a revelation, his practice of it in Nauvoo, teaching it extensively in private, his taking plural wives, as the affidavits of such wives and witnesses prove, his performing the ceremony for others; the testimony of men to whom he dictated the revelation, of the one who took a copy from this original, of apostles who passed on the revelation in high council, and of the editors, re-organizers, founders of the Re-organized, in the first number of their official organ, render Kelley's attempted denial brazen in effrontery, and idiotic in its worthlessness.

In his attempt to reconcile the gross contradictions in the Book of Mormon, that we exposed, he falsifies its statements. The plates of Ether which Limbi found, were not the plates of Jared's brother, which were not to go forth until after the Gentiles were converted. He did not explain how any Jaredite plates could be in the keeping of King Benjamin, when Mosiah, Benjamin's son and successor, did not obtain the plates until after Benjamin's death, and the Nephites did not know of the existence of the plates, or the people who had them, until after Benjamin's death. The Book of Mormon does say, in so many words that Coriantumr died among the subjects of King Zarahemla, who reigned 250 years before Christ, or 350 years after the Nephites reached America, and 340 years after

the Zarahemlites reached America; or at least 350 years after all the Jaredites, except Coriantumr were slain. Moroni did say he could write no more for his plates were full, and he could make no more plates. In representing that he afterwards wrote the Jaredite portion, the Book of Mormon does make him write on nothing, 57 pages of the Book of Mormon. Unfortunately for my opponent's gabble about the sticks of Ephraim and Judah, the same Hebrew word means "rod," "staff," "stick," "scepter." In not one instance are rolls or books called sticks. Ezekiel wrote on a literal stick as Aaron wrote on a literal stick. We have several times proved from the context that his long string of prophecies can refer only to Israelites on the old continent, and not to Israelites in America, for there never were any such, and the speakers knew nothing of America. We have several times exploded his archaeological stuff.

If any one will compare the characters on real glyphs with Joe Smith's lying pretended *fac simile* of what was on his pretended plates, he can see the difference between real glyphs and a clumsy fraud gotten up by an ignoramus.

The contradictions in Mormon statements that I have exposed, I quoted from Mormon books themselves. I showed that Mormon statements are contradictory. By quoting from Mormon books we proved that Smith, Harris, Whitmer, Cowdry and others flatly contradicted themselves. In the same statement of Whitmer that Kelley read a portion of, are silly yarns about angels plowing seven acres of land, sowing eleven acres of plaster, old Maroni trudging along side of Whitmer's wagon, lugging the plates, and sweating like an old tramp. The silly lies of Whitmer, Harris, Smith and Moroni destroy their testimony. Kelley says Whitmer is a most estimable man. I read from his own copy of the Mormon official organ, the "*Times and Seasons*," the statement of Smith that he was an ass braying out cursings, and was cut off from the church for lying, slander and plotting robbery and murder. We read an official document issued by Rigdon and 83 Mormon officials, their highest officials, that he was guilty of lying, stealing, counterfeiting, and was a blackleg of the blackest dye.

The Book of Mormon declares that the plates were engraved by divine command, by the gift of God, translated by the gift of God, and the witnesses declare that God told them the translation was correct, yet the Mormon Deity had to correct 5000 blunders!!

CONCLUDING SUMMARY.

The issues in this debate have been: I. Did mankind need new revelations in addition to those in the Scriptures, when Joseph Smith pretended, in the Book of Mormon and other pretended revelations, to give to the world new revelations, in addition to those in the Bible? II. Was Joseph Smith a true prophet of God? III. Did Joseph Smith, in the Book of Mormon and other professed revelations, give to the world new

revelations, in addition to those in the Bible? We have been agreed: 1. That man needs a revelation of religion and morals. 2. That it should be given by inspiration of chosen men. 3. That inspiration and revelation should be attended and attested by signs, wonders and superhuman powers. 4. That the Bible is a revelation given by inspiration, attended by signs, superhuman powers. 5. That these superhuman powers did benevolent work for man while attesting inspiration and revelation. 6. That they combatted evil superhuman powers, and enabled man to overcome them. 7. That they aided and directed man in matters incidentally connected with the development of the revelation of truth recorded in the Bible. 8. That they developed and cultivated his spiritual nature. We have agreed in this concerning the Bible and superhuman power connected with it.

The issues have been: 1. Has man received inspiration superhuman power, and new revelations since the apostles of Christ completed their work? Or more particularly, did he need inspiration, superhuman power, new revelations, when Joseph Smith pretended to be inspired, possessed of superhuman power, and to give new revelations in addition to those in the Bible? 3. Does the Bible teach that inspiration, superhuman power and new revelations are possible? That they were and are to continue, as an essential constituent element in the church? 4. Or does it teach that they are to cease? That they perfected their work when the New Testament was perfected? That the law of God was and is, that they should cease, when the New Testament was completed, having accomplished their work? Our position has been that, just as, in the analogous cases, of exercise of miraculous power in creation, as in the growth of each individual existence in the animal and vegetable world, or in the work of framing a constitution, and organizing a government under it, so in the exercise of miraculous power, and the influence of inspiration, in the giving of revelation there was an end, a purpose to be accomplished, and that that purpose determined the time of its continuance, and that it ceased, when it had accomplished its purpose, and was succeeded by a higher and more perfect condition, for which it had prepared the way.

We explained that there have been two influences of the Holy Spirit. 1. The direct and miraculous, seen in inspiration, revelation, and miracle. 2. The ordinary through the truth. The first is not a moral influence, produces no moral change. Left the person influenced just as it found him. That the only moral influence the Holy Spirit has exerted on men has been through truth. Conversion and sanctification can be accomplished only through the truth. The Bible speaks of these manifestations of the Holy Spirit: 1. The inspiration enjoyed by the inspired men of the Old Testament, and until the ascension of Christ. 2. Baptism in the Holy Spirit. 3. Spiritual gifts

imparted by the hands of an apostle. We proved that promises of Joel, John the Baptist, and Jesus, in regard to the Holy Spirit, all had reference to the miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit. That the promise of the Comforter was to the apostles alone, and was miraculous. That Jesus limited the promise of Joel "to all flesh," to believers; and that his language in Mark 16, logically does not extend beyond the apostles; such apostles as would preach, believing his promise to be with them; for it concludes "they" the apostles "went" everywhere preaching, and the Lord was with them" the apostles "attesting their work," the work of the apostles, with the signs he had promised to the apostles.

We proved that Peter limited the promise of Joel to such believers as "the Lord should call," to the exercise of the spiritual powers, that Joel promised. We proved that the Lord called by the imposition of an apostle's hands, that none but an apostle could impart these gifts. That they never descended to a third person. We proved that there never were but two instances of baptism in the Holy Spirit, and that, as there is one baptism, only water baptism is in the church. Baptism in the Spirit has ceased. We proved by an appeal to Eph. 4, that spiritual gifts were to remain until the church was completed, or became a perfect man, and the faith was completed in the New Testament. By an appeal to 1. Cor. 12-13, that there is a more excellent way than the exercise of the best spiritual gifts. That prophecy, all speaking by inspiration, knowledge, all revelations, tongues, all mere signs, were to cease; when the church was completed in organization, and the New Testament, the perfect law of liberty, that which makes perfect, was completed. We proved by our appeal to Daniel's prophecy that all vision and prophecy were to cease about 105 years after Christ. That as miraculous work in creation ceased, and gave way to the higher, the operation of natural law, so miraculous work in revelation ceased, and gave way to the higher, the moral power of truth. We next stated the forty cardinal ideas of religion and showed that Christianity contains all of them, expresses each perfectly as a universally applicable truth, and that it is an absolute religion of universal and eternal truths, perfectly expressed, and can not be outgrown.

We demanded of our opponent, what single truth had been given to the world by Mormon pretended revelations, not in Christianity. What idea that was not better expressed in Christianity, than in Mormonism? He has utterly failed to meet this question. We proved that all Bible writers and speakers speak of the work of Jesus and the apostles, as perfect, the last, the final. They never speak of any thing that is to succeed it. They declare that Christ came in the fullness of the times. That in Christ dwells the fullness of the Godhead, in him was all fullness. They say that all fullness is in his church. That the Gospel is the fullness, the completeness

of God's word. That the church is perfect in organization and faith or doctrine. That God gave to the apostles all things pertaining to life and godliness. This utterly forbids all idea of Mormon revelation. They are needless, for the perfect, that which is complete, the fullness, all things have been given in Christianity.

We then presented the history of the Book of Mormon and proved that it had a base human origin, and was fabricated as a fraud to deceive. We proved by the concurrent testimony of seventeen witnesses, one of them Rigdon himself, that Solomon Spaulding wrote a romance called the "Manuscript Found," that he wrote three drafts, or manuscripts, of this romance and part of another before his death. We have proved that the "Manuscript Found" had in it these features found in the Book of Mormon, and found in no other books but the Book of Mormon and the Manuscript Found. 1. The plot of the Manuscript Found, as witnesses describe it, was just what Mormons give when describing the Book of Mormon. 2. It purported to be a veritable history of the aborigines of America. So does the Book of Mormon. 3. It attempted to account for the antiquities of America by giving an account of their construction. So does the Book of Mormon. 4. It assumed that Israelites were the aborigines of America and ancestors of the Indians. So does the Book of Mormon. 5. It said the Israelites left Jerusalem. So does the Book of Mormon. 6. They left to escape divine judgments about to fall on these people. So does the Book of Mormon. 7. That they journeyed through and from Southern Asia, by land and sea. So does the Book of Mormon. 8. Their leaders were Nephi and Lehi. So does the Book of Mormon. 9. One Laban was murdered to obtain records. So declares the Book of Mormon. 10. They quarreled and divided into two nations, called Nephites and Lamanites. So says the Book of Mormon. 11. There were terrible wars between the two nations, and the parties into which they divided, with awful slaughter. So declares the Book of Mormon. 12. They buried their dead after these slaughters in great heaps, that caused the mounds. So declares the Book of Mormon. 13. In two instances the end of these wars was the total annihilation of all but one, who escaped to make a record of the final catastrophe. So declares the Book of Mormon. 14. These sole survivors finished the record of the people and buried it. So declares the Book of Mormon. 15. The Manuscript Found gave an historical account of the civilization, laws, customs, arts and sciences of those peoples. So does the Book of Mormon. 16. One party of these people were the ancestors of our American Indians. So declares the Book of Mormon. 17. The names Nephi, Lehi, Laban, Laman, Nephite, Lamanite, Mormon, Moroni, Amlicite, Zarahemla, etc., were in the Manuscript Found. So they are in the Book of Mormon. 18. The use and characteristics of these names in the Manu-

script Found were precisely the same as in the Book of Mormon. 19. The Manuscript Found was written in scriptural style—that is, the style of King James' version. So is the Book of Mormon. 20. "Now it came to pass" occurred so frequently as to render the language ridiculous. Such is true of the Book of Mormon. 21. This ridiculous peculiarity got for the author of the Manuscript Found the nickname of "Old Came to Pass." The Book of Mormon is just such a book. 22. The original from which the story was translated was taken from the earth. The same is claimed by the Book of Mormon. 23. One party of emigrants landed near the Isthmus of Panama, and migrated across the continent in a north-eastern direction. So declares the Book of Mormon. 24. The land near the Isthmus was called the land of Zarahemla. So declares the Book of Mormon. 25. In a battle between Amlicites and Lamanites, one party marked their foreheads with a red cross to distinguish them from their enemies. So declares the Book of Mormon. 26. The destruction of the nations exterminated took place near a hill called Cumorah. So declares the Book of Mormon. 27. The Manuscript Found could have been used as a fraud, an imitation of the Bible, a pretended revelation. The Book of Mormon is just such a fraud. Now, then, the reader must do one of the two things, believe that Solomon Spaulding, during a period of from twenty-two to fourteen years before the Book of Mormon appeared, by a miracle wrote a romance that contained these twenty-seven great features of the Book of Mormon—features that no other book except the Manuscript Found and Book of Mormon ever contained in common—or that Rigdon stole the manuscript of the Manuscript Found and remodeled it into the Book of Mormon.

We proved that the third manuscript of Manuscript Found was taken to Patterson's printing office. That Rigdon was learning the tanner's trade in Pittsburg at that time. That he was very intimate with Lambdin, one of Patterson's printers. That the Spaulding Manuscript Found attracted much curiosity in the printing office. That Rigdon as he interested in it. That he hung around the office, till Engles, the foreman, complained of it. That the manuscript was stolen. That Rigdon was charged with stealing it. That he afterwards showed it to Dr. Winters, saying that it was a Bible romance, written by a Presbyterian preacher named Spaulding, giving a history of the Indians, and that it had been taken to a printing office for publication, and that he borrowed it as a curiosity. We proved that he spent so much time over it that his wife threatened to burn it. That he retorted: "Indeed you will not; this will be a great thing some day." We proved by Jeffries that Rigdon told him that he took the manuscript from the printing office and gave it to Smith to publish. We proved by Tucker, Mrs. Eaton, McAuly, Chase and Saunders that Rigdon was seen at Smith's

in New York, from the spring of 1827 to the fall of 1830. We proved that he was absent from Mentor for weeks at a time, during these years, and no one knew where. We proved by Bentley, Campbell and Atwater, that he announced years before it appeared such a book as the Book of Mormon, translated from Gold plates, dug up in New York, giving the origin of American Antiquities, a history of the aborigines of America, and telling that the gospel had been preached in America just as the Disciples were then preaching it on the Reserve. We proved by Atwater, Dille, Z. Rudolph, John Rudolph, Green, and Ly Kelley himself, that Rigdon preached and advocated the doctrines in which the Book of Mormon differs from the Disciples, the peculiar ideas of the Book. That he so indoctrinated all his hearers, where he could, that every Rigdonite became a Mormon, when he became one. He had prepared then for the slight change, chiefly a change of name. We showed that when a Mormon preacher read to a Comenaut audience, for the first time they had ever heard it, the Book of Mormon, Spaulding's old acquaintances, who had heard him read his Manuscript Found, denounced the fraud, Squire Wright shouting: "Old-come-to-pass has come to life." His brother, John Spaulding, denounced it on the spot.

We have shown that the witness after reading the Book of Mormon, declare that the historic portions, in all of the twenty-seven great features we have enumerated, is identical with the Manuscript Found of Solomon Spaulding. They reject the religious portion. That accords with the idea that Rigdon stole the Manuscript Found, and remodeled it to the use of a pretended revelation, interpolating the religious portion. The testimony showing that Spaulding wrote several Manuscripts explains away the trouble over Rigdon's copying it.

He stole it. It explains the size of the Manuscript Martha Spaulding read. She read her father's first brief draft, or the portion he wrote in Amity after Rigdon stole what he had sent to Patterson's office to be published. It explains away all trouble over the discrepancy, the difference between Spaulding's sentiments and the teaching of the Book of Mormon.

We then gave a chronology of Mormonism showing that our history of the book accorded exactly with every demand of history. We then proved by the Rigdonisms in the Book of Mormon that Rigdon is its author. We found that no one but a Disciple preacher of the time when it appeared, could have been its author, used its language, and uttered its teachings. We showed that where Rigdon agreed with the Disciples, the Book agreed with them. Where he disagreed it disagreed and very bitterly too. That it advocates Rigdon's ideas on community of goods, restoration of spiritual gifts, new revelations, his fall-down power to which he was subject. His anti-Masonry. His name for believers and for the church. His sermon against infant

baptism. That it contains his baptismal formula, his revival expressions, his rant bombast, fustian, and spread-eagle. That it has every mark of being arranged by one mind, not many, as Mormons claim. The style is a unit not diverse as is the case in the Bible. That one mind is Rigdon.

We took up the testimony of Smith, the three witnesses, the eight. We proved that Smith was notorious for his frauds and lies. We exposed his almost countless lies and contradictory stories about the matter. We proved that he never made a statement that he did not, at some time, contradict. We proved by the declarations of those who had been his neighbors, associates, and by Mormons themselves that he was notorious for his falsehoods and frauds. We took up the three witnesses. We proved Martin Harris to have been utterly unreliable in his stories about Mormonism. He lied about his interview with Anthon. He told most idiotic lies. He said he never saw the plates with his natural sight. He saw them by faith. We read Joe's warning against adultery and murder, in a revelation addressed to Harris. Joe's denunciation of of him as being beneath the notice of a gentleman. That he had been a vile character before he joined the Mormon Church, and he gave his testimony one year before he joined the church. We showed by his ridiculous, idiotic tales, that he was utterly unworthy of belief. We proved by Cowdery's old neighbors that he was worthless and unworthy of belief. By a revelation uttered by Smith that he was not to be trusted. By Hiram Smith that he was a thief and a robber and forger. By Joe that he had been cut off from the church for crime, and was engaged in lying against the Saints, and plotting their murder and robbery. That he died a drunken sot with delirium tremens.

We proved by David Whitmer's yarns that his testimony was worthless. Angels sowing plaster, plowing land, and all such tomfoolery. We proved that Joe said he was cut off with Cowdery from crime, and was engaged with him in circulating lies and plotting the murder and robbery of the Saints. We showed that Rigdon and 83 other Mormons, their leaders, denounced Cowdery and Whitmer as slanderers, liars, thieves, counterfeiters, connected with a gang of blacklegs of the blackest dye. Such are the three witnesses according to Mormons themselves—Joe Smith, Hiram Smith, Rigdon, and leading Mormons. We showed that the testimony of the eight witnesses was a lie, for they testify to what they could not know. We showed by comparing the revelation announcing to the witnesses that they should see the plates, with the two testimonials, that Joe wrote all three. He wrote the lie and the confederates in the fraud swore to it. We proved by appeals to their stories in Mormon books that the persons who claim to have seen the plates and their associates in the fraud, tell contradictory stories on every point connected with it. That there is not a state-

ment of one that is not contradicted by others, and that the witnesses contradict themselves, every statement they make. On such testimony as this is the Book of Mormon based.

We proved that Joe had for years, before going into Rigdon's book fraud, been engaged in lying frauds, witching for water, peeping for money with the peep stone he stole from Chase's children, digging for money, lying about it, swindling every dupe he could find, and stealing in connection with it, and that all the witnesses were connected with this money digging, thieving, lying gang, who had been lying to get money by fraud, and a living without work. If Joe's peep-stone, stolen from Chase's children, his witching for water, his digging for money, his seeing buried money with his stolen peep-stone were frauds, so was his tale about finding plates, and his tale about translating them. The Book of Mormon is as much a fraud as his digging for pots of money. We showed that his translation of the papyrus was a transparent fraud. So was his Book of Mormon. It was as great a fraud as his Book of Abraham. We showed that the pretended *fac simile* sent to Anthon and the one in Utah were lying frauds. So was the lie he told about having plates, from which he copied these frauds. All these are frauds, one as transparent as the other, and as palpable as the noonday sun to all, except fanatics or dupes.

We proved that the Book of Mormon is based on two assumptions: 1. An angel gave a pile of plates to Joe Smith. 2. The Lord gave the translation of the plates to Joe, word by word, by miracle. Of this we have not one iota of proof, except the naked assertions of Joe Smith. We have already exposed his character and frauds. His assertions are no better in regard to this than in regard to witching for water, peeping for money, or his translation of papyrus rolls, or his lying *fac simile*. The Book of Mormon has not one particle of proof that an uninspired book should have. No interlocking with history, geography, literature and customs. No more than Vernet's "Trip to the moon." It has every feature of a fraud. It avoids all tests like all frauds. It lacks every feature that sustains the Bible. It does not interlock with other history, geography, literature and customs. It is not attested by national customs, history; by monumental institutions; by prophecies; by a vast literature based on it; by growing up in the midst of hostile criticism and attacks. It does not form the most wonderful part of the world's history, as does the Bible. It is as isolated from all these tests as Gulliver's Travels. It is as monstrous a fabrication and infinitely more improbable.

We examined the book itself. We exposed its contradictions of common sense, its monstrous fabrications, its hundreds of contradictions of itself, its contradictions of the Bible, in history, in doctrine; its contradictions of the inspired translation of Joe

Smith, its contradictions of science, of history. We exposed its literary character, its grammatical blunders, its atrocious style, its silly expressions. We show that Mormons admit its ridiculous inaccuracies and atrocities by revising out of it over 5,000 blunders, many of which are perfect monstrosities. Yet it was written by inspiration by the Almighty. The Almighty revising himself! The Almighty learning grammar and composition!! We exposed its quotations from King James' translation, quoting its blunders in text, in translation, in grammar, its obsolete words, its ridiculous copying of the brogue of that translation; showing that it was written by a person who used that translation alone. We exposed its adaptations from modern history and the Bible, its anachronisms, its speaking of things hundreds of years before they existed, its quotations from the New Testament hundreds of years before it existed, its ridiculous quotations from modern authors, proving that it was written after their day.

Finally we proved that Joe Smith was the author of Mormon polygamy and the infamy blasphemously called "The Revelation on Celestial Marriage." This alone damns with infamy all claim that he was a prophet, or that a book that emanated from him is of divine origin. In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, will you believe that Spaulding by miracle in writing a fictitious history of the aborigines of America wrote a book that agreed with a revelation of the history of the aborigines of America in all important features and names, events, and even of persons and nations, twenty years before such pretended revelation appeared? Or will you believe that the pretended revelation is a plagiarism from Spaulding's

manuscript written twenty years before it appeared? There are twenty-seven great features of the Manuscript Found in the Book of Mormon. The Manuscript Found is twenty years the oldest. They were stolen from the Manuscript Found by the Book of Mormon. Will you believe that Nephites, in America, quoted whole chapters of the Bible written after they left Asia, quoted chapters and hundreds of verses before they were uttered, that they quoted modern authors, quoted the brogue of King James' translators, its grammatical blunders, its obsolete words, quoted Rigdon's baptismal formula, his rant on infant baptism, his revivalisms, his peculiar ideas in every particular, all of which existed before it appeared? Or will you believe, as we have proved, that Rigdon stole Spaulding's manuscript and remodeled it into a pretended revelation, "to make a big thing out of it," as he declared he would?

You can act for yourselves, but common sense says this fraud was started by a back-slidden, sceptical man, once a preacher. Another sceptical preacher stole and remodeled it. A third infidel gave it to the world with his stolen peep-stone. As it was the work of infidelity, there is a fitness of things in its being defended here by infidel attacks on the Bible. As infidels got it up, an infidel should defend it with infidel sophistries. It was begotten by Spaulding, a sceptical back-slider, in sin; conceived by Rigdon, another sceptical back-slider in iniquity; and brought forth by Joe Smith, a sceptical admirer of Paine, and an advocate of his sentiments, in depravity and pollution; and has flourished in fraud and fanaticism until it has culminated in Utah in what would make devils blush.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

Proposition: Is the Church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member, identical in faith, organization, ordinances, teaching, worship and practice, with the Church of Christ, as it was left completed and perfected, by the apostles of Christ.

CLARK BRADEN AFFIRMS:

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—To avoid all wrangling between the disputants, and to enable the hearer to understand fully the issue, the proposition and its terms need careful explanation.

The word *church* has a variety of meanings, arising from the various ways in which it is used. 1. It includes all the children of God in heaven and on earth; as when it is declared that the whole family on earth and in heaven are named after Christ, Eph. 2. Also in the expression "the Church of the First Born." 2. It includes all followers of Christ on earth when it is declared that the Church is the pillar and support of the truth. Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, etc. 3. It includes all the followers of Christ in a certain country, region or district, as the Church in Galatia, Rome, United States, Ohio, Saline County, or Cincinnati. 4. It means a body of Christians organized according to the New Testament model. 5. It means a number of Christians who meet to worship God, whether organized or not, as the church in the house of Aquila. Such church may be an organized church or an elemental church. These are all the uses of the word that are recognised in the New Testament, when the word is applied to the followers of Christ, for there were no denominations in the days of the apostles. Since the division of Christians into denominations, it means: 5. A body of Christians that are separated from all others into an organization characterized by certain features peculiar to themselves, such as the Methodist Church, Baptist Church, etc.

It is in this sense that I use the word in the expression, "the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member." Thomas and Alexander Campbell, believing that the division of Christians into denominations is unscriptural and wrong, tried to remedy it by securing a union of all followers of Christ. They undertook to accomplish this, by trying to get all Christians to take the Bible as their creed; to return to exact conformity to the apostolic precedent. They urged that all should abandon everything that had not a clear apostolic precedent, and accept all that had such precedent. They undertook a *restoration* of Apostolic Christianity, and not a *reformation* of any or all existing denominations, which was

all that Savonarola, Wickliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Wesley and other reformers attempted.

The result of the efforts of the Campbells and their coadjutors, has been a body of people known as the "Disciples of Christ," "The Christian Church," or "The Church of Christ." It is this body of people that I mean, when I speak of the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member.

There is one more phrase that needs explanation, it is "The Church of Christ," as it was left perfected and completed by the apostles of Christ." The revelation contained in the Scriptures, was gradually revealed and developed, during a period of several thousand years. God's dealings with men, in making this revelation can be divided into four dispensations. 1. The Antediluvian Dispensation, that we might call the Infancy of our race, extending from Adam's first transgression, to the Flood. During this period there was no organization of the children of God. God had individual followers, like Abel, Seth, Enoch. To these individual followers he gave rudimental revelations, the alphabet of revelation, through angelic messengers and inspired men. 2. The Patriarchal Dispensation, the childhood of our race, extending from the Flood to the calling of Moses. During this period, the family was the organization, and the father was the priest of the family. To these families God gave higher teaching and simple commands, but it was still elementary. 3. The Mosaic Dispensation, extending from the calling of Moses to the Day of Pentecost, that we might call the Youth of our race.

During this period God had a chosen nation "The Commonwealth of Israel." To this nation he gave, in the Mosaic Code, a disciplinary law of positive commands, and a system of types, symbols, object lessons, prophetic of a better dispensation, and symbolizing great truths. 4. The Christian Dispensation, extending from the Day of Pentecost until the end of the human epoch of the world's career, that we may designate the "Manhood" of our race. During this period God has a church, an organization based entirely on faith and piety. To this he has given a law of universally applicable truths, and principles, in the gospel of Christ.

The Israelites were God's normal school in religion. It was his purpose to develop among them a religion for the salvation of men, and by such development to train them to be its missionaries, the teachers of this religion to the world. In this normal school there were different periods or grades of teaching. From the calling of Abraham to Moses was the primary grade, with sim-

ple teaching and discipline. From the calling of Moses to the Prophets, beginning with Samuel, was the intermediate grade, with much teaching and discipline. From Samuel to Malachi was the grammar grade, with still closer drill, discipline and teaching. From Malachi till the day of Pentecost, during which time there was no revelation, was the high school grade.

In this period John the Baptist called the Israelites back to a faithful, pious obedience to the law of Moses and the teachings of the Old Testament. Our Savior educated his apostles and prepared the way for the establishment of the church by them. But neither John nor Jesus established a church. They were loyal Israelites, obeying the law of Moses, and never worshipped apart from the Israelites' worship. During this development of revelation there were revelation, inspiration, miraculous work of the Holy Spirit. He inspired all men who spoke, wrote or acted under inspiration from Adam to John the Baptist. He inspired Zachariah, Mary, Elizabeth, Anna, Simon, Jesus and his apostles when they acted under inspiration.

John and Jesus promised a more complete work of the Holy Spirit. Joel and the prophets had prophesied that, at the close of the Israelite dispensation and the beginning of the Christian dispensation, there should be a wonderful work of the Holy Spirit that should not be confined to Israel but should extend to all mankind. John and Jesus promised the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Jesus promised the Holy Spirit as a comforter or advocate to his apostles.

Peter promised the Holy Spirit to all that God should call. The apostles imparted miraculous gifts to Christians, such as our Savior promised in the last chapter in Mark. These gifts existed in the apostolic churches. They were designed to supply inspired teaching to the church, and attest it, until the apostles had perfected the organization of the church, and had completed the work of revelation in giving to the church the New Testament.

Then, as God completed his work of creation, when he created man, and creation ceased, and plants and animals came into being by natural laws, so when the New Testament church was perfected by the apostles, and its perfect law of liberty was completed and perfected in the New Testament, the work of revelation and inspiration ceased, having been perfected in the apostolic church and in the New Testament, and the church is controlled, and will be until the end of time, by the perfect Word or God, the New Testament.

By the Church of Christ, as left perfected and completed by the apostles of Christ, I mean the followers of Christ, as they were left in congregations, with the New Testament as their rule of faith and practice, by the apostles and inspired men, when the last inspired man fell asleep in Jesus.

It is my work to prove that the "Disciples of Christ," "The Christian Church," "The Church of Christ,"—the denomination of

which I am a member, is identical in faith, organization, teaching, ordinances, worship and practice with the apostolic church, composed of the congregations that the apostles left with the New Testament as their rule of faith and practice.

I believe as the apostle John teaches, that all persons who believe with the whole heart that Jesus is the Christ, who forsake and oppose all sin, and who believe and accept the Bible as God's word, and live according to the light they have, in its teachings, are "Christians;" and that all denominations composed of such persons are "Churches of Christ," although they may be imperfect and in error in certain particulars.

It is our duty, as teachers of God's word, to proclaim its full teaching and to enforce its every law; but we are not judges, to decide who shall be saved, or to decide who are Christians, and who are not. Preach the whole truth, and leave judgment with God.

The "Church of Christ" is controlled by certain great principles in its use of the word of God. These may be summarized as follows:

1. The Scriptures, and the Scriptures alone, should be the creed of all Christians. The word "creed" has three uses. A man reads the Scriptures and he believes that they teach certain things. What he believes the Scriptures to teach, is his creed. Men preach, write and print what they believe the Scriptures teach. Such belief is their creed in the second use of the word. Men use such understandings of the Scriptures as a bond of union, and unite on them with all who believe with them. They use them as a test of fellowship, and will unite with only such as profess to believe such understandings of the Scriptures, and will fellowship only such. They use such understandings of the Scriptures as guides in worship, practice and discipline.

This is the third use of the word "creed." It is only in this sense that we object to creeds. The difference between ourselves and others can be seen by a familiar illustration. A legislature enacts a statute. A case is brought before a judge that comes under this statute. He decides the case by his understanding of the statute. In like manner, if a question of faith, practice, worship, ordinance or duty arises, we, in common with all Christians, decide it by our understanding of the Scriptures. So far we do just as all Christians do.

Now comes the difference. We say "Go to the law each and every time, and decide each and every question, by an original investigation of the law." The rest of the religious world reduce their first understanding to a creed, written or unwritten, and decide all subsequent cases by their first understanding, or more properly, by an understanding of their first understanding. They practically lay the law on the shelf, and use original investigation only to reach an understanding of the first understanding of the Bible.

We say use the Bible just as you use your "Confession of Faith," or "Book of Discipline." God's word declares it should be so used, and it alone should be so used.

2. Agreement among Christians is to be required only in such matters of belief, organization, worship, practice, and duty, as are matters of faith. In matters of opinion there must be toleration and Christian charity. There should be charity also in all questions covering expediency and instrumentalities, in carrying out the faith, worship, practice, and duty embraced in matters of faith.

3. Nothing should be required of anyone as an item of faith in belief, organization, worship, practice, or duty, for which there is not a "Thus saith the Lord," expressed, or clearly implied, for which there is not an apostolic precedent expressed in language, or action, or by clearest implication. For all items of faith in belief, worship, organization, ordinances, worship, practice and duty, there must be a clear apostolic teaching, by word, or example, clearly expressed or implied.

All creeds declare that the Scriptures are a perfect and all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, and that what cannot be read therein, nor proved thereby, should not be required of anyone, as an item of religious faith or practice. We say if they are perfect and all-sufficient, we need no creed. If we can read an item of faith or practice in the Scriptures, or prove it by them, we do not need a creed to do what we can do by using God's perfect word.

4. Where the Bible speaks, Christians can speak, and should speak, and always speak as the Bible speaks.

5. Where the Bible is silent, concerning what is claimed to be an item of faith or practice, Christians should be silent, and never teach or enforce as an item of faith or practice. The silence of the Bible is as much to be respected as its speech. This does not apply to opinions, or to expedients, means and instrumentalities, to be used in carrying out faith or practice. It forbids enforcing these as items of faith and practice, and divisions of Christians over such opinions, means and expedients.

6. We will always call Bible things by Bible names. We will use the speech of Canaan and not of Ashdod. We say "Lord's Day" not "Sabbath," which belonged to the Israelite seventh day.

7. We will apply Bible names only to Bible things. We call immersion of a believer baptism. We do not apply that term to sprinkling or pouring, nor to immersing, sprinkling or pouring an infant.

8. All followers of Christ should wear his name, and his name alone, and be called "Christians," and that alone. The Church should wear his name, and his name alone, and be called "The Church of Christ," or "The Church of God."

We do not say that none but ourselves are Christians. We merely say we are Christians, that we should wear that name alone. If others are Christians, they should

wear that name alone. We do not hinder them from doing so. We only object to their nick-naming us. If they are willing to wear a nick-name rather than the name "Christian," they have no right to force us to violate the law or God, in forcing a nick-name upon us.

We do not claim that our church is the only church of Christ. We may say we are a church of Christ, and will wear that name alone. If other denominations are "Churches of Christ," they should wear that name alone. They violate God's law in using a nick-name. If they prefer a nick-name, they have no business to try to force us to violate it by forcing on us a nick-name.

9. To apostolic precedent, in all items of faith, in regard to belief, organization, ordinances, teaching, worship, and practice, for which there is an apostolic precedent, there should be strict conformity.

10. All followers of Christ should be one, as he prayed, when he said:

"Father keep them through thine own name, the disciples that thou hast given me. That they may be one, as we are one. Neither pray I for these alone, but also for those who shall believe on me through thy word, that they also may all be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee that they also may all be one in us, that the world may believe that thou hast sent me."

And that they should be one by standing on the platform laid down in Eph. 4; and that they all could, and would be one, if they would do so. Paul says:

"I beseech you therefore, brethren, to talk worthy of the name by which you are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love, giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as you were named in one hope of your naming, (one hope through the name by which you are called), one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all."

Paul lays down eight items, eight planks in the platform for Christian union. 1. One God, the Father. 2. One Lord Jesus, the Christ. 3. One Holy Spirit. 4. One faith, the faith, one system of belief and teaching, the Scriptures. 5. One baptism. 6. One hope. 7. One body, the Church. 8. One name for believers, "Christian." One name for the Church, "The Church of God," "The Church of Christ."

We will now analyze these eight items, specifying wherein we agree with the religious world, and wherein we disagree, and our reasons for such disagreement. My opponent will criticize our position in two ways. He will object to some thing we teach. He will object that we do not teach certain things, that he regards as essential to the Church of Christ.

The first criticism we will notice. The second we will let rest until he begins his affirmative.

1. One God the Father. One self-existent, independent, self-sustaining, eternal, absolute Spirit, the author of all other existences, and the cause of all phenomena. In this we differ from others, only in refusing to speculate as to whether God is without form, body or parts, or has form, body and parts. Obeying the apostolic injunction

tion, "avoid untaught questions," we are silent on a matter on which the Bible is silent.

2. One Lord, Jesus of Nazareth, the only begotten son of God; Deity manifest in flesh; the Divine Prophet, source of all teaching religion. We reject Joseph Smith as a prophet. Divine Priest, the one who made an expiation for the sins of every human being. Divine King, the only one whose commands we obey in religion. And his commands are all divine. Not one is a non-essential. We teach that Christianity is loyalty to Christ, a Divine person.

We do not teach eternal Sonship, nor anything about essences, substances, etc., for the Bible says nothing about them. We reject all the speculations of Trinitarianism, Arianism, Socinianism, Unitarianism, and the thousand other isms, that attempt to be wise above what God has revealed. We speak only where the Bible speaks, and as it speaks. We are silent when it is silent, and reject the confusion of the theological Babel, and the jargon of Ashdod, and use only the pure speech of Canaan.

3. One Holy Spirit. We teach that there is such a Divine being or person as the Holy Spirit. We say "Spirit," not "Ghost." He, his and him, not *it*. That He inspired all persons that the Scriptures declare spoke, wrote and acted by inspiration from Adam to Christ; that he was given to men in the baptism in the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost; and at the house of Cornelius. That he was imparted by the imposition of the apostles' hands in the gifts that our Savior promised in the last chapter of Mark, and in other places, those spiritual gifts that existed in the apostolic churches. That he inspired the divine truths in the Scriptures. That wherever and whenever these divine truths influence the spirits of men, the Holy Spirit influences the spirits of men, through the divine truths that he has revealed in the Scriptures.

We differ from the other people in rejecting these three dogmas: 1. That portion of the religious world that arrogates to itself the exclusive right to the titles "orthodox" and "evangelical" teaches that in convicting and converting the sinner, and in comforting and sanctifying the Christian, the Holy Spirit exerts, on the hearts and spirits of men, a direct and immediate influence, in addition to and distinct from any that He exerts through the divine truths that He has revealed through the Scriptures. 2. Some of this party claim that the Holy Spirit is given in the baptism in Holy Spirit, now as He was on the Day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius; and that the baptism that is for remission of sins, that our Savior declares saves, etc., is baptism in the Holy Spirit.

3. The Latter Day Saints teach that the gifts of the Spirit that our Savior promised to his apostles and disciples, and that existed in the apostolic churches, should exist in the Church of Christ now. We reject the first dogma for these reasons:

1. There is not a sentence in the bible that even hints that in convicting and converting the sinner, or in comforting and sanctifying the Christian, the Holy Spirit ever did in a single instance, ever will, or does now exert any such direct and immediate influence, in addition to and distinct and different from what He exerts through the divine truths that He has revealed in the Scriptures.

2. An honest, careful investigation of the Bible shows that all work that is ascribed to the Holy Spirit, except His miraculous influence, is ascribed to the Word of God, or the truth, proving that the Holy Spirit exerts all influence, except the miraculous influence, through the divine truths that He has revealed in the Scriptures.

3. Conviction, conversion, sanctification and comforting are moral influences, in which man is a free moral agent. Such influences can be exerted only through motives presented to the spirit of man in the truth.

Man is convicted and sanctified through hearing, believing and living the truth, as the Scriptures teach.

4. If conviction, conversion and sanctification are to any extent the results of a direct influence of the Holy Spirit, in addition to what is accomplished through motives presented in the truth, and not the result of a free choice of the truth, by man's spirit, they are so far the acts of the Holy Spirit, and not of man's spirit, and man is not responsible for the absence or presence any more than a machine is responsible for what man's strength accomplishes through it.

5. If such an influence of the Holy Spirit is what converts and sanctifies men, if God is impartial He will exert it on all men, and save all men, and Universalism is true. Or if He does not, he is partial, and exerts it on only part, and elects them to eternal life, and passes by the rest and reprobates them to eternal death, and then Calvinism is true. No Arminian can be consistent and believe such a dogma. 6. Such an influence renders all preaching of the Gospel needless, for man is converted by an influence of the Spirit, distinct from preaching; and absurd, for it can do no good; and presumptuous, for man tries to accomplish, by preaching the Gospel, what God alone can do and does by the direct influence of His Spirit.

7. If there are in the mind of one on whom such an influence is exerted, two sets of impulses, the impulses of the Holy Spirit, and the impulses of his own spirit, man cannot distinguish between the impulses of his own erring, sinful spirit, and the impulses of the Holy Spirit. The result has ever been, that believers in such influences have mistaken the impulses of their own spirits, for impulses of the Holy Spirit, and every delusion, folly, absurdity, and crime, have been mistaken for the influence of the Holy Spirit. The insanity and absurdity of what is called "the power" "sanctification," "second blessing," "higher life" has led to insanity, folly, crime, and infamy.

8. If men appeal to their feelings as a proof that the Spirit exerts such a power, we reply that they measure themselves by themselves, and sanction their own folly, and not by the word of God, that condemns all such fanaticism. All enthusiasts, urge the same proof as confidently. The lives of those who make the loudest professions of such an influence, are the most defective of all professed Christians. The lives of the apostles of this dogma are the most defective of all ministers. This delusion has loaded Christianity with the most infamous fanaticism and crime, and caused more infidelity than all other causes combined. It has led to Shakerism; the Oneida Community; Free Love and pollution.

We reject all idea of any baptism in the Holy Spirit except on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius, for these reasons:

1. The baptism in the Holy Spirit was a promise, not a command. A promise is received, not obeyed. There is but one baptism in the church. Eph. 4:5. Christ commanded men to baptize others. This baptism that he commanded is the one baptism in the church. It is not Holy Spirit baptism, for Christ could not command men to baptize men in the Holy Spirit any more than he could command them to create a world.

2. Men were commanded to baptize others. This is the one baptism that is in the church. Man can no more obey a command to baptize in the Holy Spirit than he can create a world. It is not Holy Spirit baptism that is the one baptism that is in the church.

3. The baptism that Christ commanded, and that is the one baptism that is in the church, was in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. The baptism in the Holy Spirit was not in any name. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is not the one baptism that was commanded by Christ that men were to obey, and that was in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is not the one baptism in the church.

4. Holy Spirit baptism was a promised miracle. The one baptism in the church is not a miracle. And miracles have ceased.

5. Holy Spirit baptism was attended by miracles and miraculous power. The one baptism in the church is not attended by

miracles or miraculous power. All such power has ceased.

6. Christ was the administrator of the Holy Spirit baptism. It was from heaven. Man is commanded to administer the one baptism in the church. Holy Spirit baptism is not the one baptism.

7. The scriptures never hint that more than two occasions were baptisms in the Holy Spirit. Peter declares, Acts xi. 15, 16, 17, that two occasions, the descent of the Holy Spirit on the apostles at the beginning or on the day of Pentecost and the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, are baptisms in the Holy Spirit. Not a passage of scripture hints that any other occasion was a baptism in the Holy Spirit.

8. Persons who claim a baptism in the Holy Spirit, and to speak as the Spirit gives them utterance, utter nonsense, contradict the word of God, contradict each other. Such a claim is blasphemous, and an insult to the Holy Spirit, on whom they palm such nonsense, and contradictions of sense the Bible and each other.

9. The one baptism that is in the church, that is in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is water baptism, for it is commanded and men are to obey it. Holy Spirit baptism, that was a promise, not a command; that was received, not obeyed; of which Christ was the administrator, not man; that was not in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; that was a miracle that was attended by miracles, is not the one baptism in the church. All claim to it now is unscriptural and absurd.

The claim of the Latter Day Saints that the gifts promised by our Savior, and that existed in the church in the days of the apostles, should be in the church now, we will examine when we refute our opponent's affirmation in the third proposition. In regard to the trinity and the nature of the union of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and how they are one, we are silent, for the Bible is silent. It is an untaught question. We utterly discard the jargon of trinitarianism and unitarianism alike, for the Bible knows nothing of either. They are attempts to be wise beyond what is revealed, and are plain violations of the command "to avoid untaught questions." We stop with the words of the scriptures.

MR. KELLEY'S FIRST SPEECH ON SECOND PROPOSITION.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I shall first notice in my arguments this evening some of the things which have to be determined, in order for us to progress so as to receive any light whatever in the discussion of this proposition.

It is said in the question that "the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member, is, in faith, doctrine, teaching, organization, practice and ordinances, in accordance with the Church of Christ as it was left perfected by the apostles." By what rule are we to determine how the Church of Christ was left by the apostles? You will doubtless form in your minds a conclusion as to how that is to be determined. What record do you go to in order to find out how it was left? The affirmative has said, in the application of this principle to his church, and in the definition that he has given to "The church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member," that it is like the congregations that were left scattered in different parts of the earth after the apostles had fallen asleep. If that is true, where do we find the history of those congregations, that will show us just where and how they were left? I judge that my opponent will not dispute that, so far as the apostles' work was concerned in perfecting the Church, if they did perfect it, the history of their work as recorded in the New Testament is the proper history to go to in order to find out what those congregations were as they were left. The only way then by which we can tell how the congregations were left will be to turn to our New Testaments and ascertain from the situation and history as given therein, of the establishment of the churches, and of what the apostles did, thus learning from the record how the congregations were left, and whether they then filled the standard of perfection in faith and the attainment in the gifts of the Holy Spirit which the apostles so much desired they should enjoy.

Now, it is one thing to assume, as my opponent has, that there were congregations of believers left in the world without any presiding officers or duly authorized ministers, but instructed that they might make their own presiding officers and ministers, by authority of the congregation, and it is another thing to prove it. It is a little like the presumption on his part, that the Holy Spirit has ceased its miraculous power or work, for the reason, as he says, that the Holy Spirit, so far as miraculous power was concerned, was a miracle, and as miracles have ceased, therefore the Holy Spirit has ceased to operate upon the people. You see both of these are conclusions without any proper basis. They are not legitimately drawn from the New Testament Scriptures. There is, therefore, no argument in a single one of them. He starts out upon a false

premise. That is, that the miraculous manifestations of the spirit have ceased. That is a false premise. That they ceased with the apostles, too! It is false when we examine it in the light of the history as written just subsequent to the apostles' time, and false from the prophetic history in the New Testament. When we turn to Mosheim and other historians they tell us that the miraculous manifestations of the Spirit was known until the close of the third century, at least; and yet all of the apostles had fallen asleep long before this. Then, if all the apostles had fallen asleep, and still the spiritual gifts and miraculous manifestations were in the church, it will be a false assumption if he shall infer or state to the audience, as the basis of an argument, that they were not to continue after the apostles' time and that therefore, we are not to have anything of that that nature, because, as he says, there are to be no more miracles. The argument turns upon the point: Where does he get the "because?" If he could take up the New Testament Scriptures here and read to us that there were to be no more miracles after the first age of Christianity, then his first premise would be good, because he would have a "because" upon which to base it. But he makes his premise, which is not good, and proves it by a false presumption that the gifts were to cease, when he has not a single passage of scripture which he can stand by to base it upon. Thus he stands before the audience upon a false premise to begin with, and from this he draws his false conclusion.

Now let us examine and see if this is not correct. Unless he can show that there is some passage of Scripture, showing that miracles were to be confined to the first age of Christianity, he fails. In the first place, Jesus says, in Mark 16th chapter, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe."—Not you to whom I am talking, but the believer in the words that you shall bear. Well, who were to believe? Those who were to be saved, evidently. Is there any promise broader than that in the whole Bible with regard to salvation? "Preach the Gospel to every creature, and (every creature) that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and these signs shall follow (every creature) that believeth." Now, if he can show from the Bible that there is another passage some place saying that this statement of Jesus referred to the first age of Christianity only, and that after the first age of Christianity there were to be no miraculous gifts, Gospel preached, true believers or anything of that nature, then he may truly state to this

audience, that there were to be no miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit, or baptism of the Holy Spirit. But let us first have some proof, and then it will be time enough for assertions.

He says that he (his church) rejects the baptism of the Holy Spirit, for the reason that they do not consider it a means entering into the conversion of the sinner; that these miraculous manifestations have no influence in the conversion of the sinner, or in changing his moral state in any manner. He rejects the views of the Saints for that reason. And then he rejects the baptism of the Holy Spirit as believed in by the orthodox world, he says, because that has nothing to do with the conversion of the sinner either. Why does he make a difference, then, in rejecting the baptism of the Holy Spirit as we believe it, as it is manifested in the different gifts and signs, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit as believed by Mr. Wesley and others? This distinction evidently is for the purpose of keeping up a supposed difference between the views of the Saints and others, when, in fact, it does not exist. It seems to me, that, if he rejects it in their way, because it does not enter into the conversion of the sinner, as he thinks, that ought to cover also the rejection with regard to us, because we do not claim it enters into the conversion of the sinner in the sense, in which he seeks to apply it. We claim, as far as that is concerned, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the miraculous manifestations of the Holy Spirit are for the purpose of confirming the believer in the Word of God and adding the graces to his faith, and that was what it was for in the first age of Christianity. Why do you reject it for yourself for then, Mr. Braden? Answer me that question. Because it is not to be used in the conversion of the sinner, you say, when it was never given for that specific purpose; and truly you might ask, if it had been given for the conversion of the sinner only, why was it poured out upon the believers on Pentecost day? You reject it, because it is not given for the conversion of the sinner, and yet Jesus gave it for a different purpose. Why do you not keep it to answer the purpose for which Christ placed it in the church? Answer that question as you proceed.

Now, upon Pentecost day the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the believers. And I ask, for what purpose? Evidently as a blessing; and for the purpose of confirming those in the Word, who had already accepted of Jesus and John's teaching. John the Baptist came teaching, of which you are well aware, as stated in the history, saying, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." In the preaching of John the Baptist and of Jesus there was something more to be attained and sought, than simply baptism of the water. There was something that

the Christian was pointed to, that was higher and more excellent and enduring than simply going down into the water and coming up out of the water. And this excellent thing, that which formed the great central thought of the Christian religion, was the baptism of the Spirit; or the fact that men and women might attain unto the Spirit of God in order that, in their lives, they might be comforted, and that they might have that Spirit to confirm and establish them in the faith and keep them unspotted from the evils of the world.

Now, this promise was fulfilled and verified to the disciples of Jesus on the day of Pentecost by the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. We read in the second chapter of the Acts of the apostles: "Now when they heard this [the preaching of the apostle Peter], they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." What was the gift of the Holy Ghost? The same thing that they had just witnessed as having been received on the day of Pentecost. "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And yet, Mr. Braden stands before you and declares emphatically that that was the only instance in which this gift of the Holy Spirit was manifested or given except at the household of Cornelius. If his position is true, then the Apostle Peter, while speaking under the influence of the Spirit of God, told those people they should receive this same gift of the Holy Ghost when it was not for them, and they did not, and consequently he told what was not true. Now, will you please clear this up? Peter told them that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, and there was the same day 3,000 added to the church. Did they afterwards receive it, or did he tell them that they should receive something that they could not receive? But let me read further: "For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation." "And they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." Following the believer in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and thus they were "signs" indeed. The sign of the true believer.

Now, it seems that the signs did not go beforehand in order to convert men. The signs did not go beforehand in order to make men believe the truth. Nor was that the manner of procedure in the establishment of the churches in the first age of Christianity to any extent. Nor is it the manner of the establishment of the doctrine and faith of the Latter Day Saints (the saints of to-day), or those who belong to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day

Saints:—we use the term Latter Day Saints to distinguish the church from former day Saints.

Right here I will notice the argument and claim made for his church on the point that all should take the name of Christ. What name? Does it mean the entire name of Christ, or simply the name Christ, or God? Our Winebrenarian friends say just, Church of God. Braden says, Church of Christ. I take it, from the third chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesian saints, that he means that they shall take the full name; the name of Jesus Christ, after whom the whole family, both in heaven and on earth, is named. The epistle does not say Christ simply, but "Jesus Christ."

Let me ask, why do you strike off the name Jesus and say, "We will just call our church Christ Church? What is your authority for suppressing the name Jesus? Please answer that question and show the audience that if a church takes the name of "Jesus Christ," it does not have the name of Christ? Tell us how it comes that a church that takes the name of Jesus Christ is not as likely to be called after the name of the, Only begotten of the Father and of whom the whole family in heaven and earth are named, as a church that simply takes the name of Christ, or the Christian, or Disciple church? I am now upon the negative, and shall expect some proof forthcoming.

There are a few other things that were mentioned in the beginning of the remarks of Mr. Braden that I wish to call your attention to, and shall do so, because I wish to have an understanding as we proceed in this matter, so that we can come to a fair issue in the argument.

There is a difference of understanding, it seems, with regard to just what should be in the church. He thinks that I will differ with him in regard to things that ought to be in the church, and claim some things that he has not in his church. Well, what are some of those things? Possibly it is in some of the articles of faith, possibly in the organization of the church. Whatever, let him point them out, or the features not in his, that were in the church in the time of the apostles, and tell us why not? If his is strictly with the organization of the church as it was left perfected by the apostles, and we go back to the record of the apostles to find what they did to perfect it, his church will have in it, as is recorded here in the twelfth chapter of the Epistle of Paul to the Corinthian saints, the officers connected with the church as God set them in the same. Because how can we get the organization of the church as it was left perfected by the apostles without turning back and reading what was in theirs, and what the apostles did? It is said in this twelfth chapter of 1 Corinthians: "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teaches; after that miracles, then

gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?" He argues there that God has given a number of spiritual gifts for the purpose of aiding in the perfecting of the saints here, in the work of the ministry, and among these he has set in the church the gift, or office, of an apostle. Now, when I turn back to the record of the apostles, and wish to compare that record with the church of which my opponent is a member, I ask him to state whether his church is in agreement with the record there, and if not, why not? Do you have apostles as first officers in your church as they were first officers in the church of Christ as it existed in the first century? If not, why not? Do you have prophets also? Do you have evangelists, and pastors, and teachers—inspired men to perform duties as set in the church as recorded in the twelfth chapter of Paul's letter to the saints at Rome? If not, why not? The Apostle says: "For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one member one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity," etc. Here it is distinctly stated that so far as the office of each individual in the church was concerned, they were to magnify the office in accordance with the spiritual gift that God had given to them by which to work in the church. Now, is that the way that you Campbellites do? Is that the way you found these organizations left after the apostles had fallen asleep? Or did you not find that there were officers placed in the organizations as Paul states as recorded in the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, wherein he teaches that he ordained men as the Holy Ghost had called them: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers." He is talking to the elders, teaching them, "To feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of yourselves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn everyone night and day with tears." The apostle is warning them against the very thing Braden is contending for, viz., making ministers of their "own selves."

Right in this connection, another thing that my opponent stated before the audience needs to be examined in order that you may see it as it is. He took up the history as

contained in the Bible, dividing it into periods after this order: from the time of Adam to the flood; from the flood to Abraham or to the Mosaic economy; from the Mosaic institution of things to the time of Malachi; and from Malachi to the day of Pentecost; afterwards, from the day of Pentecost to the present and futurity, as though, ever since the day of Pentecost, there had been an effulgent light in the heavens, and that the people had been drawing nigh to this and gathering knowledge from that great light which had arisen, and that the world ever since that time had been in the ascendancy, so far as truth is concerned and the enjoyment of the highest blessings to be attained in the Christian economy. Do you mean that, Mr. Braden? Then you do not believe that the apostles prophesied truly when they were writing their knowledge of things here and warned the people that after their time there would come a falling away; and that the church here should not be a church perfected, but a church that would be imperfect; and that, as reported in Revelations of the seven churches of Asia, many of which had so far gone out of the way that God would not recognize them any more as in the light, but gives them to understand that unless they repent He would utterly cast them out of His sight.

The apostle Paul, here in the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, predicts that very thing, viz: that there is to be a falling away from the faith. The apostasy was plainly working then, and when we come to view the lives and teachings and true characters of those men who are called Reformers, who have labored and wrought to restore to its original and pristine beauty,—Christianity as it was at the first; to attain the apostolic doctrine, as taught by Peter and Paul; they have taught us very clearly that the falling away was so great that they had hardly a dead form left. Mr. Wesley says that they had hardly a dead form left. And the reason he gives is, that the world turned heathen again after the death of the apostles and that for this cause faith was taken from the earth and Christians had no more faith than the rest of the world; therefore, there was no longer the spiritual blessing in the church as in the first age of Christianity. See 94, and 95, sermons of Wesley. I might refer also to Mr. Calvin for authority upon this. When he began the work of what afterwards proved to be the organization of churches of his peculiar principles, he said: "Our only object is to restore the doctrines of the primitive church, which have been corrupted by the Papal authorities." That was the object as expressed in his own language with regard to the beginning and object of his work, to restore, to reinstate, the pure principles of the doctrine of Christ from which there had been a falling away. So it was with the Reformers all through. They recognized clearly the fact that darkness had sprung up instead of light and that men were without God in the world.

But let me call your attention to the fact that while one of these Reformers has tried to reach and restore the rituals and ordinances of the church, another has tried to attain to the spiritual life and the comforting influences of the Holy Spirit, as enjoyed by the saints at the first; and charged upon others that they had shut out the light of God by laying too much stress upon rituals and conforming too much to the order of things in the world, until it has come to a state as confessed, at the synod of the Presbyterian church the past year, that they have squeezed the entire life out of the church by adhering to their forms and conventionalities, instead of contending for the life and religion of the Holy Spirit as it was given in the beginning, and realized for two centuries by the early saints.

Now the position that I occupy before you is this: That so far as the ordinances, rituals, forms and rules are concerned, as laid down in the new testament, found enjoined in the word, we ought to conform to them but not have them take precedence of everything else; and that so far as the spiritual light and life is concerned, which is spoken of in this word, we ought to conform to that and have it also. It is a kind of a golden mien between the extremists who have worked on either side of the question of what shall be reformed in the church. You remember that Mr. Fox, at the time when he started out had seen so much of wrong perpetrated in the world because of institutions that adhered only to the rituals of the church, and discarded any and all actual spiritual life, that he threw away these and contended for the spiritual influences only:—striking out everything in the shape of organization, and rituals, and everything that would require persons to do anything towards conforming to the forms and ceremonies established in the first age. When it came to Mr. Campbell's turn he went off on another tangent and his followers to-day adhere closely to the ordinances of baptism that can be performed by an individual in water, because they say that, that was a command; but they leave out the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as my friend, Mr. Braden, here, this evening. He says it was not a command for us to perform; that we should not receive the baptism of the spirit because it was not a command and he thinks that because it was not a command to do, therefore, we could not baptize men with the Holy Spirit and should not seek it. Well, let us see. Is eternal life a command? No, and yet we are all to seek eternal life, and the Campbellites, I suppose, are seeking eternal life also; either in the right or wrong way. If we were not to seek eternal life because it is not a command, it seems to me that the great object and purpose of Christianity would be lost entirely. But is it not a command to seek this spiritual baptism? My opponent has overstepped the bounds in both directions. Paul says here in the 14th chapter and 1st verse of his Corinthian letter: "Follow after charity and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye

may prophecy." Is it not a command, then, to follow after these things?

Again, "For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God: for no man understandeth him; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries." It is right, then, to seek this spirit, I conclude. In the 12th chapter the apostle gives us to understand that for the hope and spiritual development of those who undertake to worship Christ and follow him, "a manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal." This manifestation of the spirit is given to the man who is unlearned, to the woman who is not as much of an adept as another, for the purpose of enlightenment and instruction through this their particular gift from God that they may profit, not only to their own, but to the advantage of the entire church; thus the church may be built up and may be made a fit temple for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost by reason of this spirit that is to be poured out upon each member, and thus it becomes "even a habitation of God through the spirit." And remember that it is not miraculous influences only, so far as outward manifestations are concerned, in tongues, prophecy, healing, etc., that come by reason of this Holy Spirit, but it is such manifestations and gifts as the church must absolutely have in order to grow in the graces and knowledge of Christ—of wisdom, knowledge and faith. I understand that the church of my opponent has none of these gifts of wisdom, knowledge and faith. Am I right? Now I ask him to answer these questions as we proceed:

First, whether the spiritual gifts spoken of in the eighth, ninth and tenth verses of the twelfth chapter of Paul's first letter to the Corinthians is desired in his church, or are any of them attained to in his church; whether the wisdom spoken of there is; whether the knowledge is; whether the faith is; whether the other things that are spoken of in those verses as belonging to the early saints are with them, and whether they desire them at the present time, and are they considered necessary by his church in order to guide men and women aright?

The apostle teaches,

"For to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit; to another faith by the same spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues; but all of these worketh that one and the self-same spirit dividing to every man severally as he will."

Second, now is this wisdom which was given to the church by the spirit of God to direct the church then, to be the guide of the church to-day, as it was anciently? or do you claim that it was miraculous wisdom?

Third. If you claim it was miraculous wisdom, will you just please state to the audience what kind of wisdom is miraculous, and what is not? And so of knowledge?

Fourth. If you answer these questions in

the negative, will you stop and tell us in what respect your church resembles the early church?

I claim that so far as manifestations of the Spirit to the church are concerned, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit, that is promised by Jesus and by John, was not to those who were gathered together on Pentecost day only, but "to as many as the Lord our God should call," as Peter says. Not call to the miraculous gifts or power, as Braden has it, but call to salvation. "The promise is unto you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Not extending to the end of the Jewish age only, as he has interpreted Joel's prophecy, but extending, as that prophecy did, to the time, "when the knowledge of the Lord should cover the earth, as do the waters the sea." Was that accomplished in the end of the Jewish age? Will you please answer that question as you go along? And not only that, but whether the following has ever taken place: "It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions, and on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out my Spirit, and they shall prophecy." Was all that fulfilled at the end of the Jewish age? Or has it ever been fulfilled since then? If it has not been fulfilled, nor will not be, who limited it? Please tell us, so we can have an opportunity of comparing the pattern as set forth in the Bible with the views of your church.

I next call your attention to some things with regard to the continuation of practices and ordinances in the church. Now, I understand that he claims that he believes in the church as it was left perfected by the apostles, whatever that may mean. In the first place then, I suppose he believes in the church that practiced the ordinances as the apostles practiced them; doubtless, as found recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the apostles, fifteenth to twentieth verses; where Peter and John went down to Samaria, after that the people had received the word through the preaching of Phillip; and when they were come down prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost. Then laid they, their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Also, the practice of the early church as shown in the instance of Ananias, who was not an apostle, putting his hands on Saul, as recorded in the ninth chapter and seventeenth verse of the Acts of the apostles, where another instance is recorded of the manifestation of the Holy Ghost through this ordinance of the laying on of hands. Will you answer this question? Was Paul ever baptized of the Holy Spirit? and if so, when and where?—Since you say only those at Pentecost and Samaria were so baptized, and Paul was not in either place. Afterwards we have a clear and decisive illustration of the practice of Paul in

his ministry, as recorded in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the apostles, where he, at a certain time, came to Ephesus and found a certain people who were called "certain disciples," and who said they had received the baptism of John, but had not received the Holy Spirit. This gives a fair illustration of the difference between Mr. Braden's teaching and mine, and the wide difference existing, as I claim, between the teaching of him and his church, and the Bible, and the examination of this difference is doubtless what this audience wants to listen to just now. It was not difficult for the apostle to find out whether these persons *calling* themselves disciples, were in fact such. I will read you the history:

"And it came to pass [here is 'old come-to-pass' again, right in the New Testament], that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, unto what then were ye baptized; and they said,

"unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied. And all the men were about twelve."

This, my friends, establishes fully the practice of the early church. The first inquiry of the minister of Christ was, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost, since ye believed?" and when he was answered, no; he proceeded to put them in the way to receive it. I present this as showing a direct contrast between the practices of the New Testament church and the church of which, "I, Clark Braden, am a member;" and as showing the fact that, instead of being in harmony with the New Testament church, the so-called Christian, Disciple or Campbellite church is in direct antagonism to that, as revealed in the record.

(Time called).

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We will continue our definition of our views:

IV. One faith, one system of belief, one system of teaching "the faith once delivered unto the Saints." The Scriptures. We have sufficiently explained this matter.

V. One baptism. We have already proved that the one baptism is in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is a command, is to be obeyed, is to be performed on men by Christians and is baptism into water. We practice immersion into water for these reasons.

I. Not a sentence can be cited in the Bible that even hints that God ever authorized in any way, pouring, or sprinkling, the element water on any human being in a single instance for any ceremonial, moral or religious purpose. I utterly defy any one to find such a passage.

II. Baptism is a form, a type, a symbol, a figure of Christ's burial and resurrection. It is an object setting forth and teaching Christ's burial and resurrection. It is a likeness of Christ's burial and resurrection. It is a memorial of Christ's burial and resurrection. It is a monumental institution, a monument of Christ's burial and resurrection. Pouring and sprinkling are utterly out of the question, as much as calves-foot jelly for the bread, and buttermilk for the wine in the Lord's Supper. They utterly destroy the symbolical, the memorial, the

monumental power of baptism. They destroy baptism and are no more baptism than Romish Mass is the Lord's Supper. Immersion alone is appropriate, it alone is baptism.

III. Baptism is an object lesson, setting forth the sinner's death to his past sinful life, and resurrection to a new and righteous life. Pouring and sprinkling utterly destroy this lesson and destroy baptism. They are not baptism. Immersion alone teaches this lesson. It alone is baptism.

IV. In baptism persons went down into the water. Idiotic if they were merely sprinkled or poured. Persons of common sense never go down into the water for such acts. They do and must to be immersed. Immersion is baptism. Pouring and sprinkling are not.

V. Persons come up out of the water after baptism. They never do after pouring and sprinkling. They always do after immersion. Immersion is baptism. Pouring and sprinkling are not baptism.

VI. Jesus was baptized in Jordan. A correct rendering would be "into the Jordan." He was immersed. Pouring and sprinkling are out of the question.

VII. Baptism was where there "was much water." It is needed for immersion. It is not for sprinkling or pouring. Persons were immersed, not poured or sprinkled.

VIII. Baptism is likened to a birth. Pour-

ing and sprinkling are utterly out of the question. Immersion is like a birth.

IX. Baptism is called a burial. Persons are buried in immersion. Not in pouring or sprinkling.

X. An overwhelming of sufferings is called a baptism. It was not a sprinkling or a pouring of sufferings.

XI. Baptism is called a bath, a laver. Immersion is such. Pouring and sprinkling are not.

XII. In every instance in which the element water alone was used in the ceremonies of the Israelite ritual or religious acts, it was used in immersion alone. Blood and the cleansing water, or lye, alone were sprinkled.

For these reasons we reject pouring, or sprinkling, and accept only immersion. All parties in creed and practice accept immersion as baptism. We are orthodox and catholic and accept what is catholic and universal, and that alone.

We teach that a person who believes the gospel with his whole heart—who has repented of his sins with that godly sorrow which needs not to be regretted—who has confessed Christ with his mouth—is a scriptural subject for scriptural baptism, and he alone. Some teach that an infant that is too young to believe the gospel with the whole heart, to repent with a godly sorrow for past sins and to confess Christ with the mouth, is a scriptural subject for scriptural baptism.

We reject such a dogma for these reasons:

I. Not a sentence of scripture can be found that even hints any authority for the baptism of an infant; not a command, not a teaching, not an example, not a hint of it.

II. In every case of baptism recorded in the Bible, the narrative shows that the persons baptized were believing penitents.

III. The design and object of baptism utterly forbid all idea of infant baptism.

IV. The most wretched, far-fetched, special pleading and pettifying in human speech is the attempt to sustain infant baptism.

V. Infant baptism has not a shred of warrant in reason, common sense or scripture.

VI. The absurd and contradictory reasons urged for infant baptism show its utter fallacy.

We teach that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to all who believe it. Romans 1:16. That men must hear the gospel of Christ. "How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard." Romans 10:14. And "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Romans 10:17. That "With the heart man believes unto righteousness." Romans 10:10. That "God commands all men everywhere to repent." Acts 17:30. That men should repent of their past sins that "Godly sorrow that works a reformation not to be regretted." II Cor. 7:10. That "with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. 10:10. This is believed by all parties.

We teach also that the one who has been begotten by the spirit through the word in believing, is born of the water and spirit in baptism; that the one who has believed and been baptized is saved from his past sins; that penitent believers must be baptized into the remission of past sins; that penitent believers must arise and be baptized, washing away their past sins, calling on the name of the Lord; that penitent believers are baptized into the death of Christ; that they are buried with Christ in baptism; that they are buried to sin in baptism; that they arise out of baptism to a new life; that penitent believers are made free from sin when they obey, in baptism, the figure, form, symbol or type of the teaching, the burial, the resurrection of Christ delivered unto them.

That men are children of God through faith when they put on Christ in baptism. That baptism now saves us in the sense of pardon of past sins, as the answer or requirement of a good conscience toward God.

Our position is this: The gospel law of pardon was first preached on the day of Pentecost. That it is the duty of men to preach it as it was then preached in all and every instance. That since the day of Pentecost, when persons have been properly instructed in the law of pardon, immersion in water, into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is a condition of the remission of past sins, to one who has believed the Gospel of Christ, with the whole heart, who has repented of past sins with a godly sorrow, and who has confessed Christ with the mouth.

We teach it for these reasons. I. In the first transgression, in Eden, man became a sinner through hearing falsehood, believing falsehood, desiring the results of falsehood, and obeying the teachings of falsehood, in violating the positive command, "Thou shalt not eat." He returns by retracing his steps, hearing the Gospel, believing the Gospel, repenting, confessing Christ, and obeying the truth in obeying the positive command—baptism. II. The entire man is changed in each case. Believing falsehood changed man's beliefs; desiring the results of falsehood, changed man's desires; his heart; disobeying a positive command, changed man's volitions, his conduct, punishment changed his condition, his state. In like manner believing the truth changes man's beliefs; repentance, his heart; confession, his position before men and divine law; baptism changes man's volition, his conduct; pardon changes his state. III. The entire man is tested in each case. Belief of falsehood was a test of mind, reason, judgement; desiring the results of falsehood was a test of the heart; disobedience of a positive command was a test of the will. In like manner belief of truth tests man's mind, reason, judgment. Repentance tests his heart, and baptism tests his will. IV. Disobedience to a positive command was before and in order to punishment, in the first transgression. Obe-

dience to a positive command is before and in order to the removal of punishment in man's conversion. V. In John's work preparing for Christ, baptism was into remission, into remission. VI. Jesus said men are begotten by the Spirit, through hearing his words, and believing the truth; and born of the water and Spirit in baptism. VII. Jesus said, "he that believes and is baptized shall be saved" from his past sins. In Matthew's account of the same discourse he tells us that this baptism was into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It was water baptism. VIII. Peter said to converted believers "Repent and be baptized unto the remission of sins." IX. The penitent praying Saul was told to "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins calling on the name of the Lord." X. Peter who has to tell Cornelius "what he must do to be saved," preached, Cornelius believed Peter commanded him to be baptized in water in the name of the Lord. XI. The jailor asked Paul what he must do to be saved. Paul told him to believe, and baptized him. XII. Baptism is recorded as an essential element in every conversion as much so, as faith. On the day of Pentecost,—Lydia, Saul, the Eunuch, the Samaritans, Cornelius, the jailor, the households of Stephanus, Crispus, Gaius, the Romans, Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, the language of Paul to Titus, the language of Peter. XIII. The Romans were baptized into Christ's death. The blood of Christ is met in his death. Were united with Christ in baptism, in the likeness of his death. Were buried to sin in baptism and rose to walk a new life. Were made free from sin in obeying, in baptism, the symbol of the doctrine delivered to them, the burial and resurrection of Christ. XIV. The Galatians put on Christ in being baptized into him. XV. The Ephesians are told that Christ cleansed the church by the washing the laver, bath of water, baptism, through the word. XVI. The Colossians were buried with Christ in baptism, and rose through faith, to walk a new life. XVII. As the Israelites were freed from Pharaoh and came under Moses in the baptism unto Moses in the cloud and sea, so we are freed from sin and come unto Christ in being baptized into Christ. XVIII. We are saved by the washing, laver, bath of regeneration, baptism, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit in belief, being begotten by the Spirit through the word. XIX. Baptism saves us as the answer or requirement of a good conscience towards God. XX. If we arrange the teachings of the Scriptures in pairs we can see what they are. Persons are begotten by hearing the words of the Spirit (faith) and born of water and Spirit (baptism). He that believes (faith) and is baptized (baptism) is saved. Believing penitents (faith) are told to be baptized into remission (baptism). Believing Saul (faith) is told to arise and wash away his sins (washing of regeneration baptism) in baptism. Cornelius believed (faith) and was baptized in water in the name of the Lord

(baptism) as what he was to do to be saved. The eunuch believed (faith) and was baptized (baptism). The Samaritans believed (faith) and were baptized (baptism). The jailor believed (faith) and was baptized (baptism). The Romans believed (faith) and were baptized into Christ's death united with him in the likeness of his death (in baptism), obeyed (in baptism) the symbol of the doctrine, the burial and resurrection of Christ. The Ephesians were cleansed by the laver bath of water, (baptism) through the word (faith). The Galatians were children of God through faith having put on Christ in being baptized into Christ. The Colossians were buried with Christ in baptism rose to a new life through faith. We are saved by the laver both washing of regeneration (as Paul washed away his sins in baptism) and the renewal of the Holy Spirit in faith. Baptism, as an act of faith, saves us as the answer or requirement of a good conscience towards God. XXI. The baptism mentioned in these couplets is water baptism. It was into the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, in the name of Christ—in water—in the name of the Lord—here is water—a laver a bath—a washing—a command—administered by man, not miraculous, not attended with miraculous power. It was the one baptism. Baptism in the Holy Spirit that is a miraculous promise, not a command; received, not obeyed: that is administered by Christ alone—was a miracle and attended with miraculous power, is utterly out of the question. XXII. Then we teach that obedience to a positive ordinance baptism occupies the same position, in order, in man's return to God, that disobedience to a positive ordinance, "Thou shall not eat," did in man's departure. That obedience to a positive ordinance is before and in order to a removal of punishment, in the same sense that disobedience to a positive ordinance was before and in order to infliction of punishment in the transgression. That as man was not punished when he believed falsehood, nor when he desired its results, and not until he had arrayed his will against God's positive command; and in his actions violated his positive command; so in conversion, the penalty is not removed when man believes or for faith only, nor when he repents, but when he submits his will to God's will, in his positive ordinance baptism, and by his acts obeys this ordinance and is born into the Kingdom of God, saved from his past sins, baptized into remission, washes away his sins, is made free from sin, is baptized into Christ, is saved by the laver of regeneration, is cleansed by it, saved by baptism in meeting the requirements of God's law and has a good conscience toward it.

We teach that faith is a means of man's justification. We reject the dogma that man is justified by faith only, for these reasons: I. The Scriptures nowhere declare that man is justified by faith only. The "only" is an interpolation. II. The Scriptures nowhere declare that man is justified

by faith without works of obedience to the law of Christ. Deeds of law have no reference to deeds of the law of Christ. III. The Scriptures declare that man is justified by ten different things and faith in one of them. IV. Faith is an act of obedience to the law of Christ, a work as much as baptism. V. The word of God declares, "Man is justified by works, and not by faith only." We believe this and not sectarian theology which flatly contradicts God's word in saying, "Man is not justified by works, but by faith only."

The sixth item or plank is one hope through the name of Christ. It embraces hope of pardon and the Spirit through the word in the case of the sinner—eternal life and the resurrection and heaven in the case of the Christian, who is faithful in a holy, righteous life to the end.

The seventh item or plank is the one body or "The Church of Christ." We find that there were two classes of persons in the church in the apostolic age. There were two kinds of work. One required miraculous powers; the other did not. The miraculous was extraordinary, temporary, to endure until the New Testament church was perfected, and the perfect word of God was completed in the New Testament. Then this miraculous power and all its work ceased; and the men who possessed it ceased out of the church. This removes apostles, prophets, who preach by inspiration, and all miraculous work and persons possessing miraculous power. It leaves evangelists, who, as uninspired preachers, proclaim the Gospel, that was perfected by the inspired apostles, to the world. Then overseers and servants or deacons. These two classes of officers are generally termed "Elders," because chosen from old men. They and the evangelists are called "shepherds," because they fed the flock. We reject episcopacy over more than one congregation, and all orders not embraced in evangelists, overseers and deacons. We reject creeds, councils and all ecclesiastical hierarchies. The local congregation is the master of its own affairs in all matters of faith, practice and discipline.

The eighth plank is the one name. Individual followers should bear this one name, the name of Christ, in being called "Christians." The Church should bear this one name of Christ in being called "The Church of Christ," or, "The Church of God." Thus we stand on the divine platform of eight planks laid down by Paul, so we proclaim these eight items to the world.

We do not preach Trinitarianism because it is an attempt to be wise beyond what is written. We reject unitarianism because it denies the divinity of Jesus, that he was divinity manifest in human form. We have rejected total hereditary depravity because unscriptural and absurd. We are not Pelagians, for we believe in inherited depravity of man's physical, mental and moral nature. We reject all idea of inherited sinfulness or guilt, and the idea that inherited depravity can be total. We have

rejected all idea of vengefulness on the part of God, and all horrible pictures of punishment, gross ideas of hell and punishment, but are not Universalists. We believe that there is punishment of sin here and hereafter, and that the finally impenitent will be eternally lost. We have rejected absurdities of human inability, that man can do nothing in hearing and obeying God's word; ideas of substitutionary righteousness in the sense that Christ's righteousness and obedience will be accepted instead of what we should and can do. Yet we believe that Christ died for us, made an atonement for us, and is our mediator and expiation. But that he did this, not to do our righteousness for us, but to enable us to be pardoned and do our own righteousness, and by obeying Him, grow up into the character we should have.

We have rejected the absurd ideas that conversion is a miracle. Also absurd experiences, and relying on our own feelings for evidence of pardon. We take God at His word. We obey Him and we take His promise of pardon as the evidence of pardon. Our evidence is divine, not human. We reject mourners' benches, seekers' circles, mourning for days or years, all idea that God has to be converted by penance on the part of the sinner, before he will pardon. We hold our protracted meetings just as the apostles held theirs. Preach the same ideas. Tell persons the same things. Proclaim the same commands. Make the same promises. We tell persons believe the Gospel, believe with the whole heart, repent with a Godly sorrow, confess Christ, with the mouth be baptized into remission. We organize them into churches exactly as the apostles did, with the same officers and services. Break the loaf on each first day as they did. Build each other up in Christian knowledge and life, by teaching, exhortation, songs, prayers, reading the scriptures, and live as the scriptures require. Thus I prove that we are identical in faith, ordinances, organizations, teaching, worship, practice, and duties with the Church of Christ as left completed by the apostles of Christ.

We will notice briefly some things said by my opponent. I will first remind him that the New Testament is our authority in regard to the Church of Christ. Not the traditions of what are called "the fathers." There is no issue that there were miraculous powers in the church in the days of the apostles. The issue is this: "Did the apostles, in giving the constitution of the church, the New Testament, ordain that they should remain in the church as a permanent feature of the church they ordained in the New Testament?" There is no disputing the fact that Jesus promised that signs should attend certain persons. The issues are, "were they to attend the preaching of more than believing apostles? Were they to remain perpetually in the church?" We are glad to hear him say that miraculous power was not given to convert those to whom it was given. See if he does not back out of

that before we are done. "The last days" in Joel's promise were the last days in the Mosaic dispensation. Peter declares that "this" series of events at which you are so amazed "is that" series of events "that was promised by Joel," and that Christ had shed forth that series of miraculous displays which they saw or heard. Peter declared that Joel's promise was to persons among all flesh that "God should call." That they should receive the Holy Spirit as a gift. There were two manifestations of this miraculous influence, baptism in the spirit, poured forth by Christ on two occasions, and spiritual gifts received by the imposition of apostle's hands. There is no dispute that there were spiritual powers in the Corinthian church; nor that they were exhorted to desire the best of these gifts while they remained in the church. I believe Paul when he says "there is a more excellent way" than exercising the best of these spiritual gifts. My opponent does not. I desire "the more excellent way." He does not. We have apostles in our church, just as we have Christ in our church, by their words, their law, their inspired utter-

ances. We have prophets in the same way. We do not substitute Joe Smith's fraud, the Book of Mormon, as the "fullness of the gospel," for Christ's law, the New Testament. Nor do we substitute Mormon impostors for the apostles and prophets of the New Testament. We have evangelists, shepherds and teachers in our church, who take God's word as their sole guide, for it "makes them perfect, and thoroughly finishes them to all good works." We do not have Mormon impostors who pretend to be inspired, and we refuse to follow the lying vagaries of such instead of the perfect word of God. Baptism in the spirit was a promise. We learn from the history of Christ's administration of it that it ushered in the proclamation of the gospel to Jews on the day of Pentecost, and the proclamation of the gospel to Gentiles at the house of Cornelius. We learn from the Bible history its period of existence. We learn from the context the meaning of Paul's language; the wisdom and knowledge that were to pass away, were the wisdom and knowledge imparted by inspiration, mentioned in the previous context.

MR. KELLEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I am glad we are going to have a discussion. I have been here, this is the eleventh evening now, and we have not had a discussion yet; he failed even to undertake to meet the issue in the other question. But it seems we are to have an issue in this, and upon that issue we are to have a discussion. The negative will not fail to meet the issue this time, I assure you.

I call attention to the last remark of the speaker with regard to the wonderful "seed" or the germ which had in its growth proved to be the culmination of the work of what the Christian world has been foolishly contending for, as he thinks, for lo, these many years. The culmination is in, that it has gone to seed in "Mormonism." What is it that he says is the seed of Mormonism? The belief in the power and regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit. It seems to me the seed is not a very bad one, then. All of this talk about Mormonism is because we claim that men ought to be blessed with the gifts of the Spirit if they have the Spirit of God; if they are blessed with the gift of wisdom, let them be wise servants; if with the gift of knowledge, let them use it; if the gift of faith or any other, let it be properly exercised; and if that is "Mor-

monism," and the prayerful desire for the Holy Spirit by the churches "the seed," was not the doctrine that Paul and Jesus and Peter taught Mormonism also? Was the full light of the gifts taught by Jesus and the apostles, "Mormonism gone to seed?" Will you please answer that to-morrow night? If they taught these spiritual gifts just like I am teaching them, and you call mine the result of the faith and the worship of the various seeded organizations, or "Mormonism gone to seed," what do you call theirs? Because certainly they taught the same things that I have been trying to teach here, and if they did not, it is with you to point out the difference.

I call your attention now to the text that I quoted in my first speech:—"Follow after charity and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." Well, but "yet," he says, "I show unto you a more excellent way." Oh no, Mr. Braden, this was after he was going to show a more excellent way. That was said as recorded in the twelfth chapter; this is the fourteenth I am quoting. This is an exhortation made after the reference to the more excellent way. Here it will be proper to stop and enquire what this "more excellent way" is.

"Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set

some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets?" "But covet earnestly the best gifts; and yet show I unto you a more excellent way." Then Braden says the apostle goes on and shows the more excellent way. That is, that prophecies shall fail, tongues shall cease, and whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away. That is the more excellent way my opponent thinks, outlined in the thirteenth chapter. Then I turn to the first part of the fourteenth chapter, after he had given them the more excellent way, according to his wise interpretation, and get the *most* excellent way. Now, Mr. Braden, you remember to-morrow night, and give us the *most* excellent way. "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." According to your interpretation, what comes last is the best; and by this, after he had given them the more excellent way, according to the interpretation of that clause, as any of you can see by turning and reading it, he then proceeded to give them the *most* excellent way. And I want to call your attention to the fact that this letter was not divided into chapters or verses when the apostle Paul wrote his letter as it is found here. These divisions are of a comparatively modern date. The apostle sent this letter entire to the Corinthian Church, and in it he gives them here, as recorded in the twelfth chapter according to Mr. Braden's interpretation—*first*, the excellent way; *second*, in the thirteenth chapter he gives them the more excellent way; *third*, in the fourteenth chapter he gives them the most excellent way; and when he gets to the most excellent way, it is, "Follow after charity, and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." He will find out before we get through that "yet show I unto you a more excellent way," is in accordance with the interpretation that I gave at Wilber, that then I was correct; and I will try and make it clear before this discussion closes. But of this I shall particularly speak another time. The apostle does not occupy the absurd position of teaching three ways as my opponent would have us believe, but he teaches one only, and that is taught in all of these chapters.

When my time was called I was examining the practice of the church as found in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the apostles, where Paul, in addressing some of the people at Ephesus, asks them whether they have received the Holy Ghost since they believed. It reads: "He said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Now this is a fair illustration of the difference between my teaching and my opponent's. I meet a community of persons that say they are believers, and I ask them, have ye received the confirmation of the Spirit or the Holy

Spirit since ye believed? Or, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" Mr. Braden comes along, and if they have had water baptism it is all right. He never thinks of such a thing as asking them if they have received the Holy Ghost. The terms "Holy Spirit" and "Holy Ghost" remember, are used in the Bible interchangeably. So also with these is "Gift of the Holy Ghost," and "Born of the Spirit." But the record proceeds:

And he, Paul, said unto them, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" And they said "Unto John's Baptism." Then said Paul, "John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." When they heard this they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Now, here are more miraculous manifestations, so far as the record shows, than was witnessed upon the day of Pentecost. On the day of Pentecost there was but the gift of tongues, so far as miraculous manifestations are concerned. But here are both tongues and prophecies. The Holy Ghost was poured out bountifully, and the brethren filled to overflowing. And yet he pretends to say that on Pentecost day there was a baptism of the Holy Spirit, while in this instance there was not. But the record holds that there *was* a baptism of the Holy Spirit. Now, I wish him to clear this up, and show to the audience the difference between the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the reception of the Holy Spirit; between the reception of the Holy Spirit as was here spoken of by the Apostle Paul and the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost day; or the gift of the Holy Spirit as was given unto those who believed at Samaria, Acts 8: 20, and the gift of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon the household of Cornelius, Acts 11: 17. All of these are used interchangeably as I have before stated, and the phenomena is the same in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the reception of the Holy Spirit, or as I might correctly use the term Holy Ghost in each instance. I take it that this is in accordance with the teaching of Jesus in the third chapter of John. "Except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit," the birth of the Spirit representing certainly the baptism of the Holy Spirit, "He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." Now will my opponent please answer to-morrow evening the question of what that birth of the Spirit to which Jesus referred had reference, and whom it affects. Do not forget that. And do not answer it by saying "I believe so and so," as you have pretended to answer the questions that I asked you this evening. I am not asking you for what you believe about it, but for what the record teaches. I want a clear exposition of the record. Do not say that Kelley believes so and so, and that Braden believes so and so.

Let us have the facts bearing upon this issue set out as they are in the record. But I will pursue the thread of my argument upon the practice in the early days of the church of the ordinance of the laying on of hands.

When the apostle had laid his hands on those at Ephesus, they received the Holy Ghost, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. This is in the record that he claims is the only genuine and correct record to show how the church was, as it was left by the apostles, and the pattern to the church now, directing what we should do. Is the church of which Mr. Braden is a member in practice and teaching with the early church, if it disregards these things? (And it does.) Now, I turn back and refer you to the record as contained in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where, after Philip had been down to Samaria and had preached to the people, and they had received the word, as it is recorded, as follows:

"But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done. Now, when the apostles, which were at Jerusalem, heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money."

I cite this for two purposes: First to show that the baptism of the Holy Ghost was given to those, who were obedient and were confirmed by the laying on of hands after the day of Pentecost, in this instance to the people of Samaria; and they were evidently baptized of the Holy Ghost as fully and effectually, as were those of Pentecost day. Second, to show that the Holy Ghost is not given through the medium of the word, as Braden's church believes, but through a different means—shed abroad directly by Jesus Christ. As confirmative proof of my positions, I also cite the ninth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, 17th verse:

"And Ananias went his way and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee by the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales, and he received sight forthwith, and arose and was baptized."

Here is a fair sample of the practice. A clear case showing that the Holy Ghost was not received through the medium of the word, but through the ministrations of an elder, one not an apostle.

Now he says that none received the Holy Ghost, except they had the apostles' hands laid upon them. But he is mistaken; here is Ananias who lays his hands upon Saul of Tarsus; and Saul received the Holy Ghost under his hands, and Ananias was not an apostle. What excuse have you now to offer to this audience for saying that this practice ought not to be in the church; that

the Holy Ghost is given through the medium of the word and under an apostle's hands only? Here are three flat contradictions to your order in one case.

Then I call your attention again to the household of Cornelius, where "the Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word," and was not imparted through the medium of the word?

I next invite your attention to the church record as given by the best historians subsequent to that time, to show that this was not only the order during the New Testament times, but that it continued to be the order for a long time subsequent, and that they actually received the Holy Ghost by conforming to the ordinances as they were placed in the church, and not simply through the medium of the word.

The following are the authorities showing the order of doctrine of the laying on of hands, as it was practiced in the early church upon baptized believers, and the manner of reception of the Holy Spirit in the church as left perfected by the apostles, if ever perfected.

First. Tertullian, A. D. 200. *de Bapt.* c. 6.

"After baptism the hand is imposed by blessing, and calling, and inviting of the Holy Spirit, who willingly descends from the Father on the bodies that are cleansed and blessed."

Further upon this in chapter 8 he says:

"It is the fleshly, or outward act of baptism that we are dipt in water; the spiritual effects that we are freed from our sins. Then follows laying on of hands, the Dispenser, inviting the Spirit of God by prayer, And being cleansed by baptismal water we are disposed for the Holy Spirit under the hands of the Angel of the church."

Speaking concerning the order and state of the church at this early time, after the death of the apostles, he says, (*de Script. Cap.* 36):

"She believeth in God, she signs with water, (that is baptizeth,) she clothes with the spirit, (viz., by the Imposition of hands,) she feeds with the Eucharist, (administers the emblems of the Lord's body,) and exhorts to martyrdom, (to faithfulness, and the keeping of the law of God even unto death,) and against this order or Institution she receives no man."

This is the declared practice of the church as it was left by the apostles. I call my opponent's attention to it particularly, and ask him to explain how it is, that it is not the order in his church too, since he affirms his "is in accordance with the church of Christ as it was left perfected by the apostles." I have shown you that under the immediate supervision of the apostles that this was the order and practice, and now that it was still the order in the century which immediately followed. And I want some evidence that will support your bold assertions to the effect that your church,—call it Christian, Church of Christ, Campbellite, Disciple, or what you may, it matters not, is either in faith, doctrine or practices, in accord with the church as it was

under the apostles, or in the immediate time subsequent.

Second, But I have other evidence to offer from the history of the early church. Eusebius, (not the Pope of that name,) but Eusebius Pamphilus, who lived about three hundred years after Christ, in his work (Book 7, c. 2), certifies that:

"The ancient manner of receiving members into the church was with prayer, and the laying on of hands."

Again he says, (Book 6, c. 26):

"That one Novatius being sick was baptized, if it may be called a baptism which he received, for he obtained not after his recovery that which he should have done by the canon of the church, to-wit, confirmation by the hands of the Bishop, which having not obtained, how can he be supposed to have received the Holy Spirit."

This was about the year 260. And it must not either be supposed to have been derived from the practice afterwards of Crossing, or Chrysm, for the writer makes no mention of this in his work.

Third, Cyrian, in A. D. 250, and against whom none will bring an accusation, in his 73d letter, when referring to the fact of the apostles going to Samaria to confirm those that Phillip had baptized, says:

"Which custom is also descended to us, that they who are baptized, might be brought by the rules of the church, and by prayer of imposition of hands to obtain the Holy Ghost."

Again in Ep. 72:—

"It is of no purpose to lay hands on them to receive the Holy Spirit, unless they receive the baptism of the church."

Fourth, Hierom in answering this question, viz:—"Why he that is baptized in the church doth not receive the Holy Ghost but by the imposition of hands?" answers (*Dial ad Lucifer*):

"This observation for the honor of the priesthood, did descend from the Scriptures. If you ask me where it is written? 'Tis answered, in *Actibus Apostolorum*, in the Acts of the Apostles."

Fifth, The testimony of Chrysostom, who wrote during the fourth century. He says: "That confirmation gives us the Holy Ghost."

Sixth, Augustine, of the same century, writes:

"Still we do what the Apostles did, when they laid their hands on the Samaritans and called down the Holy Ghost upon them."

With these I might also cite Mosheim's Church History, Vol. 1, page 91; and Gahan's Church History, page 93.

These give you an unmistakable history of the church upon the doctrine and practice of the reception of the Holy Spirit, and the laying on of hands, down to the fourth century from the time of Christ. These historians are some of the same parties through whom we received the record of the Scriptures themselves.

The practices and teachings of the church by the apostles as I have shown, were

not only different from Braden's church, but also that of the church after the apostles, whether perfected or not. What has he to answer, I again ask him, to this emphatic testimony?

I cite these to show you that after the apostles' time the churches that were left, (these congregations that have been referred to), practiced the same things (that we have recorded in the New Testament Scriptures, and that this is the highest and most correct history and account that we have with regard to the practices of the church after the time of the apostles. This is the history as handed down of the doings of those churches after the apostles' time.

Now I hurriedly invite your attention to a description of the doctrine of Christ as set forth in the sixth chapter of Hebrews, and call the attention of my opponent to the fact that in describing the faith of his church this evening, he left out one of the *first or foundation principles* here named by the apostle Paul, and not only by Paul, but by others of the apostles; and as I have shown, was held to be the practice and doctrine of the church as handed down afterwards until the fourth century, at least after the apostles' time.

The apostle says:—

"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands."

Now, you did not enumerate this last as one of the doctrines of your church, and one of the things you believe in. Do you believe in it for any purpose, and practice it for any purpose, in your church, either for the ordination of the minister setting apart of the minister, or anything else? Do you for anything? You may answer these questions to-morrow night. The record continues:

"And of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment. And this will we do if God permit."

Remember these are principles in the foundation of the structure. Do you accept all as being in the foundation of your structure? If you do not, then answer the further question, and show your authority in the scriptures here, something upon which we may safely rely, for your people taking that out of the New Testament so far as your practicing it is concerned. Just give us one passage of scripture to-morrow evening showing that that passage is not as the apostle used it, one of the *first, fundamental, foundation principles* of the doctrine of Christ, and that it should be taken out of the New Testament. Not only that, but to-morrow evening will you please answer this question, for I wish time enough to examine your answer: Where and how do you receive authority to teach and administer the ordinances as established by Christ for these, as you say, congregations which were left after the apostles' time? Second, who were left over these congregations, and

from whence did they receive their authority? Third, and when Mr. Campbell organized his church in this century, where did he get his authority to organize, if the authority is vested in the congregation? And fourth, had he any more authority to organize a church at the time that he did than I have to organize a church, or you have to organize a church? Please answer all these questions to-morrow evening.

I shall call your attention in this connection to the claims made by him with reference to the continuance of the Holy Spirit as manifested upon the day of Pentecost, and spoken of by Peter as belonging by promise not only to that people but "to all that were afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Was this indeed a fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel? I will read it carefully, because I wish you to understand and comprehend the full instruction given. Acts 2:38:

"Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is unto you and to your children, and unto all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation."

The promise he says of this gift of the Holy Ghost is "unto you and to your children, and unto all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Called to the laying on of the apostles' hands, or called to miraculous power? Could the apostle Peter have had in his mind at the time that the promise "to you and your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," was only to those that the apostles could lay their hands upon? Was the call to stop with those? Jesus had ordained a certain Seventy before this time, as you will find by turning and reading the tenth chapter of Luke.

"After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city."

Seventy elders, besides the apostles, certainly, and the reading is such that it is claimed to show two Seventies, making 140 that we know of that were in existence at that time, and recognized by Christ besides the apostles; and these went out preaching, and there were many of them preaching and teaching as is shown by reference to other passages in scripture. Did the promise made by Peter extend to those who should accept the faith under these others, or did they only follow the eleven apostles whom Jesus met after his resurrection? Peter says, verses 32 and 33: "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." This is connected with the sixteenth verse of the same chapter, where he refers to the prophecy of Joel. "For these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that"—

now what do "this" and "that" refer to? The word "this" all must agree refers to the thing poured out upon that occasion—the Spirit. The argument of the apostle is, For this that you see, that which seems to make this audience stagger, or act differently from what they would act at other times, is not strong drink, "seeing it is but the third hour of the day." "But this [Spirit] is that [Spirit] which was spoken of by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, 'I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams'."

Now let me examine it as Braden wishes you to take it. This is the fulfillment of the prophecy made by Joel. Can't you see that that is a different thing entirely from a mere reference to that Spirit that Joel said would be poured out in the last days? The true antecedent or substantive is Spirit, and not the "fulfillment of Joel's prophecy." Hence he says: This is that [Spirit] which was spoken of by the prophet Joel, "and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." This is the Spirit of God, then. Peter is giving them to understand upon that day that it is the Spirit of God that is made manifest before their eyes, and not a fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, because he could not have truthfully made them believe it was a fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, for Joel's prophecy included seeing visions and dreaming dreams. Was there anybody there that fell asleep and had a dream that you have any account of? Was there anything poured out there "On my servants and on my handmaidens?" etc. Was it poured out upon all flesh there? It is not only to be poured out upon certain persons when the prophecy is fulfilled, but upon all flesh. Then is the time when the lamb and the lion shall lie down together, when all shall be at peace, and when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters fill, or cover, the sea. I know that Mr. Braden thinks it will be when the lamb is inside of the lion that they will lie down together, but that is not according to the prophecy. The prophets declare that they shall lie down together at a time when they should not molest each other, and a little child even should lead them, etc., and we ought to believe fully in the predictions and in the prophecies being actually fulfilled at some time, for these prophets spoke as they were moved upon by the Holy Ghost.

Here I shall take up his idea of the Spirit being received only through the word, and cite passages of scripture to show that the Spirit is not given through the word, the letter of the law, as the Campbellites hold. 1 Peter 1: 10—12:

"Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you. Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the suffering of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now

reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, which things the angels desire to look into."

Now the persons who before this time received the Holy Ghost as "sent down from heaven," the apostle Peter says received it, not as it came through the word, the dead letter, but direct from heaven. There is no such thing in the Scripture, either that the Holy Ghost was given for the purpose of perfecting the word. The word, as I understand, was perfected as it emanated from God. It was perfect then. Do you think Jesus gave the Holy Spirit in order to make the word more perfect? So far as that is concerned, it was perfect in the Psalmist's day. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Was it perfect in the sense that my opponent would have you believe now, so far as to include all that God should ever give? Not at all. This is only a false theory among the people. James speaks of the "perfect law of liberty." That perfect law of liberty that he was speaking of was the law that they had then, and that they were commanded to teach, and they had all the law that was in a sense requisite to salvation, from the time when the great commission was given by Jesus, when he said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." Mark 16. "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Did he tell them to teach anything else than what he had commanded? Yet, notwithstanding the fact that they were instructed to teach just what Jesus had commanded them, afterwards they received word upon word, line upon line, and precept upon precept, and we have this in part here in the New Testament, and it comprises the greater part of the New Testament all received, so Braden would have us believe, after they had enough—close the portals—we have got a Bible; we don't want any more Bible. But the men inspired of God never thought of such a thing, yet they were commanded to teach just what Jesus had commanded. If he says now the word is perfected, I say it was just as perfect at the time that Jesus taught the eleven disciples upon this occasion, and raised up his hands and blessed them. The perfection of the word does not consist in the amount of the word, but it consists in the fact that the word emanated from God. Because if you say it consisted in the amount, there are several of these writings in the Bible made after the time that Jesus speaks of "the perfect law of liberty." And Jude says, "Contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints."

Do you say it was this faith that is contained in the writings of the New Testament that he exhorted them to contend for? The faith that is contained in the New Testament is a system of religion, and was not compiled in Jude's time. Do you say that it meant the powerful faith, the

active faith, the principle by which men and women could do wonderful things by the Spirit of God that he exhorted them to contend for? If so, why do you not contend for it? Just answer these questions, and answer them one way or the other, so we may know your position. The apostle Jude wrote in the year 66. Many of the Epistles found in the New Testament, were written after his time. Yet he exhorted them to contend for the faith "once delivered," already done, not that which is to be delivered to the Saints.

But let us examine more particularly the position taken that these epistles and revelations were given for the purpose of perfecting the word of God. It occurs to me that there are no grounds for this, and that it is but a false assumption on the part of my opponent. He assumes that the apostles were placed in the church for the purpose of perfecting the word of God. Now, I open the Bible to ascertain whether this was for the purpose of perfecting the word of God or not, and turn to the fourth chapter of Ephesians and read as follows:

"And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." For the perfecting of the word of God: Did you read it that way, Mr. Braden? The Bible reads, verse 12, "For the perfecting of the Saints." And yet he had it for the perfecting of the word of God. Again, "for the work of the ministry"—doing the preaching and administering under the word, and yet he has it for the perfecting of the word.

Again, "For the edifying of the body of Christ." No, Braden says, to edify the word. And now let me call attention to the fact that when he said, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" He did not quote the full text, which also says: "And how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" Why did you not quote the entire verse there? "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" Very true; but what is the balance? See tenth chapter of Romans: "And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, how beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things." O, the true messenger from God brings something of value then. He does not only relate history, but he brings to the craving heart the like rest and peace of which he reads. God has something to do with such a preacher of his word, and hence the calling of men in order to do this preaching, to dispense this word to the people. They cannot believe except they shall hear. So this is the idea for the giving of the apostles, and prophets, and elders, and teachers, etc., and not that these apostles and preachers were given for the purpose of perfecting the word of God as Braden interprets it. In contradistinction the apostle says they were given for the perfecting of the Saints, (those who believ-

ed in Jesus Christ and had undertaken to become his children and walk in his ways,) "for the work of his ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." They were there for the purpose of exhorting them, instructing them, and to this end they received knowledge from time to time, so as to be able to rightly divide the word and build up the church; and thus their work was in perfecting the church, instead of perfecting the word. Braden's church has not only changed the officers and practices of the church, but actually changed the object and effect of the work done, and of those who did it. And yet he pretends to affirm that his church is in accordance with the New Testament pattern in faith, doctrine and practices, organization, etc. Wherein is it similar? Will he please tell us so that we can discover any similarity whatever, in fact, aside from the representation that Paul makes to Timothy that at

sometime there should a people arise claiming to be the Church of Christ, "Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof;" but of this class the apostle says, "from such turn away." The apostle seems to clearly foresee that somebody would try to take one of the *foundation* principles out of the structure, and discard the means ordained, for giving access to the power, and he warns Timothy to be careful:—

"Take heed unto yourself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: For in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." He could not dispense with one, two, three, or all the principles of the doctrine of Christ except baptism in water, and be justified. But was to "observe these things without preferring one before another, doing nothing by partiality."

1 Tim. 4: 16, and 5: 21.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Last night I gave you a detailed account of the faith, organization, teaching, ordinances, worship and practice, of the church of which I am a member. I compared these features with the church of Christ, as organized and completed by the apostles, and established perfect identity. There were open to my opponent three lines of criticism. I. I did not describe my church accurately. He has not urged this objection and has conceded the accuracy of my description. II. There were features in my church that were not in the apostolic church. He has conceded that the apostolic church had all of the features of my church. Mormons usually tell us, "You Campbellites are all right as far as you go; but you don't go far enough." III. There were features, elements, in the apostolic church that are not in my church. This is the criticism that he has made. On this alone do we differ. He has conceded that we are right in our teaching in regard to the one God—in regard to the one Lord. His first attack is on our teaching in regard to the work of the Holy Spirit. We are agreed that there is a divine person, the Holy Spirit. That he has exerted two influences on men, direct in inspiration and mediate through the medium of the truth he has revealed. We are agreed that the direct influence was exerted in inspiration, miracles, revelation. We both believe that this influence was exerted in the inspiration of men that the Bible says were in-

spired, from the days of Adam until the days of the apostles. We both believe what the Bible teaches in regard to the inspiration of men during that period, and that they wrought miracles, gave revelations, acted, spake and wrote by inspiration. We are both agreed that this influence was not exerted in conviction, conversion, sanctification and comforting. We are agreed that it was to reveal truth, attest such revelations, do benevolent work in miracles of mercy, and to aid man in emergencies in which human wisdom was not adequate. We are agreed that in the conviction and conversion of the sinner, and in the sanctification and upbuilding of the saint, the Holy Spirit accomplished his work through the truth revealed in his word, or preached in accordance with it. My opponent claims that it is a part of the permanent constitution of the church, that believers should enjoy the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, as it was enjoyed in the apostolic churches. That this direct influence will constitute persons, apostles, prophets, etc., in the church now, and thus the church should enjoy all the powers and possess all of the works that the apostolic church possessed, inspiration, prophesying, speaking with tongues, working signs, revelations.

There is no difference between my opponent and myself as to whether these spiritual powers were in the Apostolic Church. The sole issue is this, "Does the constitution of the Church the New Testament ordain that they are to remain in the

Church? Does it make them a permanent constituent element as it constitutes and organises the permanent organization of the Church?" My opponent need not read to me Joel's promise. I believe that. We differ as to its extent and time of continuance. Nor the promises of John and Jesus of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I believe that. We differ as to its extent and continuance. Nor the promise of Jesus that his apostles should receive the Comforter. I believe that. We differ as to its extent and continuance. Nor the promise that his apostles, when before magistrates, should be inspired, nor that those who believed on Him should have inspiration, like rivers of water. I believe that. We differ concerning the extent and continuance. Nor His promise to His apostles that they should be endued with power from on high, and that signs should follow their teaching. I believe that, but differ as to its extent and continuance. Nor Peter's promise on days of Pentecost. We differ as to its extent and continuance. He need not read accounts of the baptism in the Holy Ghost. I believe that. We differ as to its extent and continuance. He need not read to me accounts of the apostles conferring the Holy Spirit, nor of the apostles working miracles, nor of persons working miracles who possessed spiritual gifts. I believe all that. We differ as to its extent and continuance. He need not read to me 1 Cor. XII. xiii. xiv. and Eph. iv., and other passages. I believe all that. We differ only concerning extent and continuance of such gifts. He assumes that the baptism in the Holy Spirit was a general gift in the Church. I assert that there were only two occurrences of it. He asserts that it was to remain as a constituent element in the church. I assert that it ceased with the two sole occasions of such baptism. He asserts that the promises of our Saviour of the Comforter were to all Christians. I assert they were to the apostles alone. He asserts that the promise of signs in Mark xvi. was to all believers I assert it was to the apostles who believed. He asserts that Peter's promise was to all believers. I assert that it was only those whom God called in his appointed way, the imposition of an apostle's hands. He asserts that others than those on whom an apostle had laid his hands possessed these spiritual gifts. I assert that only such possessed them. He asserts that the persons possessing these powers as described in 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv. and Ephesians iv. were, by the constitution of the Church, placed in the Church as permanent offices, a permanent element in the Church. I assert that they were provisional, the constitution making power of the Church, and ceased when the constitution, the New Testament, was completed, and the Church was organized under it; and that the constitution did not ordain them as a permanent constituent element of the Church, organized in accordance with the completed constitution. That the constitution ordains that the Church is to be governed by the

perfect word of God in the New Testament, and that we need no new revelations. That it ordains that evangelists, pastors, teachers, officers, servants, without direct influence of the Spirit or constitution making power, shall rule the Church, in accordance with the perfect law of God, completed in the New Testament. The issue then is whether miraculous powers, such as existed in the Apostolic Church, and such as are described in 1 Cor., Eph. and other epistles shall be a permanent constituent element of the Church? Or were they merely provisional, constitution making powers that ceased when the constitution was completed and the Church was organized under it and were not part of the Church.

We will now review my opponent's talk and answer his questions. In 1 Cor. xii, the apostle explains to the Corinthians the spiritual gifts in the church. He says, "desire earnestly the best spiritual gifts, nevertheless I show unto you a more excellent way" than the exercise of the spiritual gifts. He then explains what that more excellent way is. It is the condition of the church, after spiritual gifts have ceased, and the church is under the perfect word of God. He then closes by telling them to desire spiritual gifts as long as they are to remain in the church. It is not, however, the most excellent way, but the way he had discussed in the eleventh chapter. Moses gave laws to the Israelites when in the wilderness suited to their condition. He tells them what will be their condition in the land of Canaan, and often returns to their present condition and tells them how they are to conduct themselves until they reach the land of promise. So Paul tells the Corinthians how to act under spiritual gifts; then describes a more excellent way than the best of these gifts, when they shall cease; then he returns to his first thought, and tells them how to exercise the gifts till that more excellent way obtains. He no more describes the permanent of the church than Moses describes the permanent of the Israelites in similar language.

My opponent says I would not ask converts "have ye received the Holy Spirit after ye believed." No I would not. I would know that the indwelling of the spirit they had received, and that the miraculous power of the spirit, such as Paul inquired about, they could not receive, for the Bible so teaches. The baptism of the spirit is one thing, the gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit is another. To receive the Holy Spirit in baptism from Christ is one thing, to receive him in spiritual gifts by an apostle's hands is another. Those baptized at Samaria had received the indwelling of the spirit. The miraculous influence of the spirit could only be imparted by the imposition of an apostle's hands. Will my opponent tell me? Had these Samaritans been born of water and spirit before the apostles laid hands on them? Were they saints or sinners? If sinners, how could they receive the spirit? Jesus says the world cannot receive him. The Holy Spirit in miraculous power was

not through the word. It was by imposition of apostles' hands. But the indwelling was through faith, belief of the word. "After ye believed, because ye were sons, God has given you his spirit." Ananias was a special apostle, just as persons sometimes offered sacrifices who were not priests when a priest was not present. So Ananias was a special apostle sent by God to impart the spirit to Saul.

He challenged me to explain the birth of the water and the spirit. I will cheerfully do so. The Greek has one word, *gennao*, that is used of both male and female. When used of the male it means "beget;" when used of the female it means "to bear, to bring forth." When James says "He begat us by the word of truth" he used this word. When Paul says "I begat you through the gospel" he uses it. When Peter says "We are begotten through the truth" he uses it. Then God, the Spirit and Paul begat the believers through the truth. When it is asked "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" it is this word. "Those born of woman" it is the same word. In a birth there are two parties, the father who begets. God or his spirit begets through the truth. There is the mother of whom the person is born. When we speak of both together we say a man was born of his mother and father, or born of his mother to his father, because he must be born of his mother before he is born to his father. The word *pneuma* occurs in the Greek New Testament 287 times. It is translated "spirit" in every case except one, in John iii, 8, when it is said "the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, and thou canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the spirit." If it should read "The wind bloweth," it should read also "be born of wind" in the same sentence, which is absurd. If it is "born of spirit" it should read the "spirit breathes." There is no sense in giving such different meanings to the same word in the same sentence. Wind in every other case in the New Testament is a translation of *anemos*.

Our Savior told Nicodemus that unless a man be born again he could not see the Kingdom of God. Nicodemus did not understand, and asked him to explain what he meant. Our Savior did so. He did not make it still more mysterious, but he told Nicodemus just how a man is born again. He said, "Except a man is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." "It is not the natural birth that I mean," he explains to Nicodemus. He then tells how men are begotten by the Spirit. "The Spirit breathes" (in inspiration) "where he pleases, and you hear his voice." (The words he inspires, the Word of God.) "You cannot tell whence he comes or whither he goes. In this way (by hearing the word of God) 'is every one (begotten) that is begotten of the Spirit.'" Then men are begotten by the Spirit through the word, and born of the water and Spirit in baptism. The fact that in twenty cases we

cited last night, belief and baptism are so coupled together, proves that this is correct.

Hebrews VI. refers to the Mosaic law that these Hebrews were not willing to lay to one side. The Mosaic law was the foundation of the gospel, prepared the way for it. The gospel of Christ is that which is perfect. The writer exhorts them to lay to one side Mosaism and go on to perfection in the gospel. We lay hands on evangelists, overseers and servants of the Church, to induct them into office, and not to impart spiritual gifts. He wants to know what offices were left in the Church? Evangelists, overseers, servants, who acted as pastors, teachers. Where do they get their authority? From the constitution of the Church, the New Testament. Where did Campbell get his authority? From the constitution of the Church, the New Testament, just where those who went preaching the word got theirs; just where Aquilla and Priscilla got theirs when they taught Apollos the word of the Lord more perfectly. He wants to know if the Seventy did not impart spiritual gifts. The Bible does not say they ever did. It does say the twelve did, so did Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles; so did Ananias, a special apostle. The word was given perfectly to the disciples. They gave it to the world complete. First spoken, then written. Even if it had not been all written when Jude wrote, it had been spoken. Then it was reduced to writing.

We will now teach our opponent another Bible lesson. In Gen. xvii, we read that circumcision in the flesh is the token of the inheritance, the land of promise, to all who are born of Israel's seed after the flesh. I, Chron. xvi, 15, declares that the land of Canaan was the inheritance that the covenant gave to them. Circumcision in the flesh of a descendant of Israel was a token that he, under the covenant, was entitled to a share of the land, the inheritance. In Gen. ix, the bow in the cloud is called a token of the covenant not to drown the earth. It is so called three times. The token and the covenant are not the same thing. The token binds a verbal covenant as a seal does a written covenant, or as signing a written covenant binds it. Romans iv., 2. "Circumcision is a sign, a token, and a seal of the covenant God made with Abraham." Saints are born of the water and the Spirit. John iii, 5. In Galatians iv., and following verses the apostle speaks of those under the law or Moses as born after the flesh. Their token was in the flesh, and their covenant was after the flesh, and so was the inheritance. He speaks of those who are born of the Spirit. Their covenant is after the Spirit, their inheritance is after the Spirit, their token or earnest is after the Spirit. Eph. i, 13-14. "After you believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise who is the earnest of our inheritance. II. Cor. I. "God has sealed us and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." Rom. v, 5. "The love of God is shed abroad in

our hearts by the Holy Spirit who is given unto us." Gal. iv. "We receive the adoption of Sons in believing the Gospel of Christ and being baptized into him. Then because we are sons God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts." Col. ii, 2. "We are circumcised in Christ with the circumcision made without hands, by the circumcision of Christ in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh." Romans ii, 28-29. "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the Spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God." My opponent confounds the indwelling of the Spirit, which is without hands, with the impartation of the Spirit by hands. He confounds the Spirit as the earnest of our inheritance, with the impartation of the Spirit by hands to confirm acts of inspiration and revelation. He has admitted that the direct miraculous influence is not exerted in conviction, conversion, sanctification, upbuilding. Yet, he quotes passages where the convicting, converting, sanctifying, upbuilding influence is spoken of as the present privilege of the sinner and saint, to prove that the miraculous power that he admits has nothing to do with conviction, conversion and sanctification is also a privilege of the church. If he will learn to rightly divide the word of truth he will not blunder so.

Let us now learn the object of miraculous power and miracles. John, xv, 26, 27. The apostles and the Holy Spirit were both to testify of Christ, bear witness. Mark, xvi, 20. "And the apostles went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them and confirming their words by signs, that followed their preaching." I, Cor. ii, 4. Paul's preaching was in a demonstration of the Spirit and power. I, Thes, i, 5. The gospel came not unto you in word only, but in power and the Holy Spirit and in much assurance. Rom. xv, 18. Paul had preached the gospel over the Roman empire, through mighty signs and wonders, through the power of the Spirit of God. I, Cor., xiv, 22. "Tongues or miracles are for a sign to those that believe not, and not to those that believe." Hebrews, ii. "The gospel was first spoken through Christ, and confirmed unto us by those that heard Christ, God bearing witness with them, by signs and wonders, and manifold powers, and by distributions of the Holy Spirit, according to his will." If necessary, we can trace the signs God gave to Moses and to Pharaoh and Israel to demonstrate that Moses was his servant. The signs he gave to Gideon and others. These miracles are a testimony that God gives that the person is inspired a demonstration, an assurance, a confirmation. When the word was completed in the new Testament, inspirations and revelations were no longer necessary, and miraculous powers, signs of revelation and inspiration are not needed. After God has authenticated his word, when he gave it, was it necessary for him to continue to

authenticate it by working miracles all the time? After the government of the United States has authenticated a law by government seal, must it authenticate it by a new sealing, every time the law is used? My opponent would have God stand on the witness stand for ever. He would have him put the seal of miracle to his revelations in the Bible, every time a man reads or preaches it. We say that the seal of heaven put once on the law of God, the teaching of the apostles is sufficient. My opponent wants the seal used every time he opens his mouth to read the word of God. It is not faith but lack of faith, as in the case of doubting Thomas. Did my opponent stop to think that if miracles were the never failing accompaniment of preaching, in all ages, they would cease to be miracles, and become the order of nature, an ordinary, a common event? Will my opponent tell me what confirmation an event that always attends preaching gives to it? What sort of a sign would it be? The difference between my opponent and myself then is this: I believe that God inspired the men that the Bible says were inspired. I believe that he confirmed their inspiration by signs, miracles; I believe that God's seal once set to their teaching is sufficient. My opponent wants the Almighty to stand at his elbow, like a lackey, to apply the seal to his talk, every time he reads the Bible, or preaches its truths. The law of God does not sanction such nonsense. It is utterly opposed to it.

My opponent blunders over I. Peter 1, 10. The apostle declares that the Spirit that was in the prophets testified of the glory that should follow. He declares that the Holy Spirit, sent down from heaven, preached, through the apostles, the Gospel. My opponent blunderingly jumbles these two manifestations as he does everything he touches. My opponent blunders over "the faith once delivered unto the Saints" in Jude. Romans iii, 3. "Shall the unbelief of men make the faith, the Gospel of God of no effect?" Gal. iii, 2. "Receive ye the Spirit by works of law or by the hearing of faith which should afterwards be revealed." Eph. iv, 5. "One faith, the faith, the Gospel, the word of God." Then the faith once delivered unto the Saints is the Gospel, God's word. It had been delivered in preaching before it was committed to writing. I. Corinthians xv, 1. "I delivered unto you the Gospel." In I. Corinthians xiii, Paul declares "Though I have faith, (miraculous faith) so as to move mountains it is no profit unless I have Christian love." Our Savior says, Matt. xvii, 20: "If you have faith (miraculous faith) as a grain of mustard seed, you can say to this mountain, 'be plucked up and cast into the sea,' and it shall be done." Has Kelley or any Mormon miraculous faith as a grain of mustard seed? Let us see him pluck up a Kirtland hill and cast it into the lake. Belief of the faith the Gospel, saves, converts, sanctifies. Miraculous faith that my opponent regards as the all in all of the religion of Christ, does not have one particle of moral influence.

MR. KELLEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Last evening I waited patiently for my opponent to lead out upon his proposition, and show the similarity and agreement in teaching, organization, practice and doctrine of his with the New Testament church; but the longer I waited the less I was able to gather either a comparison of the features of his church with the New Testament, or of an explicit statement of the teaching of either, so that the audience could compare. I noticed, however, that he took particular pains to compare his views with what he thought the views of the Latter Day Saints were, and with what the views of other churches were, not forgetting the Spiritualists, Buddhists, etc.; and, strange as it may seem, always with a favorable opinion in his own mind of the superiority of his little system over all others. It called to my mind the prayer of one of old, "Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men." Now will he please tell us to-night what bearing all of this had upon the question under discussion? Whose faith is it that is called in question, and is now under discussion here? Anybody else except that of "the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member?" Yet almost all denominations and beliefs are dragged in here by him, and men and women assailed upon the right and left, although they are not permitted under the rules to offer a word in reply or defense, and when I cannot be expected to answer the charges, because they are not in the least touching the question. Does he show a disposition of fairness to others in this? I call attention to this particularly because the manner adopted by him through the first proposition in two-thirds of his work had as little application to the question under consideration as the polygamy practiced by Nicholas and the body of Christians under him in the first century had to do with the faith which Jesus and Paul preached. Don't you forget the question under discussion, my friends, if Braden does. I noticed last evening that a wonderful change had come over him since the discussion of the first proposition; in that, because the Book of Mormon spoke of the Holy Spirit being enjoyed before Christ was manifest in the flesh, he said it contradicted the New Testament, for that said "the Holy Ghost was not yet given;" and it was no consequence to him that I showed that the prophets before received it and spoke by it—no, sir; he insisted it was a flat contradiction. But now he confesses. Last night he had the Holy Ghost inspiring all the prophets, from Adam's time to that of Malachi. My few remarks upon that seem to have completely revolutionized him. But he has not yet told us whether they received it through Christ or some man, a question asked him five evenings

ago. The idea thrown out by him that the Disciples go to the Bible for information but other churches go to their creeds, when presented in this false light looks very plausible for his side, sprinkled over as it is with a good deal of sophistry; and this makes it look very bad for others. The inference is that others go to their creeds for precepts, whether based upon the Bible or not, for the reason that they have a written statement of what they believe, notwithstanding, as they think, taken from the Bible, while the Campbellites go to the Bible. What is the difference between a written statement and an unwritten one, so far as a comparison with the Bible doctrines is concerned; and if there is a difference, would it not be in favor of the written, so that men could with more certainty compare with the Bible? I am aware that there are formulas of faith and disciplines in the world, and interpretations of the inspired writings, but when I come to examine critically, I find among them Mr. Campbell's *Christian System*; and in many things it comes as far short of standing on the Bible and the Bible alone, as many others. Why did he not arraign his own creed instead of going out of the way in this discussion to attack others? I take up this work of Mr. Campbell and read upon page 11 of the preface, "Our aim is now to offer to the public a more matured view of such cardinal principles as are necessary to the *right interpretation of the Holy Scriptures*, both in acquiring and communicating a correct knowledge of the Christian institution."

It seems from this that these professed Bible-alone-people have something to go to also, so that they may know first what Mr. Campbell thought about it.

Turn to page 85, chapter 26, and you have the fifteen points of their discipline duly arranged. I call Mr. Braden's attention to it for the reason that when I simply referred to the matter in the Wilber-Nebraska debate he got terribly beside himself. I have the book now, so that if he disputes me I can soon decide the matter.

The chapter is headed:

"THE CHRISTIAN DISCIPLINE,"

And contains the points of discipline of the so-called Christian, Disciple, Church of Christ or Campbellite Church, as furnished by Alexander Campbell himself for that body.

In this discipline I find a different order introduced and held out as a rule of practice to the Bible order. It is the formal, or "hand-shaking" order, or the plan of reception of members into the church after baptism. This evidently takes the place of confirmation under the hands of the eldership that was practiced in the early church.

Mr. Campbell, on page 86, makes this

formal reception out to be a "necessity," although he has not a word of sanction for it in the Bible; yet, it is pretended here by my opponent that they go to the Bible alone for their precepts, and are thus peculiarly different from others. But this bauble I shall fully puncture at another time, and this evening will take up at once those prominent points of difference that are so apparent between "the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member," and the New Testament, and examine them; for the reason that the general differences are so many it would hardly be possible to enumerate and make the reference of an argument to them in a single evening.

The great trouble is to find in what they do resemble. Take out the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, which Campbell began fully to teach in 1828, but which was plainly set forth in the Gospel as contained in the record Mr. Smith received of the ancient inhabitants of America in 1827, and Mr. Campbell's church will be as hard to identify with the New Testament church as would some of the organized benevolent societies of our time. Good enough in their places, but not calculated to point out the straight and narrow way that leadeth unto life. In their order then I take up:

1. The name of the church, "Christian, Disciple, Church of Christ." I referred to the fact that the word Christian was only used three times in the Bible.

1. In Acts 11:26, where the saints were called Christians at Antioch.

2. Where Paul was dragged before the king for his faith, and Agrippa says, "Almost persuaded thou me to be a Christian." Very similar to the way I have been treated time and again, when I had placed before persons the hope of my promise in Christ, and reasoned with the people from the Bible, the answer would be returned:—"Well, I don't see anything bad in what these Mormons teach after all." Why do they have to nick-name us, cast derision, as those out of Christ did the saints in Paul's time?

3. The last is in I Peter, 4:16: "Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." Don't be ashamed, if they do nick-name you, who are Saints, and call you Christians, because you have a hope well founded in the Messiah. Nick-names contain no argument, and if you are not of the world, you will certainly be nick-named by them. This is the sum and substance of the teaching of Peter upon that.

But what were the people of God called? Disciples? That showed no distinguishing feature between Jesus' disciples and Plato's disciples. Disciple simply means a learner, a follower, etc. And may be applied to learners and followers outside of religion as in. The true and distinguishing name of the children of God is that of Saints, so used both in the Old and New Testament, and they are to be known as such when Jesus brings them with him in his second advent. When he comes the Saints will be with him, and none others at that time. Not

Saints only after they are dead and gone, but Saints here. Upon this I hastily offer my authorities:

1. "Israel in the wilderness called Saints." Deut. 33:2-3.

2. "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints." Ps. 116:15.

3. "And the graves were opened and many bodies of the Saints which slept arose." Matt. 27:52.

4. "Saints at Lydia." Acts 9:32.

5. "Many of the Saints shut up in prison." Acts 26:10.

6. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace as in all the churches of the Saints," 1 Cor. 14:33.

7. "Collection for the Saints." 1 Cor. 16:1.

8. "Fellow-citizens with the Saints." Eph. 2:19.

9. "For the perfecting of the Saints." Eph. 4:12.

Showing that they were not perfect beings, but to be perfected through the instruction and teaching of a spiritual ministry—not by persons versed in man's wisdom only—if so they would have their hope in men instead of the power and wisdom of God.

10. "The prayers of the Saints." Rev. 5:8.

11. "The Saints are refreshed by thee, brother." Phil. 7th verse.

12. "Salute all the Saints." Heb. 13:24.

Besides the name Saints, they also are named after Jesus Christ; Eph. 3:14-15; he being not ashamed to call them brethren; and hence we have the Church of Jesus Christ of the Saints; called Saints, and Latter Day Saints, in distinction of Former Day Saints. The Church Re-organized (since the organization in 1830) and hence properly called The Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, or the Church of Jesus Christ, it being his formal organization of the Saints.

Leaving the name, I pass to the second difference. He says Jesus established no church before his death or the day of Pentecost. Let us examine this; for it is clear from the New Testament that if he did not, he did not establish any at all.

Matthew 16: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." These were to enable Peter to act authoritatively here on earth in the church; the kingdom of heaven being represented and established here under the name, style and title of the church. 18th chapter, 17th verse: "And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church." And 18th verse, "Verily I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Showing Peter's work in the church, the kingdom of heaven then in existence, as referred to, when he says, "The Kingdom of God is [now] within you." In your midst, among you. Then established and men pressed into it. Luke 16:16.

"The law and the prophets were until John, since that time the Kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it."

How did they get in, if there was none? But the Kingdom, the Church, was within them. Not the kingdom as it was in heaven, for "flesh and blood" could not inherit up there, but the kingdom as represented in the church on earth. Matt. 11: 12. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." And also 12: 28: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you." But how come? I answer emphatically that it was under the figure and name of the Church. Jesus the King was there; He gave them the laws of the Kingdom then and there, as also his servant John taught before. He had chosen officers to carry out and minister these laws and bring men and women into the kingdom, and they were then and there doing it, viz.: "Translating them into the Kingdom of His dear Son," by administering the laws of the Kingdom, properly bringing them into the Church. Col. 1: 13. Thus forming, in fact, the family of God, making them heirs of the Kingdom, the body of Christ, "which is the Church," Col. 1: 24. Hence Jesus could call them brethren. "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." John 17: 16. This is why Paul said in the 1st Corinthian letter: "And God hath set some in the Church, first apostles." When was it done? After Pentecost day? No, long before, as shown by Luke 6: 13. After the day of Pentecost no Apostles were set in the Church except the calling of others to fill the vacancies made by death, or otherwise.

Braden says the law of Moses extended to Pentecost day, and Jesus kept this law in all things. But Matthew and Luke say "the law and the prophets were until John," and that Jesus said, "Before Abraham was, I am." That he went through the fields on the Sabbath day, and plucked the ears of corn; and told His disciples, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees," (these persons who kept the law of Moses and their traditions), "ye can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." Referring evidently to that kingdom which was from above, of which the church on earth was the figure, type or representative; and hence his disciples were not of the world because they imbibed, yielded obedience to, had partaken of the laws which were from above—the laws of Christ's Church,— "Therefore the world hateth you."

Acts 2: 41: "Then they that gladly receive the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." Added to whom? To the children of God there, the Church, see verse 47, same chapter, "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." What church? The church then

in existence, and which had existed from the time Jesus organized it, for no act had been done towards further organizing it, so far as the history shows to this time, except to fill the vacancy in the church caused by the death of Judas Iscariot. God hath set in the church "*first apostles*," said Paul. And now when this Judas falls, it is from the church; for his office was in the church, and his place, or office, which is still in the church, is filled by another. This is the sentiment taught by Jesus, the great Head of the Church, in John, 15th Chapter, "I am the vine," "ye are the branches," and now, not hereafter; and if branches, they were members in the family of God, the body of Christ, "which is the Church," and which was in existence then and there. Jesus even before John's time had a church. "This is He that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel that spake to Him in the mount Sinai; and with our fathers who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Acts 7: 38. This is the reason we find *elders* in Moses' time—the 70 elders—they were officers in the church.

But says Braden, "The gospel law of pardon was first preached on the day of Pentecost."

What does he wish to teach by this? That there are two gospel laws? That people received forgiveness of sins after Pentecost differently from what they did before? Let us see. Luke 1, 76 and 77, speaking of the work of John says: "For thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways; to give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of their sins." Was this any different gospel than that preached afterwards? Mark 1: 4: "John did baptize in the wilderness for the remission of sins." This seems to me was freeing men from their sins before the day of Pentecost in some other way than by the sacrifice of the dove, the lamb, and the pigeon. Here, "the church of which I, Clark Braden, am a member," is clearly shown not to be in accord with the New Testament pattern in doctrine and faith. "The law and the prophets were until John." Not John's birth; but till John was commissioned by the Most High to teach the principles of the Kingdom of God, and came preaching the Gospel law, in contradistinction to the Mosaic, and saying, "Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" proclaiming a law which superceded the old; and when the new came in the old was displaced, and for that reason nailed to the cross. Not nailed to the cross while it was in force and operative, but after it had performed its work and God had abolished it.

4. Now I approach the fourth difference and distinction between his church and the New Testament church; viz., the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In this book by which we are to try his church, there is such a baptism taught as the baptism of the Holy Spirit; the Comforter, of which Jesus speaks when he says: "It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the

Comforter will not come." Teaching the necessity of its coming; and not only for those with him there, "but for them also who shall believe on me through their word." This Comforter which Jesus was to send was the Holy Ghost, verse 26th, 14th chapter; and for this they were to wait at Jerusalem that they might receive this Holy Ghost, which was "the promise of the Father," Luke 24: 49: "and behold I send the promise of the Father unto you: but tarry ye in the City of Jerusalem until ye are endowed with power from on high." This power from on high was the promise made by John and Jesus when they taught, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Not simply to enable them to do signs and wonders, for they did those things before; but to comfort them, and guide them into all truth, so they would not have, or take, erroneous views as to his teachings and God's word. The same is spoken of also by Jesus as the Baptism of the Spirit. "Except ye be born of the water and of the Spirit." It was in the hour in which "the true worshippers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." This Spirit which he wanted them to have,—the Holy Ghost Religion,—shall be in them a well of water, "springing up into everlasting life"—referring to the giving of the Holy Ghost. Again, Jesus says: "My words, they are Spirit and they are life." Not that the word itself is spirit disconnected with anything else; any more than the word is life itself disconnected with anything else. My opponent will hardly take the ground that a man just taking up the word and reading it, or even eating it would have the Spirit spoken of there, or the life spoken of; but as Jesus interprets it in John 12:—"My commandments are life everlasting." "He that loveth me keepeth my commandments; and if ye keep my commandments, I will send the Comforter;" (John 14: 15 and 17,) which is the Spirit of truth; this having come because they obeyed the word, and which will make complete the new birth, and "spring up into eternal life," and thus *only* is the word, "spirit and life;" and for this cause the "manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit with all." I Cor. 12: 7. The wish of the Savior was that all should partake of this spirit. Hence, we are saved "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3: 5.

Those on the day of Pentecost did not receive the Holy Ghost through the medium of the word; but by reason of having obeyed the word; hence the apostle describes the giving of the Holy Ghost as being that "which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." Titus, 3: 6. This is also the idea conveyed in Ephesians 1st chapter: "In whom ye trusted after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." "Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith—I ceased not to give thanks for you,—that the

God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him.

They did not get it through the medium of the word, for they had long before had that, but through Jesus Christ and the ordinance of "laying on of hands." Acts 8: 17, 18. "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money saying, Give me also this power that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost."

Thus we readily discover the sixth difference between Mr. Braden's church and the New Testament church.

But these persons, he says, were not baptized with the Spirit. Oh no, only those on Pentecost day and the household of Cornelius. It makes no difference to him that Peter said that which was shed forth on Pentecost day, they should receive who were repentant and obedient; and although he takes up the prophecy of Joel and shows that "the promise is unto you, and unto your children, and unto all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord or God shall call," and this was the baptism of the Holy Spirit, to which Peter refers; nor what has been said upon this by the great apostle of the Gentiles, who too, speaks emphatically upon this question, 1 Cor., 12: 13: "For by one spirit *are we all* baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been *all* made to drink into one spirit."

Remember not baptized by water into the one body, or into the spirit, but baptized by "the spirit into one body, and which is equivalent to drinking into one spirit." Paul agrees with Jesus, "Born of the water and of the spirit," and both disagree with Braden's church; therefore the church "of which I, Clark Braden, am a member," is according to the pattern! Now, is not this wise logic? There is not a ghost of a hint that there is such a thing taught in the Bible as where the spirit is given through the medium of the word. When Peter taught the Gentiles it fell on them independently, and so it came to the Ephesian saints after they had believed the word and had complied with the ordinance of "laying on of hands." Just so at Samaria, and on Pentecost day; for before this Jesus had "lifted up his hands and blessed them." Paul says: "I came not to you in word only, but in power and the Holy Ghost." "He therefore, that ministereth to you the spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith."

Now I come to the Hebrew letter which he claimed referred to the law which they had before Christ. It reads: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection." [It is not the old law then, but the principles of the doctrine of Christ,] of faith, repentance, baptisms, [of water and the spirit] and of

laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." Heb. 6:2 and 3.

Who were these Hebrew saints to whom the apostle is addressing this letter? I answer—Those of Jerusalem; and who had before this accepted of the principles of the doctrine of Christ; but had forgotten to build upon them as they should. The apostle, however, exhorts them to go on and perform the work to which they had given adherence: "Not laying again the foundation." And then in verse 4, they are told, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted of the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance."

This is the language the apostle uses towards these Hebrew saints, and no wonder. They were among those, doubtless, who had tasted of the heavenly gift on Pentecost day and at Samaria, and they should not have to lay again, the second time, the foundation principles of the doctrine of Christ, of faith, repentance, baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment. Ah! the reason is evident why "baptisms" is, as it is put by the apostle in the plural, they had been "born of the water and of the Spirit," as Jesus had directed, and thereby tasted of the heavenly gift. Then Paul in closing his letter could well say, for he is talking to those who had accepted these first, or foundation principles: "And I beseech you, *brethren*, suffer the word of exhortation, for I have written a letter unto you in few words."

But he did not wish them to keep doing their first works over again,—remember, first works in the Gospel of Christ—but "go on [in the Gospel of Christ] unto perfection." Please look back three verses: "For when for the time you ought to be teachers, [they had not progressed and improved as they ought to have done, hence], ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God." Heb. 5:12.

Certainly there were never positions more secure than I have taken on these texts. *Baptisms*, then, and laying on of hands, are foundation principles in the doctrine of Christ. But Mr. Braden's church is just the reverse in doctrine and practice. He has neither the baptism of the Spirit nor the practice of the laying on of hands in his church, therefore, he concludes that he stands on the Bible, and the Bible alone. No creed in his church. O, no! Turn now to Ephesians 4:5. "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." By this one baptism they are baptized into one body, of course, for Paul again says, "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. 12:13. Ah! Then if the word baptism in Ephesians 4:5, refers to the elements of the new birth, it cannot exclude the Spirit. There is a baptism of the Spirit. No man can successfully deny this. "Ye shall be bap-

tized with the Holy Ghost, (the Spirit), not many days hence." Acts 1:5. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." John 3:5. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Savior." Titus 3:5,6. Not through the medium of the word, remember.

This baptism, then, is used in the sense in which the same apostle refers to it in the Galatian letter, as well as the Hebrew. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. Here are two acts referred to; the baptizing into, and the putting on—"washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." What is it to put on Christ? Simply to go into the water? No. That act is only for the cleansing, freeing from sin; thus men may be swept and garnished, but after this, shall the house be left empty? No, not in Christ. Hence he has ordained the supply of grace in the heart by means of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "I will not leave you comfortless," says Jesus, but "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him; but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." John 14:16,17. These were to receive the "baptism of the Holy Ghost not many days hence." While Jesus was with them in person, they might endure without it, but not otherwise. Therefore they afterwards received the renewing of the Holy Ghost, as did Israel, who were "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all drink of that spiritual rock, which rock was Christ." Why, says one, they partook of Christ, then, did they? Certainly. That was only one of Mr. Braden's whims in criticizing the Book of Mormon, because they enjoyed Christ on this continent. Peter says, referring to those before Christ: "Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ *which was in them* did signify, when it testified beforehand the suffering of Christ and the glory that should follow." 1 Peter 1:11. This is sufficiently emphatic, showing that the Nephite prophet was right, and my opponent wrong, and just so upon this point of the baptism of the Holy Spirit after Christ. Those who are "born of the water and of the Spirit are made complete in one birth by the 'washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.'"

Thus they have given to them a deed, "earnest" of their inheritance in the kingdom of God, which "earnest," or deed, is the "gift of the Holy Ghost." There is none in Mr. Braden's church, however, but there was in the apostolic church. Therefore my opponent believes that Mr. Campbell was a restorer.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN:—My opponent wants to know why we do not use the term "Church of Jesus Christ," instead of "Church of Christ." He may ask the Holy Spirit why, in Romans 16-16, he did not say "The Churches of Jesus Christ" or "The Re-organized Churches of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." Let him settle it with the Holy Spirit. He wants to know if men can not seek for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, even if it is a promise. Yes, all to whom God has promised it, can seek it. But my opponent can not dodge in that way. We have proved, and he dare not deny it, that there is but one baptism in the church. He dare not deny that the one baptism that is in the church, is a command, not a promise, is in the name of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, and is in water. Holy Spirit baptism, that is not a command, but is a promise, is not in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and is not unto remission of sins, is not the one baptism that is in the church. That ends that matter. My opponent blunders outrageously over Peter's language in Acts 2. Peter does say that this event, this occurrence at which you are astonished, is that event or occurrence of which Joel prophesied, when he said, and quotes Joel's promise. In the 34th verse Peter declares that Jesus has shed forth, this series of wonders that you see and hear. Not the Spirit, for they did not see him.

Let us now narrow down our contest to as narrow a compass as possible. We have given ten reasons why we do not believe that the baptism in the Spirit is in the church now. My opponent has not noticed them, although stated twice, and he has been challenged twice to notice them. We need not re-state them. We have given our reasons for believing that the promise of the Comforter was to the apostles alone. My opponent and myself agree that it refers to the miraculous influence of the Spirit. Until he notices our arguments, he confesses that the promise was to the apostles alone. My opponent dare not deny that Jesus says that believers alone shall enjoy Joel's promise. We have given our reasons for confining it to the apostles. He had rebuked the apostles for their unbelief. He told them (the apostles) to preach. He said the signs should follow those who went out preaching, believing what he said.

The context declares, the apostles went forth preaching; the Lord did confirm the preaching of the apostles, and the signs did follow the preaching of the apostles, who believed and preached. My opponent will not deny that Peter says that such believers as the Lord should call, will receive the Holy Spirit as a gift. We are agreed that it refers to the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, and that alone. "The prom-

ise" is Joel's promise, just quoted above, the only promise Peter quotes or refers to.

How did God call believers? By the case of the Samaritans, who had believed and were baptized, were saints and had the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, but who could not receive the miraculous power until the apostles laid hands on them, although the mighty wonder-worker, Philip, full of the miraculous power of the Spirit, was with them; by the case of Saul, who could not receive the Spirit until Ananias, a special apostle, laid hands on him; by the case of the disciples at Ephesus, who could not receive the Spirit until the apostle to the Gentiles had laid hands on them; by the case of Timothy, who received the gift of the Spirit through Paul's hands as one of the Presbytery, and at the order of the Presbytery, we learn that no one received, or could receive, the Holy Spirit as a miraculous gift except by the imposition of an apostle's hands. When my opponent points to a single case outside of the baptism in the Spirit that received the Holy Spirit in any other way than by the imposition of an apostle's hands, he proves his case. I am not to prove that no one did. Let him prove that one did. I am not to prove a negation. He need not jabber about Saul of Tarsus, for he received the Holy Spirit, and could only receive it through one specially and miraculously sent by the Spirit, a special apostle for that purpose.

All the cases he quotes, the Samaritans, Saul, the household of Cornelius, the disciples at Ephesus, the events in the church at Antioch, are all cases of the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. The issues are, "Did any enjoy the baptism of the Spirit except at Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius?" We have proved that no one ever did, except on those occasions. Did any enjoy the gifts of the Spirit, outside of baptism in the Spirit, on whom an apostle had not laid hands? Let him cite a case.

Lastly the great issue is, "How long were these gifts to continue?" I was amused at my opponent's dodge over Eph. iv. He reads that apostles, prophets and evangelists, with miraculous powers, and pastors and teachers with miraculous powers, were given for the perfecting of the saints unto the work of the ministry. I accept all that. They were given to perfect the saints for such work of ministry as the churches then needed. Also for the up-building of the body of Christ. I believe that. All these workers with miraculous powers were needed to build up the body, to give to the church government and constitution, and to guide it until that was done. There is not a word of difference over that. The issue is, how long were apostles and prophets that were miraculous to continue? How long were miraculous

powers to be given to the evangelists, pastors and teachers? How long were miraculous powers to continue? "Forever," as Kelley says?

No! Paul says, "Until;" Until when, Paul? "Until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." Or until the one faith, of which Paul spoke is completed. Until the word of God is completed. "Until we attain also unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Or until the new man, composed of Jew and Gentile; the body of which Christ is the head, the church is completed in organization. These miraculous powers are to continue until then; then they cease. If my opponent will read all the context and rightly divide the word, it will utterly explode his cavils and quibbles. My opponent nibbles around the argument based on 1 Cor., 12-13-14. Having been once landed high and dry, with it through his gills, the fish nibbles cautiously. We agree that the Corinthian church had in it nine spiritual gifts. That these gifts constituted powers, nine miraculous powers in the church.

Paul compares the church to the human body. Christ is the head. These spiritual powers are the members, not the trunk of the body. My opponent will not deny that Christ is still the head of the church, although in heaven, and not in the church, as he was among men before his ascension.

Christ is in the church, in his word, his law, his government, his Holy Spirit. Not miraculously, but in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

The Apostles, prophets, and all miraculous powers are in the church, just as Christ is in the church, in the New Testament, in their words and acts recorded there, for our example, in what they left on the pages of the New Testament as the ambassadors and representatives of Christ.

We no more remove the apostles of Jesus, nor his inspired ambassadors, his representatives, his delegates out of the church, when we say that they had no successors, then we remove Christ out of the church, when we say he had no successor.

We no more need persons to succeed the persons who exercised the spiritual powers in the church, than we need a person to succeed Christ. We no more need the constant presence and ministry of men with the nine gifts, that were in the Corinthian church, than we need that Jesus should stay on earth, and be in the church in person.

The Holy Spirit is present in his indwelling power, though the truths he revealed by inspiration, just as God is present in the operation of natural law, that took the place of miracles of direct creation.

We no more remove the Holy Spirit from the church than we remove God from nature. There is no more need of miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, and miracles of revelation, and signs in religion, than there is need of miracles of direct creation in nature.

The apostle speaks of the exercise of spiritual gifts, as analogous to the exercise of miraculous power in creation. It was provisional and preparatory to a higher and better law, and would pass away when it had prepared the way for that higher and better, and would be succeeded by it. He declares, "desire earnestly the best spiritual gifts," while they are the order of the church. "Nevertheless, I show unto you a more excellent way," than the exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts. The apostle is contrasting two states of the church. One is the exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts. The other is more excellent than that. In the eighth verse following he declares prophesying, all utterance by inspiration shall cease. Knowledge imparted by miracle shall cease. Tongues, all miracles that are signs shall cease. That is the more excellent way. Or that shall be the state of the church, when that more excellent way has prevailed. That is as clear as sunlight. He confirms it when he says "That under these spiritual gifts, knowledge and prophesying are but fragmentary in each exercise, they are partial, can only give a part at a time."

He declares that when that which is perfect has come, the partial shall pass away. This is not heaven or the future state. There is not a reference to heaven or the future state in the chapters. Paul is talking of the state of the church under the Christian dispensation. The partial childish formative state is the condition of the church under these spiritual gifts. Its state when it is a man, when that which is perfect is come, is when the word of God, that which makes Christians perfect and thoroughly furnishes them to all good works, is completed; and the body, the church, the new man, of which Christ is the head, is completed in organization. This is plain common sense. Both members of the comparison are states of the church, and both are states under the Christian dispensation.

He then resumes his former exhortation, "Desire the best gifts, but above all to prophesy, to teach by inspiration, while spiritual gifts are the order, and until the word is completed, then prophesying will cease." He describes the condition under gifts, just as Moses described the condition of the Israelites in the wilderness. He then speaks of a better state than the exercise of such gifts, as Moses spoke of a better condition of the Israelites in Canaan, better than the condition in the wilderness.

He then returns to directions how they were to exercise these spiritual gifts, while they were the order of the church, and until that better way is ushered in, just as Moses resumes directions to the Israelites how to live until they enter Canaan, or while they are in the wilderness. There is no more three states in one case than in the other. That sets to one side that little quibble.

We have called our opponent's attention to the fact that our Savior constituted the apostles his representatives, ambassadors,

delegates, to organize the church, first provisionally, during which time spiritual gifts prevailed, and to give to it the constitution, the New Testament, and to organize it permanently under that constitution, and in accordance with it. His claim that these spiritual powers, these provisional powers, and these constitution-making powers, these delegates, should be forever in the church, is as absurd as to claim that the old government under the Articles of Confederation, and the Constitutional Convention should forever remain in session and be forever making constitutions.

He would either never have the government ordained by the constitution, for the old government, and the convention would not give way to it. Or if the government ordained by the constitution and the constitution ever were in full force, he would have the force of a form of government from which all authority had been taken, and a constitution-making convention that had nothing to do, and could do nothing, for a constitution had already been made and was in force.

If he contends for new revelations he impeaches the word of God. If he contends for miracles to confirm the word of God, already perfect in the New Testament, he has the force of God's sealing forever that to which he once put a seal. If he does not have new revelations of truth in addition to those in the Bible, he has God eternally engaged in the force of confirming what he has once confirmed. In no way can he show that inspiration, miracles and revelations are necessary, unless the New Testament is imperfect and incomplete, as the Old Testament was incomplete. If the work of the Son of God was incomplete, as was the work of Moses, and if he stands related to Joe Smith as Moses did to the Son of God, then we need Joe Smith, new revelations, inspired men to give them, and miracles to confirm them. Will he take that position?

If Jesus does not stand related to Joe Smith as Moses did to Jesus; if the New Testament does not stand related to the Book of Mormon as the Old Testament does to the New; if the spiritual powers of the days of Jesus and the apostles do not stand related to the spiritual powers of Joe Smith and Mormonism as the spiritual power of the Mosaic dispensation stands related to the spiritual powers of the Christian dispensation, what need of Joe Smith, the Book of Mormon, and Mormon spiritual powers and revelations and miracles to succeed those of the Christian dispensation, as they succeeded the Mosaic dispensation? What need of instruction and tutors for children if the church became a man in Christ? What need of an everlasting constitution-making convention? What need of an eternal sealing of God's word by miracles? If such a course were pursued, would not they cease to be miraculous? My opponent's position is a contradiction of all scripture and common sense. He would have God continue to bring animals and

plants into existence by miracle of creation after preparing the way for and establishing the control of natural law.

My opponent wants to know why not have the perfect word of God and miraculous gifts now, both in the church. Because such is not now the decree of the constitution, God's word. He undertakes to find fault with the course I have pursued in my argument. I have presented frankly what we, as a people, teach and practice. If it is so like the New Testament teaching that he can find no fault with it, the fault is in his attempt to assail it, and not in my presentation of it. My opponent confounds two operations, two influences of the Spirit. The Spirit, as enjoyed in inspiration before Christ, and that higher manifestation that was not given till after Christ was glorified, which was sent forth in the name of Christ. John 14:26.

We differ from people who have written creeds in this. They decide cases of faith and discipline by an understanding of an understanding of the Bible, the creed. We decide them by our understanding of the Bible itself, found in every instance by original investigation of the Bible itself, and not by an investigation of our understanding of the Bible, a creed. "Saint" is a name for children of God in all ages. "Christian" is the name of saints who are followers of Christ. In that name they are called after Christ, are called by his name. Saint would not call them after his name; it would not call them by his name.

He admits that Paul never heard of "Latter Day Saints," nor of "Re-organized" Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Paul had heard of "Christian" and gloried in it. He had heard of "Church of God" and "Church of Christ." "Paul I know, and Jesus of Nazareth I know, but who are ye." The Bible knows no such Ashdodish lingo. Our Savior told his apostles when announcing to them the law of the church and instructing them in it, that when the church was organized by them, members in certain cases should lay certain things before the church. That no man proves that the church was then in existence than his telling them what they should do after they were endued with power from on high, proves that they were then endued with power. The kingdom was not then in existence, for after the death of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathea was still waiting for the kingdom. Kingdom has a variety of meanings. The kingdom is spoken of in a variety of aspects.

The Kingdom was among the Israelites in Christ's day, in promises, in preaching that announced that it was at hand, approaching, and not as an established institution, for Jesus himself said it was only at hand, approaching. The law and prophets were preached until John. John preached that the Kingdom was at hand. Not that it was in existence, and he in it. He was not, for the least that was in the Kingdom, when established, was greater than John.

My opponent must be hard pushed when

he quotes Colossians 2:13, "hath translated us into the Kingdom," written thirty years after the death of Jesus, 'o prove that the Kingdom was in existence before his death.

The apostles were in the kingdom as soon as selected, he tells us. They were selected at the beginning of the ministry of Jesus. Just before his death, not six weeks before, Jesus said, "I will build my church;" and my opponent admitted it was still future at that time. Will he explain how the apostles were in the Kingdom, three years before that time, when the Kingdom was future, was not in existence at that time? He read "added to them," "added to the church," said of what happened on and after the day

of Pentecost. If he will read such language in regard to events before the day of Pentecost, he will prove that the church existed before that day. There was an Israelitic congregation in the wilderness, but not the "church of Christ." Not a soul had been baptized into Christ. They had been baptized into Moses. As the miraculous influence of the spirit is no part of conversion, by his own admission, it is no part of the birth of the water and spirit. That ends that matter if he does not back out of the truth he admitted. We receive the Holy Spirit now after that belief and obedience that makes us sons of God. "Because we are sons of God, he sends forth the Spirit into our hearts," the indwelling of his Spirit.

MR. KELLEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It seems that if there is anything to be attached to the manner of one of the disputants in a debate, I should not have anything to say this time. My opponent has finished up the argument—closed the thing down. He says, "There is only one baptism in the church, and that one is not the baptism of the Spirit, and that settles it." What is the use of argument? Braden can settle it alone without any trouble. Just because. Now can't you see the point, my friends?

Instead of giving you an interpretation of the passage, he says, I assert that there is but one, and that is not by the Spirit. But Jesus said, "Born of the water and of the Spirit." "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Peter says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And this was the baptism of the Spirit, so admitted by Mr. Braden. Those at Pentecost and those of Cornelius' household received the baptism of the Spirit, he says, only. But why should God give it to them, if not in the church? Again Paul says, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles; whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." Here the authority of Jesus, Peter and Paul settles the question adversely to Mr. Braden, for they say there is a baptism of the Spirit in the church.

The passage in Ephesians 4:5, which Mr. Braden professes to rely upon, I showed fully in my last speech did not, when properly understood, exclude the baptism of the Spirit from the Christian system.

But my opponent thinks they had no use

for the baptism of the Spirit after the first century, for the reason that they had the word after that, and Jude said, "contend for the faith," etc. But whom did he tell to contend for the faith; those of the second and third centuries, or those of the first? Jude is exhorting the saints in his time, who also have these spiritual gifts having been baptized with the Holy Spirit, to "contend for the faith delivered (then) to the saints." They had both then. So also had the Corinthian Saints. Paul says, I Cor. 15:1, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel, which I preached unto you which also ye have received and wherein ye stand."

Here these people are plainly shown to not only have the law, the Gospel in word, but also the gifts. Enjoying both at the same time, and having both more fully than the people have either now; yet, we are gravely told that all this spiritual endowment was to cease when the word came. At the same time too, he says the Spirit, what little we have, comes through the medium of the word. But if that is true, would it not also follow that they who have the most word would have the most Spirit and *vice versa*.

Whichever way Mr. Braden turns in this net, he winds himself just that much tighter.

He says now, that I have conceded certain things were all right. O yes, Kelley has given away his case. But did he show you wherein? Take out the baptism in water that he holds to, and in what other thing is he with the Bible? John the Baptist preached and administered that rite; but there is now, as then, something else to seek after. A greater baptism than that of

water. "I indeed have baptized you with water," says John; but this was not the great central thought in the religion of Christ. Mark 1:8, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." This was the great central thought of both John's and Jesus' preaching, besides that of all the apostles after them. Hence we find Paul the first thing enquiring at Ephesus, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?"

But again, he says the Mormons believe so and so, pretending to tell you what I believe.

The question under discussion now is not what I believe, or what the Mormons believe, if he wishes to nickname the Saints that; but what does Braden and the so-called Christian, Disciple or Campbellite church believe.

What the Saints believe, and how far that belief agrees with the Bible, we will consider under the third question, and I shall not attempt to avoid the issue.

He takes up the plain declaration of Jesus in John 3:5, and undertakes to translate. The word Spirit, he says, is from the Greek word *Pneumatos*. Well, suppose it is, does that make any difference? Is his position upon this, that the word means breath, or wind, as some of our Adventist friends claim, and therefore Jesus did not mean baptism of the Spirit, but of breath or wind?

Mr. Braden: I said it was Spirit, not wind.

Mr. Kelley: Why do you refer to the word wind at all, then, in giving your interpretation? In your use of the word wind, breath, etc., you make it appear as though Jesus referred to the wind.

Mr. Braden: I said the translation of the 3d of John was wrong.

Mr. Kelley: You will have a chance. I am arguing that it is not wrong, but right, and consistent with all other teachings of Jesus and the apostles. The Greek word *Pneumatos* is properly translated Spirit, signifying the Holy Ghost. 1 Cor. 2:10, "But God hath revealed them unto us by his (*Pneumatos*) Spirit. For the (*Pneuma*) Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God." Again, Rom. 8:16, "The Spirit (from *Pneuma* again) beareth witness with our spirit (*pneumati*) that we are the children of God."

These are texts, and I might give many others, where even Mr. Braden himself could not claim that the word Spirit was a mis-translation. What argument then is there in trying to re-translate John by putting a different word there? Suppose we translate the word *Pneumatos* to mean simply an element and not spirit; in what will it benefit the matter? Read it thus, fixed up: "Born of the water, and of—" what? The element of water again? Breath, air, wind, or what? Spirit is the most consistent, and it is true, and that is what Jesus said and meant. Hence we have written in Acts 1:5, Jesus' words: "For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost (*Pneumati*, Spirit,) not many days hence."

But he wants me to answer the question

as to whether the people of Samaria were sinners, whom Philip baptized, before they received the Holy Ghost.

I answer, no more than the apostles were sinners before they received it while they were tarrying at Jerusalem waiting for the Holy Spirit to be poured out as had been promised.

Will Braden answer as to whether he considers the 120 at Pentecost sinners up to that time? The people of Samaria, although they had obeyed the word and had great joy, wanted something else—they wanted the "promise of the Father," as that was, "to as many as the Lord our God shall call;" but they did not receive it prior to the confirmation by the laying on of hands, for Peter says, "for as yet he was fallen upon none of them." Yet this was the Spirit of truth, the Comforter, which alone could give them a right to the inheritance. He tries to make out, however, that when they have the word of truth they have the other also, as per consequence; but where are his proofs? Here at Samaria they had the word but not the Spirit. However, those who had received the word from proper motives afterwards received the Spirit through the laying on of hands. So also, as declared in the first of Ephesians, those who received the word, after that they believed, they were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise which is the earnest of their inheritance.

But had the Spirit anything to do in their conversion, he asks. I answer that it was not given to them as a comforter, seal of adoption, or as "the promise of the Father," before conversion, any more than it was given as such to Peter, James and John prior to Pentecost. Yet will he say God by his Spirit had nothing to do with Peter, James and John before this?

Jesus said. "No man can come to me except the Father draw him." I apprehend that the Father has much to do in bringing people to the point where they may receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit which they do not give him credit for. But because of this is it any reason that they should not have the baptism of the Spirit, or the seal of adoption, the means by which they may indeed manifest their right to the inheritance when they shall be called to give an account before the Judge of both the quick and the dead?

Again he thinks that it was not Christ's church in the wilderness. No, that was only Moses' church.

But Paul says Christ was in the church in the wilderness, and if Christ was in it, that is more than Mr. Braden can show for his church. And if Christ was in it, it was indeed His church.

He attempts to turn one of my arguments by referring to the passage, "The Kingdom of God is within you," in order to show that the church was not there then. Jesus when using this language is talking to the wicked Pharisees. Luke 17:20. "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the Kingdom of God should come, he answered them

and said, the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, lo here! or lo there! for behold, the Kingdom of God is within you."

He does not tell these wicked persons that the Kingdom was within them—in their hearts as we sometimes hear—but in their midst. [Among you]. Look on the margin of your reference Bible; the word *among* is given as a better one. The thought and instruction presented by Jesus at the time is, that the kingdom was well represented then in their midst. And had they but opened their eyes they could have beheld the same; but it was not in such pomp and splendor as to attract the attention of the vile or indifferent. Hence, "not with observation." Notwithstanding this, Jesus the King was there. He had announced the laws of the kingdom, and urged their acceptance, thus putting them in force. He had chosen officers then and there to administer these laws; and they were being administered. Men and women were becoming subjects of this king daily, and the power of the kingdom was felt, not only upon the good, but the evil; and hence we find that even the evil spirits had to obey. "And I, if I cast out devils by the power of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you," said Jesus. This had come under the form and organization of the church. And although the Scribes and Pharisees stood disputing the fact like my opponent here, Jesus argues that if these things are done, then the kingdom is there in fact, no difference how much they may cavil over the matter. The very fact that these things are accomplished, viz., "The sick healed," "devils cast out," "the dead raised," and that "the poor had the gospel preached unto them," is overwhelming proof that the Kingdom of God with which men have to do in this life—the church—was an established fact.

The word kingdom is used in the New Testament to not only represent the church here as in Luke 16:16, Matt. 11:12, and 7:29; but also at times as referring to the kingdom when it is to be revealed in glory and majesty, as in Matt. 6:10, 26:29, and Mark. 15:43. This last refers to the text he quoted where Joseph of Arimathæa waited for the kingdom of God. But it was not the church, or the giving of the Holy Ghost that he watched for; but the time when the glory of the kingdom should return to Israel; when one should come and "Establish the kingdom and sit upon the throne of his father David forever."

But he says, his church claims that Christ is among his people. I know he does, and so do all others. But how does he know? His very principles do not permit Christ to do anything in the church if he should be in it. The distinction is this:—We not only claim that Christ is in the church, but that as a fact direct his people, answer them, and bless them directly. Being the head of the church, he can, and does communicate with the body and in an intelligent, reasonable manner.

My opponent pretends to have Christ along, but it is only as a kind of a silent partner. It is a more absurd position than if he would say, Jesus was not in the church at all. For he places him in his church where he must observe the evil, and then by his creed, binds the Master so he is not permitted to speak, or in any way protest against their unlawful works. Do not deceive yourselves my friends; where Jesus is, there his power will be felt. "If I by the power of God do these things, then the kingdom of God is come." The converse of the proposition is: If the power is not made manifest, to wit: In the healing of the sick, casting out devils, speaking with spiritual gifts, and preaching the Gospel in power and the Holy Ghost, then the kingdom, or the church of Christ in fact, is not represented. But, there is simply an organization "Having a form of Godliness, but denying the power thereof." 2 Tim. 3:5.

I ask my opponent to point out a single instance in the world's history, where Christ has ever had a church on earth, one that was acknowledged and accepted of him in any way, when he had not inspired men in the same, and the people were not blest with the presence of this power? Where they had not the gifts of the Holy Spirit; and the sick were not healed; men blest with prophecies, tongues, visions, wisdom, knowledge, faith, discernment of spirits and interpretations. In which too, there was not either an apostle or prophet? Can he mention a single time within the past five thousand years of the history of the race when such an anomalous thing took place? Yet he pretends to say his church is Christ's church. But don't he know hundreds of others that are widely different from his, are claiming the same thing? Is Christ divided? What reason is there in claiming that a church which denies all communication of Christ to it; that rejects the idea of present inspiration of Jesus; that rejects the idea of the manifestations of the spirit that Jesus promised to be with his children is in fact Christ's church? The idea is preposterous. In the language of the apostle, I feel like saying to such: "Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light."

But it is claimed that the Campbellites have apostles in their church. Ah! do they? How do they have them? So as to speak and act in the church, "for the work of the ministry," as they did in the church established by Jesus. Oh no. It is only a turn Braden has. He wants to carry the idea that they have dead apostles and prophets in their church. What are they in there for then, and who are they? It is not Peter, or Paul, or James, I assure you, for they are in the church Triumphant—they said they were going, ere they left. "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." 2 Cor. 5:1. "Knowing that shortly I must put off this my tabernacle,

even as the Lord Jesus Christ hath showed me." 2 Peter 1:14. But says Braden, Is not Christ in the church, and he died too? Yes, Christ is in his church; but how? Answer, by the presence of the Holy Spirit. "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him. But ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you. I will not leave you comfortless. I will come unto you." John 14:16-19. Here is fully set out the manner of Christ's presence in his church, but not so the apostles. This is the Spirit that Jesus shed forth upon them on the day of Pentecost. It is that which Jesus speaks of in the 26th verse of the same chapter: "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you."

But Braden has already disclaimed the idea of it being in the church now, hence it is shown beyond all controversy that Christ can not be in his church. The apostles were set in the church for a purpose, to edify the church; not forever, as Braden said, I believed, but till the church is edified, "and we all come to a unity of the faith, to a perfect man in Christ." That is what I said, and that is what is written. Again, he thinks I am wrong as to Joel's prophecy, because he says they could not see the Spirit, and Peter says, "this which ye see and hear."

Could not see the Spirit! Who said so? My opponent, that is all. The record says they both saw and heard it. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. 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." Acts 2:1-5.

Then they did both see and hear the Spirit. And John beheld the "Spirit like a dove descending and lighting upon him." Yes, the Spirit can be seen and heard. So much for another one of Braden's wise expositions of Scripture. This is like his position as to the Spirit being in the church. O yes, he says, I believe in the Spirit. Kelley misrepresents me. But he wants it in a modified form, a different thing altogether from what was in the church then. That is the reason I say he has none. When he changes its form, purposes, powers, operations and fullness, he has a different thing. He thinks it a terrible thing, if he hears of the Methodists sprinkling with a little water for baptism, changing the ordinance Jesus instituted. He says, it is no baptism at all. But at the same time he comes in and says, just give us as little of the Spirit as possible. A very little will do now. Can he not see that it is a greater

evil to the Christian system to try to limit the baptism of the Spirit, than to limit the baptism of water—to limit Spirit in baptism than to limit water in baptism?

But the question of authority has been raised, and he says that Mr. Campbell claimed the word of God as his authority. Very well; if he did we will go to the word of God and see what it says:

1. Acts 20:28: "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock of God, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers."

Here the word of God says the Holy Ghost made persons overseers, ministers of the word; but Mr. Campbell said there was none now calling ministers into the church; he was certainly not the restorer as to this part of the gospel then.

2. Acts 13:2, the words speak again: "And the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."

Here again the Holy Ghost is the agent and authority for the calling of the minister, and the laying on of hands the ordinance used to convey the authority.

3. Again John 20:21: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." How was Jesus called and sent? Heb. 5:5, 6. "So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my son; to-day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

No, not even Jesus would take the honor from the word, and undertake to administer in the house of God.

4. Again we are told: "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron." Heb. 5:4.

Aaron was called by the Lord communicating his will in the matter to Moses, and directing the ordination by his Spirit as in other cases. Numbers 28:1.

Where is it, then, Mr. Campbell finds any authority for his acts in the word? Let me examine further.

5. 1 Cor. 7:17: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches." Here it is again. God does his work through the Holy Spirit, as Mathias was chosen. And they prayed and said, "Lord, show which of these two thou hast chosen." Acts 1:24. Again I ask if Mr. Campbell is with the record as he claims, where did get his authority since he rejected the inspiration of the Holy Ghost that our other Christian friends had been long praying for, and God answered him not by this Holy Spirit, neither by prophets, nor by dreams, nor by Urim and Thummim?

I will answer it, as my friend seems to be ignorant on the topic.

You will find it in Barton W. Stone's history, about page 175: "We concluded if we had authority to preach we had authority to baptize." "If we had authority to preach." Here it is! Their whole church hangs

upon an if. Man-made from foundation to top. And yet they are going about, or at least Braden is, calling the Saints blasphemers because we promise the people that they may have a realization of the blessings of God's kingdom here if they obey him so they may have a firm assurance of their acceptance with him; and thus they can find out whether we are impostors here for themselves. But the Disciples go about promising the greatest gift of God, which is *eternal life*, if they will only conform to their water baptism; but their converts, they say, shall not hear from God upon this highest of all matters to their being, so they may know whether their preachers are impostors or not. They make them wait till they get to that "bourne from whence no traveler returns" before they let them know anything about it, and, of course, they receive no deed to this promised inheritance. Now who is the most consistent? Yet he tells you my doctrine is blasphemous. Why is it? Because it differs from the Bible? No. For Jesus says, "These signs shall follow them that believe," and that is what we promise to the believer. It is for the reason that we differ from him that he talks that way. That is all. Whether he hugs it to his bosom or not, it is the outcroppings of that spirit of intolerance that is adverse to the great Christian system as reflected by Christ, and this is another grand distinctive difference between his church and the New Testament church as left by the apostles. This makes ten differences to begin with, broad ones, too.

It was rather amusing on last evening to hear my opponent state that Mr. Alexander Campbell was not a reformer, but a *restorer*. If a restorer he must have brought back something that was lost. That is, the perfect church that was established by Jesus Christ and his apostles. Notwithstanding this wonderful claim made by my opponent that their church is the *restored* one, yet he don't say that theirs is the *only true church*. This is another strange diversion. There is but one other person who has lived in this age who claims to have been a restorer, and that was Joseph Smith. All others who have gone forward in church organization only made the claim of being reformers. Now before it becomes necessary to restore the church it must be lost. This restoration my opponent, in the person of Mr. Campbell, claims to have effected. If so, then it is the *true church*, and all this talk that they don't say that they are the *only true church* is some of his "balderdash," unless he accepts the Latter Day Saints as another true one; for if necessary to restore, all not restored must in some sense be lacking, hence not true. But he makes faces at the Church of the Latter Day Saints, and calls it nasty, and "gone to seed." Where is the other *true* one except the one "of which I, Clark Braden, am a member." Please name one. Mr. Smith was honest in his claim, and said that God had restored the true church by his hands

through the administration of an angel, just as it was to be restored as shown in prophecy, and that all others were in some particulars wrong, not excepting Mr. Campbell's restored church. Because of this claim, a great many got mad at Mr. Smith, including Mr. Campbell's followers, who were claiming to be in a *restored church*, and in order to meet his claims and refute his positions, a number of them gathered together, including a large number of Mr. Campbell's restored Disciples, now practicing the doctrine of love, and, "As ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them," and put "tar and feathers" on Joseph's bare back and told him to "git." Of course this was the restored church and restored Disciples that did this. Smith was consistent, and stuck as tight to his claim as did the tar and feathers to his bare back. But my opponent is inconsistent when he says that Mr. Campbell restored the true church, and notwithstanding all his labor and effort at restoring, it is no more right than others; yet Braden affirms it is just like the church that the old time Saints were identified with when Paul ministered to them.

That there would be a necessity for a restoration was clearly predicted by Paul, and John and others, and this is admitted by all reformers, and the restorer, Mr. Campbell. Paul says the coming of the Son of Man will not take place "till there comes a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed." 2 Thess. 2. And John the revelator says: "And it was given unto him to make war with the Saints and overcome them; and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations." Rev. 13. The history of the church confirms these predictions, and others of like import. By reason of these statements and the history of the doctrine of Christian light and civilization, all reformers say there was an apostasy; hence, it made it possible for them to be reformers. Mr. Campbell united in this belief and declared as follows:

"The day of light so illustrious in its beginning, i.e., the gospel in the time of the apostles, became cloudy. The Papacy arose and darkened the heavens for a long period, obscuring the brightness of the risen glory of the Sun of righteousness, so that men groped in darkness. By the reformation of the 17th century that dark cloud was broken in fragments, and though the heavens of gospel light are still obscured by many clouds—the sects of various names—the promise is that at evening time it shall be light. The primitive gospel, in its effulgence and power, is yet to shine out in original splendor to regenerate a world."—Hayden's History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, page 36.

Mr. Campbell gave expression to this in 1826. It was after that date that the "primitive gospel in its effulgence and power" was to shine out. If he was ever a restorer, it was after that date; for it was after this that the gospel was to shine. The "Sects," the reformed churches, the Episcopalian, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Methodists and others, are represented by him as obscuring the "heavens" like so many dark "clouds." If they were dark clouds then, and are now as then, how many true churches are there besides the one of which "I, Clark Braden, am a member?"

These are the utterances of this wonderful apostle of restoration. About four years after this date the "primitive gospel did shine out," by the authority of the angel's message; but Mr. Campbell got mad at it and set about being a restorer himself. Walter Scott had been preaching all through the Western Reserve baptism for the remission of sins, as a member of the Mahoning Association, and that they should receive the gift of the Holy Ghost—that there was a Millennium day spoken of, and contending that they should have Christianity as it was. Sidney Rigdon was the great orator and leader of this great Mahoning Baptist Association. Scott and Rigdon and Osborn and Alexander Campbell were all contending in 1826 for the reinstating of "primitive Christianity." It was not then revealed, says Mr. Campbell. In 1830 the gospel began to be preached in New York State and over the Western Reserve. A number who labored in the Reform movement investigated and accepted it, and among them Mr. Rigdon. All that they had been praying for, for years, was presented to them. Some accepted and some rejected.

Among those who rejected, was Mr. A. Campbell; and he told Mr. Scott and Mr. Osborn not to preach, "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," any more; so they did not. Page 75 of Hayden's history. Now they began to blacken Rigdon's character. He had dwelt right here on the Reserve for years. Was preaching constantly. Well-known by every one. Communing with members of the Association on the Sabbath, and considered worthy beyond question. But when he espoused the new faith, that he and Scott and Campbell had been praying for and talking about, and which was too formidable for them to overthrow, he soon became, according to their vocabulary, all that was bad, even ac-

cused afterwards of having been in league with Smith for several years in order to get up a new faith; and Smith over in New York State and but just a little upwards of 14 years of age. It is much easier, and a thousand times more reasonable, to believe in miracles and angels than to believe that under the circumstances Rigdon and Smith could have been in communication with each other; and this story never would have been hatched up, had it not been that Smith was illiterate, and they hoped to give some plausible answer for not accepting the truth. For it is well known that, if the faith of the Saints is not true, that Sidney Rigdon himself was one of the worst humbugged men by it that ever belonged to the church and lived and died under the delusion.

Having rejected the Gospel message Mr. Campbell and associates set about to get up a church of their own; and after trying for nearly fifty years to name it they have not yet positively decided whether it is the Christian Church or the Disciple Church. Campbellite Church seems to more fittingly express it than anything else, as it received Mr. Campbell's impress all through. This institution which we will call the Disciple Church is said by Mr. Campbell, the restorer, to have been built on the "Bible and the Bible alone." The meaning of this is, that it was a new thing under the sun and that they rejected all creeds in its establishment, and that it is an exact pattern of the church of God as was established by Jesus and the apostles. This my opponent undertakes to show. When John the Baptist came preaching he said, "He, that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he that baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." John 1:13.

(Time called).

MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We will first dispose of the question whether the church was in existence before the day of Pentecost. The gospel has been preached in three ways; I, in promise; II in its formative period; III, as an accomplished fact. The church has been spoken of as existing in three conditions. I, as future; II, as in formation; III, as completed. The gospel was preached in promise to Abraham, saying, "In thee and thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." II. The gospel was preached in process of development Mark. 1. I. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." III. The gospel as an accomplished fact, 1 Corinthians, xv:

"Now brethren I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which ye also received, and wherein ye stand, and by which you are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I have delivered unto you the first of all that which I also received how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures."

The gospel in promise could be preached before the church existed. The gospel in process of development could be preached to prepare the way for the church. But the gospel in fact as the foundation of the church, could not be preached until Christ died for men and rose for their justification. Christ is the foundation of the church. His Messiahship is the basis. For Christ says:—"On it will I build my church." It could not be built until he demonstrated his Messiahship by his resurrection and ascension.

In the kingdom, the church is spoken of as yet future. John preached, "The Kingdom is at hand"—approaching, not that it existed; and he was in it. Jesus preached the kingdom is at hand, approaching, not that it existed; and that he was in it. He said, after he had chosen all of his apostles, and but six weeks before his death, "I will build my church on the truth; that I am the Messiah." It was then future. Mark, ix, 1. Jesus said unto them, "There are some of those that stand here that shall not taste death until they have seen the kingdom of God come with 'power.'" It was yet future. Mark, xv, 43. Joseph of Arimathea waited for the kingdom of God, after the death of Jesus." It was yet future. When did it come with power? Luke, xxiv, 49. "Behold, I send the promise of my father upon you." Still future. "Tarry ye in Jerusalem till ye are endued with power from on high." The power that was to usher in the kingdom, the church, was yet future. Acts, i, 8. "You shall receive power after the Holy Spirit has come upon you." The power that was to usher in the kingdom, the church was future, just a few moments before the ascension of Jesus. The

Holy Spirit fell with power upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. They were endued with power. The kingdom came with power, was ushered in with power then, and not till then. This was the beginning of the kingdom in fact. Peter declares: Acts, xiv: "The Holy Spirit fell on us at the beginning." The beginning of the kingdom, the church. My opponent quotes "The law and the prophets, were until John, but now the kingdom of Heaven is preached." The law and the prophets were preached until John, now the kingdom of Heaven is preached. Preached, how? That it is at hand, approaching. Not that it is in existence and John in it. "The least in the kingdom is greater than John." John was not in the kingdom. "The kingdom of God (in preaching in promise) is among you," not in fact for it had not come. He has found an Israelite Congregational National Assembly in the wilderness, but no church of Christ, for Jesus said just before his death that it had not come and was yet to be built. The Israelites were baptized into Moses and not into Christ. They received the revelations that his Spirit gave them. Not that they were in the church of Christ but that Christ was yet to come. He asserts that John's law was the gospel; John preached the law of Christ. John preached that the church or kingdom controlled by the law of Christ was yet future. If my opponent will exercise common sense and divide the word correctly and distinguish between the gospel in promise, in process of development, and accomplished fact; between the kingdom in promise, in process of formation, and the kingdom inaugurated, set up, he will avoid such flat contradictions of the word of God. My position agrees with all clear passages of the word, and with a sensible interpretation of other passages. His interpretation flatly contradicts the only possible meaning the passages I quote can have.

Was the Comforter to the apostles alone? Jesus was to leave the apostles and the Comforter was to take His place with the apostles. Jesus does not leave men now and the Comforter does not come instead of Jesus and take the place of Jesus, the place Jesus has occupied with men now. He was to recall to the minds of the apostles what Jesus had said to the apostles. He never called to the mind of any person what Jesus had said to them except in the case of the apostles. Does the Holy Spirit recall to the minds of Mormon apostles what Jesus in person has said to such Mormon apostles? The idea of a Mormon claiming that promise is as absurd as for him to claim the promise of Jesus that He would meet the apostles in Galilee after His resurrection. One is as personal to the apostles as the other. My opponent quotes

Acts, viii. He does not have intelligence to see that it is fatal to his position. The miraculous power of the Spirit could not be enjoyed by the Samaritans until an apostle had laid hands on them. Just what we claim. They had been baptized. Will he tell us whether they had been born of God, born of water and of Spirit before the apostles laid hands on them? If not, how could they receive what sinners cannot receive? If they were children of God they had been born of God, of water and the Spirit before receiving the Holy Spirit by the laying on of an apostle's hands. They had the indwelling of the Holy Spirit before receiving this miraculous power. Will my opponent be man enough to answer these questions and cease playing the coward as he has so far done.

We repeat again that my opponent does not seem to be able to distinguish between baptized *by* one Spirit, that is, by the command of one Spirit, on the one hand, and baptized *in* one Spirit on the other. Between baptism *by* the Spirit and baptism *in* the Spirit. He confounds also "Born of the Spirit," and "baptism in the Spirit." He confounds "baptism in the Spirit," and being "begotten by the Spirit." There is no use in arguing with one so obtuse or so perverse. He says Christ does not speak to the "Disciples." He speaks to us in the New Testament, not in the Book of Mormon, or any other Mormon fraud. By His chosen apostles, and not by Mormon impostors. He wants to know when there was a Church of Christ without miraculous powers in it. If he will read Eph. iv. he will learn that miracles were to exist until the Church was completed. If he will read I. Cor. xii. and xiii. he will read God's description of the perfect Church, and God's declaration that miraculous power should cease out of the Church before it became perfect, and when it became perfect. There is the Church without miraculous powers: A perfect Church. The Church with such powers was imperfect, in its childhood. Will he dare to notice that?

We have Christ in our Church, not as a silent partner as Kelley says. He speaks to us in His word, the New Testament, not in that fraud, the Book of Mormon. He speaks to us in His chosen apostles, not by Mormon impostors. The Holy Spirit is in our Church. He speaks to us in the New Testament, not in that clumsy, lying fabrication, the Book of Mormon. He speaks to us through the apostles He inspired, and not in the lies of Mormon impostors. My opponent blunders over the immersion in the Spirit. Spirit alone can be immersed in Spirit. Spirit alone immersed Spirit. The spirits of the apostles were immersed in the power of the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit was not poured out as a bucket of water or a dish of fire on the persons of the apostles. Such is the gross materialism of Mormonism. He re-hashes Hebrew vi. It is simply a fact that this letter was written to Hebrews who clung to the Mosaic law, and regarded it as better than

the Gospel. It was written to prove that the law of Moses was only a preparation for the Gospel. That they should leave the law of Moses and accept the Gospel. That the law of Moses was their schoolmaster, to teach them the first principles and lead them to Christ. The dead works were works of the law of Moses. Are works of the law of Christ dead works? Faith towards God must be now faith in Jesus Christ. The baptisms were the bathings of the law of Moses, for there is but one baptism in the Gospel. The laying on of hands was the laying on of hands in the Mosaic ritual. The resurrection was the Israelite idea. They were to leave all this and take the Gospel in its stead.

But these persons had received the Holy Spirit. Yes, persons can accept the Gospel and receive the Holy Spirit, and then go back to beggarly elements. Persons have done so in accepting Mormonism. He says we have no baptism in the Spirit. No, for the word of God declares that there were but two occasions of that baptism, and that it was never bestowed on any other occasions and never will be. He has no baptism in the Spirit either. He has a Mormon vagary as unscriptural as Papal mass. We have laying on of hands to set persons apart to a work, but not to impart miraculous power. Only an apostle could do that. His laying on of hands is as great a farce as the Papal pretense to change the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ. Will my opponent be man enough, play that he is man enough, to answer these questions. Is there but one baptism in the church? Is that baptism water baptism? Or is it Spirit baptism? Do you insult common sense by saying that two baptisms are one baptism? Or do you give the lie direct to the Spirit of God and say there is more than one baptism in the church? Come, do not play the coward any longer, but answer like a man, if you can play man long enough to do so.

We believe and teach, that all obedient believers receive the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, receive the Holy Spirit as an earnest of an inheritance. We receive it through faith, belief of God's word, and not by the imposition of the hands of any Mormon Impostor. We receive it in God's appointed way; not in the lying farce concocted by Sidney Rigdon. Our overseers are made by the Holy Spirit, by his word, by his law, and not by mummeries of Mormon Imposition. He calls my attention to the laying on of hands in Acts xiii. He asserts that hands were laid on Paul and Barnabas by persons not apostles; very true. That it was to impart the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit; it was not. It was to separate them to the work of preaching. To set them apart to the work to which the Spirit called them. It could not be to impart the Holy Spirit, either the ordinary indwelling or the miraculous power, for Paul and Barnabas had both. Acts xii. 24. Long before this Barnabas was full of the Holy Spirit. Laying on hands was not to give the Spirit to

him. Acts ix, 17. Ananias said to Saul, "Brother Saul, the Lord has sent me that you might be filled with the Holy Spirit," and he laid his hands on him. It was not to impart the Holy Spirit to Saul, for he was full of the Spirit long before. It was merely to separate to a work, set apart to preaching. It imparted no authority, no miraculous power.

Kelley says, we say converts cannot hear from God. We say unless they have heard from God in his word they cannot be converted. We say, unless they have heard from God in his word they cannot be Christians. We have them hear from God through his Son and his word, and not through Joe Smith and Mormon impostors.

We will now give him our authority for preaching, organizing churches, and administering ordinances. I Peter, ii, 5: "Ye, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ: but ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that you should show forth the praises of him that has called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." Every obedient child of God is by his faith and obedience constituted by Almighty God, not by the hands of Mormon impostors, a king, a priest, a royal priest. Here is the authority, and all are equal in this priesthood and royal power. Revelations i, 5: "Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests unto God." All who have been pardoned, washed in the blood of Christ, are made by that act kings and priests unto God. Here is where we get our authority: not from a pretended revelation, the farce narrated by Joe Smith when he tells us that he baptized Oliver Cowdery and Cowdery prophesied, and Cowdery baptized him and he prophesied. Our authority is from God; he has made us, when he pardoned us, kings, priests, a royal priesthood. We can do all that kings and priests of God can do. That was Alexander Campbell's authority. He was a king, a priest unto God, and he had divine authority from God and not from Impostor Joe Smith to do what he did.

We will now examine his claim to be called of God as was Aaron. If I do not expose the ineffable blasphemy of that impudent claim, I will yield the discussion. Beginning with Hebrews iv, 14, we read:

"Having then a great high-priest who has passed through the heavens, Jesus, the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession. For we have not a high-priest that cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but one that has been tried at all points like as we, yet without sin. Let us therefore draw near with boldness to the throne of grace, that we may find grace to help us in every time of need."

Observe it is Christ that is the great high-priest.

"For every high-priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins; who can have compassion on the ignorant and them that are out of the way, for he himself is also compassed with infirmity. And by reason thereof he ought, as for the people so also for himself, to offer for sin. And no man taketh his power."

What power? Acting as high priest, offering sacrifice for the people,—

"But he that was called of God as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that said unto him (unto whom? Unto all Mormon impostors? No, unto Christ), 'Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee.' And he saith in another place (to Mormon impostors? No, to Christ). 'Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek.'"

Then Christ is the only one who was called to the high priesthood as Aaron was. Aaron was called by the voice of God to the position of first high priest of the Aaronic priesthood. Christ was called to the Melchizedek priesthood by the voice of God as Aaron was, and Christ alone. He had no predecessor in his office of high priest, and he has no successor. Measure, if you can, the blasphemy of Kelley and other Mormon impostors claiming to be called as Christ was called, as Aaron was called. Placing themselves on an equality with the Son of God. Christ alone was called as Aaron was.

We are called to be kings and priests unto God as the persons Peter addressed were called, by the obedience of faith. We were made kings and priests unto God when Christ washed us from sin. As kings and priests made by Almighty God and not by Joe Smith or Mormon impostors, we have divine authority for all, and every act a king and a priest unto God can perform. We lay hands on some of our kings and priests who have the qualifications that the law of God requires, not to impart miraculous power, not to impart authority, for they have already as kings and priests unto God received the authority from the Almighty; but to set them apart to a certain work. All are equal in authority, but they are set apart to a certain work. Peter declares in II Peter, i, 3: "God's divine power has given to us"—the apostle and the Christians of his day "all things that pertain to life and godliness through the knowledge of him that has called us"—the apostle and all Christians in his day—"to glory and virtue." Here the apostle declares that all things that pertain to life and godliness had already been given, and through knowledge, through the truth revealed. If all things had already been given, all that pertain to life and godliness, Mormon revelations are humbugs and impostures. I will stake the issue of the debate on that one passage. Will my opponent read it and tell us where his Mormonism comes in.

IS CAMPBELLISM THE ORIGIN OF MORMONISM?

The statement is often made as a reproach to the Disciples that Campbellism is the parent of Mormonism. Mormonism is Campbellism gone to seed. We propose to vindicate the Disciples from such a reproach. While it is true that there are things in the Book of Mormon that no one but a Disciple preacher would have written at the time the book appeared; and that there are one or two features in which the Disciples and Mormons agree in differing from the orthodox religious world; it is also as true that it was not what Rigdon took from the Disci-

ples that gave origin to Mormonism. On the contrary, it was the points on which he differed from the Disciples that gave rise to Mormonism. Had Sydney Rigdon accepted all of the teaching of the Disciples, and had he been loyal to them, the Book of Mormon and Mormonism would never have been dreamed of by him. The vital difference between the Disciples and the so-called orthodox world is the dogma that the orthodox religious world make the central idea of their teaching, the dogma that in the conviction and conversion of the sinner, and in the comforting and sanctification of the saint the Holy Spirit exerts a direct and immediate influence, distinct and different from, and in addition to any that he exerts through the truth, that he has revealed in the Scriptures. Some regard this influence as miraculous. Others say that it is not miraculous. The Disciples teach that all direct and immediate influence was miraculous, was not, and could not be a moral influence, and had not one particle of moral influence on the party influenced. Its work was to inspire, to reveal truth, to work miracles, and it can form no part of conviction, conversion and sanctification. They teach that all the moral power that an intelligence, like the Holy Spirit can exert on another intelligence like man's spirit, is resident in ideas, moral influences, presented to the spirit influenced in words or acts. They teach that conviction, conversion and sanctification are accomplished by moral power alone, resident in truth and acts. They believe the Bible declarations that "the gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all who believe." II Peter, i. "Divine power has granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through knowledge." That all "men are begotten by the word of truth." That men are sanctified by God's word as Jesus declares. They reject all direct and immediate influence of the Spirit in conviction, conversion and sanctification, for such influence was all miraculous, and it did not and could not produce one particle of moral influence or change. Because the Bible never ascribes one instance or particle of conversion to such direct influence. Because it invariably ascribes it to the gospel the word of God, the truth. Such is the great difference between disciples and others.

Sidney Rigdon brought from the Baptists to the Disciples and agreed with the Disciples in: I. Immersion alone is baptism. II. Penitent believers alone are scriptural subjects of baptism.

He accepted from the Disciples: I. Revelation alone should be the creed of Christians. II. The religious world had departed from the apostolic christianity and should return to it. III. What are called "first principles" by the Disciples. IV. Baptism is unto the remission of sins.

Not one of these would have even hinted the Book of Mormon or Mormonism. He brought from the Baptists and never agreed with the Disciples. I. Opposition to secret societies. That is in the Book of Mormon. It is full of it. II. The orthodox idea of a

direct, immediate and miraculous influence of the Spirit in conversion. While a Disciple preacher he would often get so excited in his preaching, as to have what is called "the power," and often claimed that he had visions and revelations in that state. He was always extravagant in his preaching, and had much trouble and difference with the Disciples over this idea. He tried to get the Disciples to accept this idea, and that a full restoration of apostolic christianity must restore inspiration, spiritual gifts, and revelations. The orthodox idea of direct and miraculous influence of the Spirit that he retained was simply this claim of Rigdon, the idea that was Rigdon's special hobby, and that was rejected by the Disciples. He brought from the Baptists the orthodox idea of a direct and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in addition to and distinct from any influence that he exerts through the truth. Like all who believe this notion, he regarded it as the sum and substance of religion. He was consistent and logical, however, and the orthodox world are not. He asserted, and truthfully, that this direct and immediate influence ever had been and ever must be miraculous and attended with miraculous power, inspiration and revelation. He came into the Restoration with that hobby and with the intention to engraft it on to the movement, and when he had gotten the Disciples to accept it, he could then get them to accept new revelations, and bring forward his "Golden Bible" that he had fabricated out of Spaulding's "Manuscript Found," and make of the Restoration what Mormonism now is.

Accordingly he was constantly talking and preaching that a full return to apostolic christianity must include a restoration of the spiritual gifts, miraculous powers, the inspirations and revelations of the apostolic age. He had large numbers of the congregation, for which he preached indoctrinated with these ideas, and some had adopted his idea of community of goods and feet washing. These he had prepared for Mormonism, and when he pretended to be converted to Mormonism that he himself had originated, and had used Smith as a tool to publish for him, these persons who had accepted his hobbies went with him, and this accounts for the wonderful rapidity with which converts were made to Mormonism in the churches where he had preached, and had great influence. His teaching in regard to new revelations led them to expect such revelations and they were ready to accept the Book of Mormon as a revelation. Here again the admirable scriptural knowledge and admirable sense of the Campbells saved the Restoration from shipwreck, as it did in regard to his millennial vagaries and the community of goods. The long and unanswerable series of articles on the Holy Spirit in "Christianity Restored," clearly separated, the miraculous and extraordinary influence of the Spirit, in inspiration, revelations and miracles, which was the direct and immediate in-

fluence of the Spirit, from the ordinary influence which was only through the truth. These articles showed that this direct and immediate influence was for a definite purpose—the completion of revelation—the word of God, and that the scriptures taught that it ceased with that work. That the only power the Holy Spirit exerts in conviction, conversion and sanctification is by and through the truth he has revealed in the scriptures, and that such influence is the only moral influence He can exert.

The rejection of this special hobby of Rigdon that he brought into the Restoration from the Baptists and the orthodox religious world, and through which he hoped to get the Disciples to accept his "Golden Bible" and lead them off into what is now Mormonism, drove him from the Restoration. It is often said that "Campbellism is the parent of Mormonism—that it is Campbellism gone to seed." We have freely stated just what Rigdon took into Mormonism from the Restoration. Because he accepted certain truths we teach, no more proves that we are responsible for Mormonism, or that our teachings logically lead to Mormonism, than the fact that Mormonism accepts many of the teachings of the Bible proves that the Bible is responsible for Mormonism, or that the teachings of the Bible logically lead to Mormonism.

The truth is that our clear, common-sense scriptural teaching that the direct and immediate influence of the Spirit was miraculous and ceased with miracles, and that the only influence that the Spirit exerts now is through the truth he has revealed, the only moral influence he can exert, is utterly fatal to the central idea of Mormonism, and the origin of everything that is peculiar to the system, the direct and miraculous influence of the Spirit, in inspiration and revelations. It was this truth that led the Disciples to reject Rigdon's idea of a restoration of miraculous powers. Had they believed the orthodox idea of a direct and immediate influence, in addition to and distinct from the influence through the truth, and been as logical and consistent in carrying out the idea as they were in all else, they would have said "such influence is miraculous," and accepted his idea of restoration of miraculous power. Because they rejected the orthodox idea of direct and immediate influence, they rejected his hobby of restoration of miraculous powers. No orthodox church could have rejected his hobby if they were consistent with their

belief of a direct and immediate influence of the Spirit, for such influence must be miraculous, and if really present be attended with miracles.

Rigdon took from the orthodox world this idea, the key note of orthodoxy, the direct and immediate influence of the Spirit, in addition to and distinct from any that he exerted through the truth. From the Methodists he took the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Having taken these ideas from the religious, orthodox world, Rigdon was consistent and logical and scriptural in asserting that such influence was miraculous, and when really present attended with miraculous powers, inspiration and revelations.

Mormonism agrees with the orthodox religious world in claiming this direct and immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in addition to, and distinct and different from, any influence that he exerts through the truth. It does not illogically stop with making the claim and refusing to claim the necessary effects of such a cause, miraculous powers, inspiration and revelations. Mormonism claims, and has every truth of scriptural teaching and all common sense to sustain it, that such influence was miraculous, and as necessarily attended by miracles as the effect must attend the cause. Miracles were what distinguished the miraculous influence, which was direct and immediate, from the ordinary influence that was only through the truth. Claiming the cause Mormonism is logical, scriptural and in accordance with common sense in claiming the effect, miracles.

Mormonism is logical and in accordance with common sense and the Scriptures in claiming all the spiritual gifts that existed in the apostolic church, when it claims their cause—the direct and immediate influence of the Spirit. Orthodoxy is illogical in claiming the cause, and refusing to claim the necessary effect, that can no more be separated from the cause than the falling of unsupported bodies can be separated from the law of gravitation.

Sometimes in its claim of special call to preach, miraculous evidence of conversion, that regeneration is a miracle, that men preach as the Spirit gives them utterance and in revival, camp meeting, holiness, and sanctification extravagances, in miraculous providences and answers to prayer, orthodoxy actually claims miraculous power, and absurdly denounces the Mormon claim to miraculous power and revelations as unscriptural and absurd.

MR. KELLEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—When my time was called last night I was making an argument upon the authority of the minister, citing John 1:5, "There was a man sent from God whose name was John." Jesus also constantly urged that he did not come to do his own will but the will of him that sent him. That his Father had sent him. "My commandments are not mine but his that sent me."

These men were sent by the God of heaven to establish his church and reveal his will to men on earth. Had they not been sent, they never would have assumed to be teachers. But they had a message because the Lord had sent them; and they said, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Paul recognizing the necessity of being "sent" before starting out with tidings, says, "How shall they preach except they be sent." Rom. 10. In accordance with this, Jesus said to his apostles, "As my Father sent me, so send I you." "Whosoever receiveth you, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me." Here we have the authoritative right to minister, extending from heaven to earth, and that right is either vested in God's minister, or he has no right to act. "How shall they preach except they be sent?" Sent of God. When Mr. Campbell and party commenced the work of church building, (restoring Christianity), upon the "Bible, and Bible alone," the first thing that stared them in the face was, by what authority shall we act? Mr. Campbell did not believe that either the Catholics or Protestants had any authority, i. e., transmitted authority, (that which had come down from the apostles' times. He did not believe that God, or angels or the Holy Ghost could say anything; that is he held that they had had their say.

So they met together, says Mr. Stone, to act by common consent, and with the intention of only doing that which the Bible authorized them to do. The question of baptizing came up; but *who has authority to baptize*, was the problem of problems. They consulted together on the "Bible alone," and alone they were. Neither God, nor angels, nor the Holy Ghost could do anything for them, for they did not believe that these could. They had no faith. They believed that these things were formerly in the church, but not now. Here they are gathered together. It is no common occurrence. The time of the great restoration has come, but how it was found out is not told—and the birth of the restored church is about to take place. All is expectation and anxiety. In the midst of the pain and anguish to bring it forth, there is an un-

yielding difficulty standing in the way. It is this: Who shall baptize the first one. They pause! At last a thought struck one of them. He was ready to cut the gordian knot. Said he, "*If we have authority to preach we have authority to baptize.*" That was the electric bolt. They thought they had it, and they went to work; ministers baptized ministers, and then the people. So the restoration commenced with all the authority of an IF. When the church of Christ was established in the time of the apostles, it took a divine commission, a word from heaven, the ministering of angels and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, apostles and prophets to set it up; but after the dark day of apostacy, and the church of God could not be found on earth, Mr. Campbell, and Mr. Stone and Mr. Scott and some others restored it over in Kentucky in all its splendor, without a word from heaven, from the Son, Holy Spirit, or angels, apostles or prophets, while standing on the "Bible alone," and restored it on the most doubtful of words, *if*. The only wonder is that it has not taken the world before this time. From that time to this they hold that one person has just as good a right to preach and baptize as another. That ordination even amounts to nothing; and upon that ground I understand that my opponent refused to let any of the brethren in this wonderful restoration lay hands on him, down at Carbondale a few years ago. Am I not correct? Or have you changed your mind upon this since you put so many of your preachers to rout on this at Carbondale, Ill.? He, like all those who ministered at the birth of this institution, was already authorized. That is *if*, and *if*.—Their is a great deal of certainty in their theory of religion (?)

The Disciples say they built their Church on "The Bible and Bible alone." But Jesus Christ built His upon a different foundation altogether. See the following: "And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, [that I am the Christ] but my Father which is in Heaven. And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "Upon this rock" says Jesus, "I will build my Church." Upon what rock? Upon the Bible and Bible alone? Not upon that, but upon the rock of revealing, the means and power of obtaining the knowledge that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. This communication from the father is that which antedates all gospel preaching, and is the inspiration and rock upon which the whole Christian institution rests. Hence Jesus says,

"when he, the Holy Ghost, is come, he will testify of me." "He will take of the things of the Father and show them unto you."

"The whole superstructure was to partake of the essence of the Rock upon which the foundation rested; hence, Paul says, the church was a 'habitation of God through the Spirit.' The foundation was laid by the declared fact that Jesus is the Christ; hence it is written: 'Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid which is Jesus Christ.' And again it is declared, 'Are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone. In whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. In whom ye are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit.' Eph. 2: 20-22.

Here we have an insight into the nature of the church building, as to what constitutes the foundation, and the rock upon which it rests. The revelation of God, not that of the past, but present, is the inspiration, underlying strata of the church of Christ, and that upon which it rests. But Mr. Campbell started his on the "Bible alone," so claimed. There is not an instance from Genesis to Revelations where God ever authorized any man or angel to build his church on the Bible alone. What is the New Testament? It is the constitutional law that governs in the church, and giving also a history of the formation and provisions of the church, and rights of the citizens in order to its perpetuity. This constitution says God placed the officers in the church as "it pleased Him;" First apostles, secondly prophets, then gifts of healings," &c., 1 Cor. 12. For these officers our constitution (the New Testament) provides, and no promise is made for any other kind of organization or officers. But Mr. Campbell and others in the great restoration made, while standing on the Bible alone, did not see fit to put any of these in his restored church. They moved out upon the hypothesis that *if* they could preach they could baptize, and *if* they could baptize, perhaps they could organize Christ's church without apostles, and so went on "restoring." Seeing that the New Testament was against their presumptuous work, they arose to explain: "That apostles were all right until the New Testament was written, then the Bible stood in the place of apostles and prophets, and all of the inspired ones," and there was nothing to take the place of the overseer and deacons, so they retained them. This restored church, built on the "Bible alone," expunged all the officers that Christ put in the only church of which the New Testament gives any account that he ever built, and it then whipped around and squared itself for battle, declaring that it was the ancient church "restored." Braden says so.

But let us examine that idea, that after the Christian constitution was written they needed no more chief officers to carry on the work of the church. In the organiza-

tion of our government there was a constitution formed. It stands related to the state as the New Testament does to the church. By constitutional provision there are certain officers appointed in the government, and the rights and privileges of the citizens declared. But who is fanatical enough to believe, that after the constitution was written and Washington's term of office had expired, that there was to be no more Presidents or Vice-Presidents, Senators or Judiciary, or delegates from the people to constitute the house of Representatives. That they were no longer needed in the government; that the constitution, Constable and Justice of the Peace were all that were needed to run the government.

Is it not a fact that the constitution provides for a line of presidents, vice-presidents, senators, etc., and a government according to the constitution cannot exist without them? The constitution of the government is all essential and so are its officers in order to its perpetuity. To destroy the officers is to destroy the government. To organize another not just as provided for in the constitution is to establish a new and strange government, not known to the people or the constitution. This is true in church as well as state. The New Testament is the constitutional enactment to govern in the Christian church. To build by that is to build aright. That constitutional law says that the first officer in the church of God is an apostle. The church of which Mr. Braden is a member has no such officer. The constitution says the second officer is a prophet. The church which Mr. Braden represents here, has none. Why has he the presumption to say then, that the church he represents is the ancient church "restored?" But he says there was to be a change. Apostles were to cease. Let us see.

When Judas Iscariot went and hanged himself after he had betrayed his Lord, there were but eleven apostles left. What was done? Just what is done in our government when the President, or a Senator or any other officer dies or is removed for other cause; another was appointed in his stead, and "he was numbered with the eleven." The only difference in the appointment is that in the church God appoints, and in the state the people appoint. By and by the wicked Herod killed James, another apostle, and there is another vacant seat; and just over the leaf a ways we read Paul, the apostle, and so on until we reach about nineteen apostles named in the New Testament. As if to settle this question forever, Paul says these apostles were given "for the work of the ministry;" (after Jesus ascended up on high) "for the edifying of the body of Christ;" and to continue "until we all come into a unity of the faith, to a knowledge of the Son of God, that we be no more tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine." Eph. 4. And this side of the house will not be moved by my opponent's gust of wind, that he imagines to himself is a raging Nebraska blizzard. These ministers are called to their several offices by direct reve-

lation from God, without which they had no right to act. Hence, up at Antioch, the Holy Ghost said, "Separate unto me Barnabas and Saul for the work wherunto I have called them." "Then laid their hands on them and sent them away." Acts 13. "As God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord spake; but Mr. Braden denies the necessity of a divine call to the ministry. All of his church are called when they are born. Don't need any laying on of hands to authorize them. But in Mr. Braden's mind this is Christ's church come again—restored; but it came to life, if it has any, in a different way than the church of Christ was instituted, and they have left out all of the leading officers, and none of them are sent of God or have any authority, only IF they can preach they can baptize.

This would be about the position of Mr. Campbell when truly illustrated. The people of the United States, by reason of some extraordinary event, find themselves without a set of officers to execute the laws, without any government. Mr. Smith takes up the constitution of the United States and says: "The means is provided herein for officers by the calling of an election, getting the voice of the people, for that is the highest authority."

Mr. Campbell says no, not that. "Here is our constitution perfected by our fathers. No use of the *authority* any longer. The former organization was only for the purpose of perfecting this law. I will be your president."

Ah! but says Mr. Smith, you may not suit the people.

Never mind that, says Mr. Campbell. The people, who are the recognized authority, have nothing more to do with it. The word, the Constitution, gives me the right to act. Of course my right can't be traced in it; but never mind; if I have authority to read the constitution and tell my neighbor about it; I have a right to act as president without a call or election by the people, as provided by the constitution, and I will not wait till I am elected. Of course some one else may claim the same right, and their claim would be just as good as mine, and thus we may create division and anarchy among the people of a country who formerly had one government, one system, one set of officers at a time. But what of it?

But Mr. Smith stands before the people at the same time and claims that when the constitution was ordained there was a provision made therein for the filling up of vacant offices, and that before the constitution can become operative this provision of it must be put in force as any other, and that it will not do to permit any person who sees fit, to force himself into the place of one of the officers, seeing that under it, one man has as good a right as another to do that, and if this assumption is permitted we will destroy the constitution, the liberties of the people, and consequently all

hope of a true Republic itself, and change it into a monarchy and have a system of another type and different government altogether. Which is the sounder position?

Mr. Braden and myself agree that we have the constitutional law given for the regulation and government of the church. We both urge the adoption of this constitution on the part of the people—yes, everybody says, it is a good thing; let us adopt it. But how adopt it? As an instrument telling what the organization of the true church once was? What the true teachings once were? Or as a rule of faith and practice by which to regulate the church now? He says it gives a true account of the organization as it once was, the practices as they once were; but that we are not to have the same now, because certain of these officers are done away by reason of the perfecting of the constitution, and that we must pattern after the church as left perfected after this time, instead of the church as reflected in the constitution itself. At the same time he claims Mr. Campbell as a restorer of the church under the constitution of the apostolic religion. But a restorer means to produce the thing; not to produce something which is not the thing, neither something that might have existed after the thing. I take the ground and state to you that it, the constitution, gives a true account of the organization as it once was, the practices as they once were, and that they are the same that ought to be in the church now, and would be if anarchy had not reigned since the true officers fell asleep, and a change was effected in the government.

That there is a means provided in the constitution for the calling of officers, and when called in that way they will act and administer the laws as did the original officers, and, if not, the government itself is changed, and hence a different church, and instead of being the church as provided in the constitution, it is a new thing, unknown to the constitution; that his man (Mr. Campbell) is not the *restorer*, for the reason that he has not produced the thing in organization, practice or teaching as included in and was a part of the original; that among the things provided in the constitution are:

1. That men may attain to wisdom and knowledge by the teaching and instruction of the Holy Spirit.

"Howbeit when he the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come." John 16:13.

"This is eternal life that they may know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."—Ibid 17:3. Again, "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."—1 Cor. 12:3. "After I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus and love unto all the Saints, I ceased not to make mention of you in my prayers that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the Spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. That ye may know what is the hope of his calling"—Eph. 1, 15.

2. That the officers under this constitution are to administer, as called to act in the work by the head of the church, Christ, through the Holy Spirit.

3. That in the church itself are placed certain gifts for the qualification of persons for the work of perfecting of the Saints, carrying on the ministerial work, the instruction of the body—the church, “Till we should all come to the unity of the faith, to the fullness of the measure of the stature of Christ.” Were these provisions of the constitution respected there would be the full means of carrying on the work as there is under our election system of filling the vacant places in the government. And when I stand with the constitution and insist that officers must be chosen in a proper way, and that way is by the inspiration of the Spirit, the only answer he gives me is the old one used against the Saints in the first century, that only a few fanatics believe in revelation. But shall I drop the Bible and go into the grand scramble for the spoils in the anarchy of confusion, and say I have as good a right to elect myself as any one?

“It is only a few fanatics who believe in revelation.” O yes, certainly. But it has been only a few persons who were falsely called fanatics who have believed in revelation in the history of the race.

Noah was the fanatic in his time, so the people claimed. He believed in revelation. Abraham was the next prominent fanatic; then came Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Zechariah, most all of whom the people thought so fanatical that they were vilely treated or killed.

After them comes Jesus, and he is set down with the fanatics; then Peter, James, John and Paul—all fanatical, according to the rage of the people in their time, and terribly maltreated and abused.

Now, it is only a “few fanatics” that believe in revelation. It is the Latter Day Saints this time. Does anybody else? No. That is the reason they call them fanatics. They are the only ones that “contend for this faith once delivered to the Saints.” And hence, we are called fanatics. My friends, are we not yet in good company, with Noah, Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, David, Job, Jesus, and all of the apostles and prophets of the world?

The constitution of the Christian Government clearly provides for an uninterrupted line of apostles to be continued in the church, and the step was taken to carry out this provision by the filling of the seat of Judas Iscariot, and that of the apostle James, &c., all having been appointed by the great head of the church, Christ.

By the constitution of our country there are certain rights and privileges belonging to the citizen, that is, the right of suffrage; the right of representation; the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and the right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. These rights are guaranteed by the constitution. To deny them to the citizen is to take away their constitutional rights and destroy the force of the constitution itself. So long as this government is to be continued, and the constitution ad-

hered to, these rights must remain with the citizens. This is true also in the constitution of the church. It provides for the receiving of foreigners into the fold, and specifies the way, and lays down the rules by which they are to be received, which are: 1st faith, 2nd repentance, 3d baptism, 4th the laying on of hands. These rules are stipulated and ordained by the constitution itself, and these rules originated with God, and not with man; men have not the right to abrogate any one of them, or change them in the least unless it can be shown that the constitution itself is not in force, but has been set aside and another established by the great head of the church to take its place. The constitution further provides, for certain blessings and privileges to be enjoyed by the citizens; and all are equal under the constitutional law in the church, as well as in state. The blessings in the church are:—

1. The gift of the Holy Ghost, of which there is but one; but it manifests itself in different ways, but it is the same Spirit; and everyone has the right to enjoy it as really in the church as they have the equal right of representation, or worship, in the state. “For there are differences of administration, but the same Spirit.” 1 Cor. 12. “The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man.” “Ye may all prophecy one by one.” 1 Cor., 14:31. In their adoption each one is entitled to the Holy Ghost as the seal of his adoption. Hence, “After that ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.” This is the Holy Spirit which Jesus said he would send if he went away. Said he, “When he is come he will testify of me,” and the “testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.” Rev. 19:10. This is all the spirit that was ever promised to the believer, either as *indwelling* or as *outdwelling*. The attempt to make it appear that there are two Holy Spirits, the miraculous and non-miraculous; or the miraculous and indwelling, is sheer cant, and without warrant in the Scriptures.

2. To the citizen is guaranteed by the constitution, that if any are sick, they may send for the elders of the church, (not apostles of the church), and let them pray over them, anointing them with oil, and the “prayer of faith shall save the sick; and the Lord shall raise them up.” James, 5:15. Hence, Jesus says, “They shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover.” Mark 16. This privilege is guaranteed to the citizen in the constitution of the church equally with the right to vote by the constitution of the state. And you can no more destroy these rights in one, and retain the government in fact, than you can in the other. But Mr. Campbell in his “restored church,” claiming to stand on and pattern after the old Christian constitution, discarded the doctrine of “baptism and the laying on of hands,” and retained one baptism and no laying on of hands—claimed that the gift of the Holy Ghost was quite an unnecessary thing to be enjoyed so long a time

after the writing of the constitution. The constitution was good, but its promises are of no account. That a great many repeals have been made, or the provisions ignored, and new regulations and provisions provided, but of course it is the old "church come again." Let us see. The ancient church was built by divine revelation from heaven by men authorized to act as ambassadors; Mr. Campbell said, "If we can preach we can baptize." The ancient church had apostles and prophets; Mr. Campbell had none. If they could preach they could baptize, and if they could baptize, *may be* they could get along without apostles or prophets, and they put only elders and deacons into their church. But it is the same old church restored. That is as clear as mud.

The ancient church taught the laying on of hands for the receiving of the Holy Ghost; but Mr. Campbell said that if they could preach they could baptize; and if they could baptize, *may be* they could put all of the apostles out and put in the elders and deacons (without God saying anything about either), and perhaps the laying on of hands was not needed, so it was left out of Mr. Campbell's restored church. What a restoration! The ancient church enjoyed the gift of the Holy Ghost in faith, and wisdom, and knowledge, and tongues, and prophecy, and visions, and dreams, and healings, by which they received the testimony of Jesus and the seal of their inheritance. But Mr. Campbell with an "if," and a "perhaps," and "may be," had proceeded thus far in restoring the ancient church, and having done so well, he thought that it was likely they could get along without any Holy Ghost at all—vision, dream, prophecy, healing or revelation. It was the old church "restored," however, so says Mr. Braden. But they must hold on to the old constitution, "stand on the Bible alone"—no doubt about that. This so forcibly reminds me of the politician's story of

grandfather's old gun, that I will ask the audience to indulge me in relating it. The gun was one that was said to have come down through the wars. It had been revamped and remodeled, so much, however, that it was difficult to trace the antiquity. The gifted little son had inquired and found out that the old gun had a new stock, new barrel, new lock and new ramrod; and he was puzzled. Finally, he looked up to his father and asked: Why, I don't see why you call it grandfather's old gun? You little fool, said the father, don't you see that touch-hole? That is the same that was in your grandfather's old gun. Now I have been looking for this old gun since Mr. Braden brought out his faith, and I have found that he called his people by a different name from the Saints, had a different kind of faith, different baptism, changed the laying on of hands, had a new kind entirely of church officers, a different Holy Spirit, Christ's work in the church different, a different kind of apostles and prophets (dead instead of live ones), a different way of calling their ministers, their church on a different rock from the ancient church, and I begin to look around to see why he calls it the old church "restored," and I am pointed to, "baptism for the remission of sins." (Applause) Thus with scarcely a single important provision of the old constitution to be found in their new fangled "restored church," they have the unqualified presumption to come before the world with the claim that they are standing solid on the old Christian constitution, or "Bible, and Bible alone." Or in other words, while professing to carry in tact "grandfather's old gun," they take the absurd position and make the absurd statement that there was a more excellent church than the one the constitution made special provision for, and cite us to the following to support it: "But covet earnestly the best gifts, and yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

(Time called)

MR. BRADEN'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mormonism takes from orthodoxy, this key note of orthodoxy, this direct and immediate influence of the spirit, in addition to and distinct from any that he exerts through the truth. Having claimed the cause, it claims the necessary effects, inspiration and revelation. By means of new revelations, Mormonism can introduce any new dogma, and if consistent, orthodoxy cannot reject such dogma. As revelation from the days of Adam to the writing of the last book of the New Testament was constantly adding new ideas, and new revelations—as the New Testament was added to the Old, Mormonism, says the book of Mormon, and the revelations of Joseph the Seer have been added to the New Testament, and if orthodoxy is logical to its admission of a direct and immediate influence of the spirit, distinct from, and in addition to any through the truth, an influence that is miraculous, it cannot reject this claim of Mormonism.

Through this wide door, thrown fully open by orthodoxy, Mormonism enters with its new revelations. It can change the name of "Christian" to "Latter Day Saints" and claim revelation for so doing—new revelations—a claim that no one can make for changing Christian into any human name. It can change the name of the church from the simple Scriptural title "The Church of Christ" into the Ashdodish lingo of Babel "The Re-organized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" and make the same claim—a thing that no one can do for any name worn by the churches. It can teach baptism for the dead, pre-existence of souls, confirmation, blessing children, and add to the simple officers of the church a score of officers unknown to the Bible, and change the church into a hierarchy in which nearly every man is an officer, and claim revelation for it. Such claim cannot be made for the corruptions that orthodoxy has introduced into Christianity. Nay, it can through this dogma of orthodoxy, a direct and immediate influence of the spirit, since such influence must be miraculous, and inspiration, claim to give the world a new revelation in favor of spiritual wifery and polygamy, calling it "celestial marriage." This dogma of a direct, immediate and miraculous influence of the spirit, is the sole and only parent of Mormonism, and every new and peculiar feature in it. It is an insult to common sense, and a deliberate falsehood, for the orthodox religious world to vociferate that "Campbellism is the parent of Mormonism." The clear, scriptural teaching of what they call "Campbellism," that all direct and immediate influence of the spirit was miraculous and ceased with miracles, and that the spirit now influences men only through the truth he revealed is

utterly destructive of Mormonism, and drove Rigdon out of the Restoration. As well say that Christianity was the parent of papacy. Orthodoxy is the parent of Mormonism; of all that is peculiar to it. The orthodox notion, that is the key note of orthodoxy—the direct and immediate influence of the spirit, the miraculous influence of the spirit, is the sole and only parent of Mormonism. Mormon revelations, including the revelations in favor of polygamy, revelations in favor of all other Mormon vagaries are simply that key note of orthodoxy gone to seed.

This central idea, this key-note of orthodoxy, is the Trojan horse by means of which those lying Greeks, Mormon revelations and vagaries were introduced into the Scriptural ideas, that Mormonism in common with what is called "Campbellism" accepted from the Bible; and which, like Aeneas, the Disciples rejected as falsehoods of the enemy. It is by means of this Trojan horse, fabricated by orthodoxy, that the pure teachings of the Bible, that what is called "Campbellism" taught; and that Mormonism accepted at first have been destroyed. Had Rigdon, Smith and the leaders of Mormonism accepted the clear Scriptural teaching of the Disciples, that all direct, immediate and miraculous influence of the Spirit ceased when it had accomplished its work in completing the work of God, Mormonism would never have cursed the world. No immediate, miraculous influence; no new revelations, no baptizing the living for the dead, no pre-existence of souls, no spiritual wifery, no polygamy, no Mormonism. But they rejected the clear Scriptural teachings of the Disciples and took up the orthodox idea of a direct, immediate and miraculous influence of the Spirit, in addition to and distinct from any he exerts through the truth he has revealed, and logically claimed that when they had the cause they had the necessary effect, inspiration and new revelations; and gave us revelation after revelation, until this immediate, miraculous influence of orthodoxy culminated in spiritual wifery, celestial marriage, polygamy; in pollution that would disgust a Grecian satyr. It is a fact that has puzzled many persons, that almost invariably claims of direct influence of the Spirit, inspiration and miraculous power, sanctification and holiness end in infamous lewdness. Let one examine a history of the various parties and sects that have arisen in human history that have claimed this direct influence as a constant influence of their followers, and have laid special claims to revelations, inspiration, holiness, sanctification, second blessing, higher life, and in every instance delusion, fanaticism, crime, and especially lewdness has attended them. The most infamous scenes in human

history have been the result of such vagaries and movements. There is not a church that believes in this direct and immediate influence, that has not had trouble with infamies and pollutions growing out of it. The fanatics that troubled the apostles and the fathers, the visionaries of all ages the monsters of Munster, the perfectionists of the last hundred years, the sanctificationists, and holiness fanatics of all ages, religions and lands, have invariably ended in lewdness, as perfectionism ended in the Oneida pollution, and Mormon claims of inspiration ended in polygamy.

As a class the persons who make such claims are the most spasmodic, fanatical, inconsistent members in the church. The preachers who preach it are of the same character. The poorest specimens of daily Christian life are the preachers, the persons, the churches who make the loudest claims to perfection, sanctification, holiness, second blessing, higher life, direct influence of the Spirit, inspiration, revelations, etc. They mistake such fanaticism for Christianity, and think that because they have this frenzy they do not need to trouble themselves about pure living, and often think that because they act constantly under the influence of the Spirit, what they are inclined to do, no matter what, must be right. It is not their excited, frenzied appetites and lusts that move them, but a direct influence of the Spirit, therefore it must be right. The Mormon claims, and logically, that if he is under the influence of the Spirit, and feels like polygamy, it is the Spirit that makes him feel so, and it must be right.

There is a reason for this lewdness of these frenzies. All abnormal excitements of the nervous system, such as are caused by ether, opium, hasheesh, alcohol, etc., generally excite the base of the brain, and especially amateness and combativeness, hence the drunkard is obscene, profane and quarrelsome. A disordered condition of the nervous system, and generally the organs of sex, especially in females, is present in nearly every instance of such frenzy, and is generally its exciting cause. Mesmerism, its trances, somnambulism, catalepsy, and abnormal conditions of the nervous system, are generally based on and caused by, or at least attended by disordered condition of certain organs. The result is that just as the drunkard is lewd, these parties display lewd inclinations, and mistake such frenzy for the influence of the Holy Spirit. As disordered condition of certain functions is the cause of such frenzy, it is attended by lewdness.

The entire teaching of the Bible is utterly opposed to the idea of a constant enjoyment of this miraculous influence, by every one. As it was not a moral influence it could not so be enjoyed. Then we repeat that the most dangerous delusion that has ever cursed the church has been this vagary of a direct and immediate influence of the Spirit. It has been the Pandora's box out of which has come only delusion, fanaticism and pol-

lution. The polygamy of Mormonism is its last and foulest product, but it is the legitimate fruit of the orthodox dogma of direct and miraculous influence of the Spirit. The Oneida abomination and the pollutions of Utah are only that dogma gone to seed. It is irrational, utterly unscriptural, the offspring of a diseased imagination or nervous system, and its results are delusion, fanaticism, lewdness, infamy and crime. Sanctification and perfection ended in the Oneida abomination, and direct and immediate influence of the Spirit and revelations ended in polygamy among Mormons. Such parties overlook two facts. The direct and immediate influence of the Spirit was not a moral influence and exerted no moral power. Its purpose was to reveal truth. It was not an influence imparted to all followers of God, but only to those whom he used as mediums of revelation. It was not a constant influence with them, but was exerted only while they were revealing the truth. It was not poured out prodigally, but was sparingly used. It was used only when necessary. It was not a tool of the one enjoying it to be used constantly for every trivial purpose like the pretended inspiration of Joe Smith and other visionaries, but was used sparingly and only when necessary, and no longer than to accomplish its immediate object. Not only is it true that the clear, common-sense, scriptural teachings of the Disciples are utter destruction of this vagary and all of its foul progeny, but the Disciples alone can meet Mormons in discussion and overturn it. The Disciple appeals to the word of God, and that alone. He shows that it teaches that there have been two influences exerted by the Holy Spirit. One immediate, direct, miraculous, that was to reveal truth and attest its divine origin. That was not a moral influence, was given for a certain purpose. That purpose has been accomplished. It has ceased. This cuts off all the Mormon claim to direct, immediate, miraculous influence of the Spirit, miraculous powers in revelation. It is a death blow to all such claim. This is why the Mormons of Wilber were so much opposed to debating with a "Campbellite," that they went to the Hon. S. S. Atley and wanted him to write to me and persuade me not to accept the invitation of Mr. Luse, to debate with their champion. They knew that our clear, common-sense, scriptural teaching took the very ground from under their feet. No one who believes and admits the orthodox claim of direct and immediate influence of the Spirit can meet a Mormon. Let a man who believes it undertake to debate with one. The Mormon demands, "Do you believe in a direct influence of the Holy Spirit—a direct call by the Holy Spirit to preach—that regeneration is a miracle, and in the baptism of the Holy Ghost?" "I do," fervently responds our orthodox brother, "and blessed be God, thousands can testify they have experienced all of them." "Then," coolly retorts the Mormon, "that is just what we claim, only we are consistent, and you are not. We claim

this direct influence, as you do, and no more than that, but we are consistent. As it is miraculous, we claim miracles. We claim a call by the Holy Spirit to preach, and we claim to speak by inspiration as the Spirit gives us utterance. Claiming that we speak as the Spirit gives us utterance, we are consistent and claim that our utterances are revelations, as all utterances of the Holy Spirit are and must be. Claiming the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we claim its miraculous power and miracles. If you admit this miraculous influence, you should admit that its utterances now are as such revelations, as they were in the apostles' day. We claim that God called men who were polygamists and gave men more than one wife; and that he did no more in giving the polygamy revelation to Smith than he did anciently. In short, we unite with you in claiming the cause direct, miraculous power, and you cannot claim the existence of the cause and deny its necessary effect, any more than you can admit the law of gravitation and deny the fall of an unsupported body." To such a claim orthodoxy can make no reply. No believer in the key note of orthodoxy direct, miraculous influence of the Spirit, can meet a Mormon in discussion.

We will now notice some of my opponent's talk. I have proved Joe Smith to be a base impostor, and I call him such. I have proved Mormons who claim inspiration to be impostors, and I call them such. All that Christ has washed in his blood and has made kings and priests have a right to preach and baptize. John said Christ had made them kings and priests, and such have a right to preach and baptize. John said Christ *had* made them kings and priests. He did not say *he will*. Peter said that all Christians *were* kings and priests then, not that they would be. It took miraculous power to reveal truth and confirm it to give the constitution. Those made kings and priests by the constitution need no constitution-making power. The church is built on Christ or his Messiahship, on apostles and prophets. There is no conflict in such expressions. We denounce Joe Smith as an impostor because he pretended to be a constitution maker, when God declares that such work is done and has ceased. When the world departed from the constitution Mr. Campbell said to it, "The constitution is perfect and divine, let us organize in accordance with it." His authority was in the constitution that made him king and priest. Joe Smith and Mormons got up a bogus constitutional convention, made a lot of trash they call "the fullness of the gospel," and undertake to substitute it for the constitution given by God's convention, the apostles.

QUERIES FOR MR. KELLEY.

I. Does not the inspired Paul say that there is but one baptism in the church? Eph. iv. 5.

II. Did not Jesus command his apostles to baptize converts? Matt. xxviii, 26.

III. Were not they to baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit?

IV. Was not this baptism unto the remission of sins? Acts ii, 38.

V. Was it not in water?

VI. Is it not this baptism that Jesus commanded the apostles to perform, that is, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, that is unto remission, that is in water, the one baptism that is in the church?

VII. Is not baptism in the Spirit a promise? Is not Christ alone the administrator?

VIII. Is it a command?

IX. Is it in the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit?

X. Is it unto remission of sins?

XI. Can Holy Spirit baptism, that is a promise, not a command, that is not in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, of which Christ alone is the administrator, that is not unto remission of sins, be the one baptism that is in the church?

XII. If there is but one baptism, which is that baptism, water baptism or Holy Spirit baptism?

XIII. Do you give the lie direct to the Holy Spirit in saying there are two baptisms?

XIV. Or do you insult common sense by denying that each of these is a baptism, separate and distinct from the other?

XV. Did not Jesus say that he would leave the apostles, and that the Comforter would take his place with the apostle?

XVI. Does the Holy Spirit take the place of Jesus with any one now, after Jesus has left any person now?

XVII. Did not Jesus declare that the Holy Spirit would recall to the minds of the Apostles what he, Jesus, had said to the apostles?

XVIII. Does the Holy Spirit recall to the mind of any person now what Jesus said to such persons?

XIX. Then is not this promise as personal to the apostles as the promise that Jesus made to the apostles that he would meet them, the apostles, in Galilee?

XX. Did the apostles have to lay hands on the Samaritans before they could receive the Holy Spirit, in miraculous power?

XXI. Were not these Samaritans who believed and had been baptized children of God?

XXII. Had not they been born on the water and the Spirit?

XXIII. If they were children of God, had not God sent the indwelling Spirit into their hearts?

XXIV. Did not John preach that the kingdom was at hand, approaching?

XXV. Could he then be in it?

XXVI. Did not Jesus preach that the kingdom was at hand, approaching?

XXVII. Could he then be in it?

XXVIII. Did not Jesus declare that persons to whom he was talking would see the kingdom come with power?

XXIX. Was it then in existence? Was he in it? Were his apostles? Was any one?

XXX. Did not Jesus say only about six weeks before his death that he would build his church on the truth, his Messiahship?

XXXI. Was it not still future? Was he or any one in it?

XXXII. Could his Messiahship be laid as the foundation, as a demonstrated truth, until he had, by his resurrection, demonstrated his Messiahship?

XXXIII. Could the church be in existence before its only foundation had been laid?

XXXIV. Was not Joseph of Arimathea still waiting for the kingdom after Jesus was dead?

XXXV. Could it be in existence? Was it not future? Could any one be in it?

XXXVII. Were not the apostles to be endued from on high? Was not this the case after the resurrection of Jesus?

XXXVIII. Were not the apostles still to receive power when the Holy Spirit fell on them just a few moments before the ascension of Jesus?

XXXIX. Did not they receive this promise on the day of Pentecost?

XL. Did not the Holy Spirit fall on them at the beginning of the kingdom as an actual fact on the day of Pentecost?

XLI. Was not that when the kingdom came with power?

XLII. Does not Paul say in Eph. iv. that miraculous powers are to remain until the children of God attain to the unity of the faith, until they attain to a perfect man, a perfect body of which Christ is the head?

XLIII. Where is your Scripture for continuing them beyond that period.

XLIV. Does not Paul say to the Corinthians, who had nine spiritual powers in their church, "Desire earnestly the best spiritual gifts, nevertheless I show unto you a more excellent way?"

XLV. Does he not mean a way more excellent than the exercise of the best spiritual gifts.

XLVI. Does not Paul say that prophecy, all utterance by inspiration, knowledge, or inspiration, or knowledge imparted by inspiration, tongues, all signs of inspiration, and revelation shall cease.

XLVII. Does he not say that such prophesying, such knowledge was partial, when given by the exercise of these spiritual gifts.

XLVIII. Does not he mean that such utterance, in each instance, can only be part the word of God, a part of revelation.

XLIX. Does not he say when that which is perfect is come, then partial revelation under spiritual gifts shall pass away?

Is not that which is perfect complete revelation? If the partial is a part of God's word is not the perfect the whole of God's word?

Then does not Paul declare that when God's word is perfected, these partial prophecies, revelations and miracles to attest them shall cease?

Did not the apostles complete God's word?

Did not revelations, inspiration, and miracles cease then?

Has Mormonism given one new idea? A better expression, a single idea.

MR. KELLEY'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It seems that my opponent got so worked up on last evening that he has not yet descended from that high horse of Ahasueras. The trouble with him is, that under the soured state of his feelings he concludes there is more argument in the use of mean terms and unbecoming expressions than in a true and manly way of debate.

How ridiculous for a man to come before an audience with the name and reputation of a clergyman, debater and logician, and to then have him employ the means of slander, vituperation, and expressions without meaning to meet his opponent. Here on his own question he has left entirely the issue and gone back to his pet theory of howling "Joe Smith," "Impostor," "Mormon Deity," "great fraud," "blacklegs," "rascals," "villains," "scoundrels," etc.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, he is quite welcome to all the argument there is in those terms, so far as I am concerned. I could, had I the disposition, answer him very effectually by returning the fire with like polite and refined language; but I will say here that I shall not so lower my standing as a minister, nor the great cause of Christ's truth which I represent, by descending to any such plane. (Applause.)

The first points discussed by my opponent I shall take up and answer in their place. But all of that relating to Sidney Rigdon and what Braden calls Mormonism I shall pay no attention to, it being in no sense connected with the question under discussion.

It is the faith, doctrines, practices and organization of Braden's, or the Campbellite church that is under consideration now, and I shall not be drawn away from the

question before you, whatever the disposition of the other side, but proceed to show that his little building is upon a sandy foundation. After first concluding the line of argument which I was upon last evening, I shall take up and examine particularly his positions.

I had just introduced the text, "And yet show I unto you a more excellent way."—1 Cor. 12:31. Paul at the time of using this had just devoted a whole chapter to describing the church, its officers, how they were placed in the church, the gifts of the Spirit and the manner in which the Spirit was manifest, together with the object of such manifestations. When through with all of this labor, was he ready, as Braden would have you believe, to tell them in the very last verse of the chapter that there was another and better system than that which he had just been pointing out to them, "a more excellent way?" Why did he point out the one not so good instead of this "more excellent?" and, what is stranger still, he never in a single epistle afterward set forth a different order than the one mentioned in 1 Cor. 12. Then where is the trouble? The whole difficulty is with the interpretation of Mr. Braden himself. In his great anxiety to do away with the order of the church established by Christ, and at the same time endeavor to make the people believe that it was restored by Mr. A. Campbell and aids of which he is a representative, he explains that the apostle would give them another order. If the order specified in the New Testament was limited, and some other system was to take its place, when did the old lose its force? Was it in the year 70, 90, 100, 150, or when? When did the new order begin? Where is its constitution and order, and what right has Mr. Campbell to be harping that they are standing on the old constitution, when they refuse to build by its provisions? But what did Paul mean by "yet show I unto you a more excellent way?"

I shall here particularly examine this, the 31st verse of the 12th chapter of the Corinthian letter that has given my opponent an imaginary covering at every step of this investigation, when he has been brought into the light of God's word as reflected from every part of the New Testament. Is it a fact, my friends, that, notwithstanding the promises made by Jesus and John that "ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence," and that due preparation for the reception of this out-pouring of the Spirit had to be made before it could be received, of "prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight," and that afterwards it was the embodiment of the promise which Jesus made to his followers of the Comforter that should be in his stead personally, to them who loved him, that those who received it were made no better thereby? Brought no closer to him who is the head of the church and raised no higher in the advancing plane of the divine life?

Do you accept Braden's proposition as sound wherein he represents that the pres-

ence of the Spirit of God in power has not a tendency to make men better? That it is not a moral agent or such an agency that acts upon men so as to build up and maintain a true character and expurge the evil? This cherished position of his I shall try and notice minutely and strip it of its deformity; for throughout the discussion of these questions he has taken the position that where there was an absence of all the manifestations of the Spirit of God, and consequently the immediate presence of divine instruction, that there was the higher Christianity and the greater Gospel light.

According to this the disciples before Pentecost were better Christians than after; because they had not the comforter, and consequently these gifts of the Holy Spirit, as they had afterwards. Down at Samaria where Philip had preached the word and they who believed him had been baptized by water, and had great rejoicing because of having found the truth, they were pretty fair Christians, until Peter and John went down and laid their hands upon them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; but upon this the Spirit of God was poured out upon them, and they were at once lowered in the Christian scale and fit only to be classed with such persons as the Corinthian church, the Latter Day Saints and the negroes, according to Braden. Afterwards the Lord tells Cornelius to send to Joppa for Peter, and that he would receive good therefrom. Cornelius obeys, sends for Peter and when the apostle comes down and begins speaking to the people, the Holy Ghost falls upon them and they begin to speak with tongues and magnify God. Here the Spirit of God, according to my opponent's talk (I will not call it argument) lowers the household of Cornelius in the Christian scale and they must be classed along with persons of such a low form of religion as the Corinthian Saints, or the Latter Day Saints, according to Braden. But I proceed. Paul passing through the upper coasts comes to Ephesus; he finds certain disciples; he enquires if they had received the Holy Ghost; no, they said, they had never heard of such a thing, they had only heard the word, and but part of that. These persons were in a pretty high state of church civilization, according to Braden and Mr. Campbell. But this impetuous Paul takes them and baptizes them. They had only gone through the form of baptism before, some person officiated who had no authority, and Paul knew it, because he did not teach the people about Christ and the Holy Spirit. Then Paul lays his hands upon them and the Holy Ghost comes down on them, "and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Went right back to the low level Mr. Braden placed the Corinthian and Mormon churches. Again Jesus is resurrected; ascends into the heavens far above all. What does he do? "And (he) gave gifts unto men," "And he gave some apostles, and some prophets and some evangelists and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body

[church] of Christ. Till we all come into the unity of the faith and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

All of these gifts were imparted to the early church. They are among the gifts exercised by the Corinthian church; Jesus bestowed them as his especial favor upon his children after he had gone into the heavens. These were the highest things he could bestow upon his people that were calculated to make them better, and notwithstanding this, according to Braden and Mr. Campbell, those receiving this Spirit and gift were placed by them in such a low state of Christian attainments, that they could never with these, equal the exact standing in Christian perfection of "us popular sects" of the 19th century, who cannot even follow the injunction, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them." That rule was given as one of the first things for the early disciples to pattern after. These things to some extent were the inevitable result of the birth of the Spirit, the renewing of the Holy Ghost, the seal of adoption, the baptism of the Spirit, which Jesus referred Nicodemus to, the same being a fact, a birth of the Spirit, a transition into a new and higher life, a partaking of the nature of the kingdom that was not "meat and drink," as some had in Paul's time foolishly supposed, as he says; "but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." Thus in the 3d of John, Jesus says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit," referring to the complete birth by the two elements, as in the citation, "There are three that bear witness in earth: the Spirit, the water and the blood, and these three agree in one." Braden I know undertook to explain this birth of the water and Spirit in John, but did one of you get his idea? The trouble with him was, that he did not understand it himself, and of course could not explain it for others. He wanted to get the birth independently of the Holy Spirit. But this cannot be done. There is in Christ's church a baptism of the Spirit as well as of water. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;" receive the outpouring of the Spirit of God that shall fill them and bring them in rapport with higher things; clothe them with the new life which Jesus should shed forth; hence become new creatures with the completeness of the new birth. Mr. Braden confounds these with "begotten by the word," as he says. Does he mean to imply a birth by this? That here is where they are born of the Spirit? Are they born of the Spirit before they are of the water, Mr. Braden? If not, why are you talking about begotten of the word? It reads "born of water and of the Spirit."

Turning to the "more excellent way," which Paul refers to, my opponent says, "a more excellent way than the spiritual gifts." Here is where he makes a mistake at the outstart. Not a more excellent way than

the spiritual gifts. He confounds at once the true antecedent. It is a more excellent way than one person having, and exercising, *all* of the spiritual gifts. Read back just two verses: "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" No; Paul has shown a more excellent way than this. Notice the 8th, 9th and 10th verses of the same chapter. "For to one is given by the same spirit, the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, by the same spirit; to another faith by the same spirit; to another the gifts or healing by the same spirit," etc. Here it is fully set out, and hence, when he repeats by interrogatory in the 29th, and 30th verses, as he does, "are all apostles?" etc.; and then refers to the "more excellent way," he refers to this one as being of a more excellent way than that of one person having all of these gifts which he had already referred to in the 8th, 9th and 10th verses, and not a more excellent way than the instruction by the gifts themselves. By such an interpretation as Braden gives, Paul is made to appear as teaching one thing at one time, and an adverse thing at another time and still a different one at another. For before this Braden will not deny that he taught the use of the gifts; then he has him teach that they shall not use them in the 13th chapter; and afterwards in the 14th chapter, he teaches, "Follow after charity and desire spiritual gifts but rather that ye may prophecy." This kind of an interpretation shakes up Paul considerably and places Paul versus Paul. But it is not the worst part of it: it places Paul versus Jesus, the master and head of the church. Jesus, when he had ascended upon high, gave gifts unto men; but Paul, according to this wise interpretation of Braden, was to show them a more excellent way than this. Jesus, before he ascended, said: "And these signs shall follow them that believe;" but Paul is to show a more excellent way than this. Peter says, "This, the spirit which ye now see and hear, he hath shed forth;" but Paul, according to the profound? interpretation of Braden, will show a more excellent way. Is it not plain that Braden can't give the true solution of this? Now let us examine the 31st verse. "And yet show I unto you a more excellent way. 'Yet,' is from the Greek word *eti*, and means *still, hitherto, yet*, and does not of itself denote something to follow in the future, as notice examples: "While he yet spake," (still spake), Mark 14:43; "While the other is yet a great way off" (now still, etc.). Luke, 15:20, "When I was yet with you" (hitherto, before); 2 Thess., 2:5. Whatever was the cause or may be the reason, it is plain there has been a transposition of the clause here, either by the transcribers of the original, or the English translators. Let me read: "I have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" "Yet, (still) I show (point out) to you a more excellent way," than this. He had

already in the letter, which he was writing, pointed out a better way than all speaking with the same gift, the more excellent way. Hence, the instruction comes, therefore "covet earnestly the best gifts." Why? Because Paul *would show* them a better way than spiritual gifts? Not at all; but because Paul *had told them* in this letter, *now*, all could not have the same gift, but that God divided these to them as he would, as they were worthy, and as the Lord saw it would be for their good, and the good of his work. The verb in the original is not in the future tense. Paul don't say, I *will show* you a more excellent way. That is made so to read by the translator into the English. Now, let me read to you the letter of Paul as he wrote it; beginning with 12th chapter, 7th verse I read:

"But the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit with all. For to one is given by the spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit; to another faith by the same spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another diverse kinds of tongues; to another interpretation of tongues. But all these worketh that self-same spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will."

Pass on now to verse 29:

"Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?"

No:

"For (literally) a more excellent way I point out, *show*."

Not in the future, but now; already done. Hence, properly translated:

"For I have shown unto you a more excellent way; therefore, covet earnestly the best gifts."

This interpretation agrees with all that Paul is at this time writing, and that he wrote at any other time; and is the only correct one. Where had he shown the more excellent way? Answer, as set out in the 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 28, 29, and 30, verses of this same chapter. Now read what follows upon the same point in the 14th chapter, first verse:

"Follow after charity and desire spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy."

Verses 39 and 40:

"Therefore, brethren, covet to prophecy and forbid not to speak with tongues. Let all things be done decently and in order."

Such an interpretation as this harmonizes with all other instruction upon these things. It is not a proper interpretation of the Bible or any other thing, where you make a conflict by the interpretation, or render a part of the instrument unnecessary or void. The rule is that the entire word, teaching, shall have its full force and effect when it can be done; and if it could not be done in Bible interpretations, who would take the responsibility of believing a part was in force and not the other part also? The sense and meaning of the apostle here is as clear as the noon-day sun. He is not teaching them two or three laws:—good, better, best; or bad, ill, worse; but one law, that of Jesus Christ. It was the Gospel law, and he says himself, "Though we, or an angel

from heaven, teach any other law than that you have received, let him be accursed." Is it so uncertain that Paul himself was double-tongued in teaching it? No, ladies and gentlemen, the trouble has been in the *man interpretation*, and as in that verse, an attempt at interpolation; but of this last I shall speak particularly hereafter.

Now, I proceed to examine the 8th verse of the 13th chapter. "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail, whether there be tongues they shall cease; whether there be knowledge it shall vanish away." This is a prophecy of Paul's; not instruction to the saints at Corinth, telling them how they shall do as to prophecy. To what extent is it and how far does it relate? Does he mean that the time is coming when we shall have no more prophecies, no more knowledge, no more languages (tongues), through which we are to be able to communicate thought? Certainly not. What does he mean then? Let Paul answer; he is the one that uses the language and the proper one to explain it. He says, (verse 9), "For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." What shall be done away? Paul answers, "That which is in part." How? By us having less prophecies, less knowledge, less power to speak with different tongues than now? No, no. By ushering in the perfect time "when we shall see as we are seen, and know as we are known;" and hence, the seeing in part and knowing in part is done away. Being brought to the state of positive knowledge and, like Jesus, understanding all things, that which was miraculous and revealed only in part shall fail, cease, vanish away; whether in prophecy, knowledge or speaking in tongues; hence he says: "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face. Now I know in part."

Yes, Paul knew only in part, although he had been taught by the revelations direct of Jesus Christ, and had been in the third heaven, in the Paradise of God. He knew about things that had been hidden from the foundation of the world, and of the future and final state of the church, even things unlawful to utter; yet he still knew but in part, but he says: "Then, when that which is perfect (perfect now, but to come) *is come*, then shall I know even as also I am known." What time is it, that is the perfect time? Turn to 1 John 3:2: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God (Paul was this, too, when he was talking), and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is." Here is the same time Paul referred to when he should see him (Jesus) as he is, in the perfect time. This time John places at his second coming. It is then that the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the water does the great deep. "And all shall know him from the least unto the greatest." Not that all knowledge shall be done away, but a fullness of knowledge arrived at, and part

knowledge shall have ceased; because we shall see and know fully as we are seen and known. This agrees exactly with the time and event as fixed by Paul in Eph. 4:13 for the continuation of these spiritual gifts: "Till we all come into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man [no man is perfect now, neither the church] unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." The apostle is in harmony throughout with himself—not a single contradiction nor disagreement; but it is clearly contrary to what my opponent teaches, all of it. Can it be said, then, his church is after the apostolic pattern? It is far short of it, Mr. Braden.

Paul is consistent in his teaching, then. In the 12th chapter of this letter he teaches them the use and benefit of these spiritual gifts. In the 13th he teaches them that the miraculous effects of this Spirit to them will not cease till the "perfect" time shall arrive, when Jesus shall come the *second time*. In the 14th chapter he teaches them to follow after them; desire, "covet" them, and to forbid not their exercise. It is all the time the straight and narrow way.

But again, Braden says: "There were some features in the apostolic church not in theirs." That is true, there was; and a great many of them at that. He says also that the Holy Ghost is revealed through the word, but the word is the result of the moving of the Holy Ghost upon a person, and not a medium through which it is communicated. The word simply expresses its will, and to a bad man just the same as a good one. How terribly mixed indeed are his positions. Again he says, "desire spiritual gifts as long as they were to remain in the church." The constitution of the church provides that they shall remain always, so far as the present condition of man is concerned, till "that which is perfect is come." To destroy it is to take away the citizen's right and destroy the force of the constitution. Where is there a constitution authorizing a better way? He says there is an "indwelling Holy Ghost," in contradiction to the miraculous Holy Ghost, yet the scripture knows but one. The indwelling *was* the miraculous; and Jesus says, "It shall be in you as a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

David says, "My heart was hot within me, while I was musing the fire burned; then spake I with my tongue." Ps. 39:3. "The Holy Ghost and fire" was promised. The Holy Spirit was in them as a flame, and it expressed itself in tongues, prophecy and wisdom as God willed and cheered the blessed soul in which it glowed. This is the Spirit as promised and sent down from heaven. Again he says, "Ananias was a special apostle." But who says he was any morespecial than any of the others not apostles? Oh, Mr. Braden, that is all. He is great to divide and subdivide. He has general apostles and special apostles; miraculous Holy Spirit, indwelling Holy Spirit, the Holy Spirit in the word, and as in the previous discussion the one that

moved on Balaam's ass. Yet the Scripture only speaks of one. But why does he say, without the least authority, that Ananias was a "special apostle?" Just because he has asserted that no one ever received the gift of the Holy Ghost only those on whom apostles laid their hands, and it was shown that Ananias laid hands on Paul for the receiving of the Spirit, and Mr. Braden at once announces: "He was a special apostle;" without the least authority for it; a sheer dodge. But the body of elders laid hands on Timothy and it was an act of presumption if they did not have authority to do it, and under their hands he received a gift. It does not say that Paul laid on hands with them, neither does it say that the gift that Timothy received under the hands of the elders was the same one that he received under Paul's hands. So we have a number of elders here, "special apostles, I suppose," to also accommodate Mr. Braden. He is not quite as wily as some others of the Campbellite "restored elders" that I have seen take positions; they have uniformly said, "no one received the Holy Ghost by laying on hands, except those on whom the apostles laid their hands and the ones on whom this second party laid their hands." By this method they pushed the enquiry clear out of New Testament times, and could stand on their assumption and say that the New Testament does not say in so many words that any others ever received it; and about that time they get oblivious to all church history, as does my opponent on the question of the laying on of hands. He says, "that those that went out from Jerusalem preached by the authority of the New Testament." But the New Testament did not exist for two hundred years only in scattered fragments. Paul and Barnabas went out from Jerusalem and was completely authorized on the way at Antioch, not by the New Testament, but by a divine call and ordination, the only way that any one was ever authorized to preach. "How can they preach except they be sent?" Not by an assumptive congregation, but by the Almighty.

He says, I confound "Indwelling of the Spirit with the miraculous." There is but one; the Holy Ghost in any form is miraculous, whether manifest in tongues, or prophecy, or acting like a glow of fire in the heart and soul of the saints, to confirm and encourage them to strive on. But he says again, "After God had authenticated his word, miracles ceased. The authentication belonged to all believers. 'Grieve not the Holy Spirit by which you (the believers) are sealed to the day of redemption.'" Mr. Braden would have it, if the Christian wishes confirmation now and sealing, he must read an account of something that to place near two thousand years ago; the Christian enjoyed the spirit and was sealed and that this must be all satisfactory to him. Might as well conclude that when Christians are hungry in this age if they will but sit down and read that Paul and Peter and others of the saints of their day,

ate a good square meal on some occasion, it will be all satisfactory; that the Christian now does not need any real food, but to read an old account of some one else's eating will ease the gnawing of hunger. Again he says, "I would have Christ standing by me ready to whack on the seal." It is poorly expressed; but the meaning is clear. I do believe that Jesus should be with his ministry and people. He says to his sent, his ministers: "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Evidently ready and quite willing, to "whack on the seal." To the believer he says, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them." Just as every foreigner, when he is made a citizen in our government, must have his own certificate, and evidence of adoption, and this made under the hand and seal of the proper officer, so must every new addition to the church of Christ, receive the seal of the spirit, to confirm them. Their bodies are to be temples for the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. And hence, the church becomes a habitation of God through the spirit. "And they are no longer foreigners nor aliens but fellow citizens with the saints." When I ask for his authority, or that of Mr. Campbell, to institute and organize a church, he answers me with, "We are all kings and priests made so by Jesus Christ, and don't need any more authority than that." Then I ask, "If all are thus kings and priests and have this inherent authority to act, why is he calling Joseph Smith a fraud, and saying he "presumed to preach?" If all have this authority one has as good a right as another, and Joseph Smith as much right to organize a church and preach as Mr. Campbell by his own admission. Mr. Braden is lost here, and he knows it. He dare not undertake to point out to you any authority for Mr. Campbell to start out preaching upon, and organizing churches, than he must admit that both he and I have. Yet, he talks about impostors. He is as wild and excited over this, as he was last evening when he broke out to me, "Paul I know, and Jesus I know, but who are you? Who is Kelley?" Now, my friends, I like to see a man quote scripture, but when he has to take up and quote what the devils said for scripture, I take it he is pretty hard pressed. (Applause).

It reminds me of the old lady who was a great lover of the Bible. A new son came to the family and she was bound to christen it with a Bible name. Finally she could select upon no other, (there was already a large family who had been named out of the Bible,) when she thought of "Beelzebub." She was at once delighted, and they called him Beelzebub. Again he takes up the Constitutional Convention argument, and tries to make out that the case of these apostles, who were set in the church, is a parallel one to the delegates in the Convention. He is determined to make them out the lawmakers if he can, instead of leaving that work to Jehovah. Anything to defeat the purpose for which they were, in fact,

placed in the church as they give it themselves. "For the work of the ministry, the perfecting of the saints; for the edifying of the body of Christ." But a moment's reflection will show the absurdity of his reasoning. The framers of the constitution were not officers in the government under the constitution without being placed there afterwards. The apostles were officers in the church. "God set in the church *first* apostles, *secondly* prophets;" and then follows the other officers. Not so in the convention that framed the constitution. They were delegates who met to formulate a new and better system of government, and when their work was done they were done, so far as officers in the incoming government was concerned, unless again made such. Washington was a delegate and afterwards set, elected as an officer in the government and made President; as apostles were set in the church away back by Jesus. If you take the ground that the apostles were the framers of the Constitution, and that took effect and the new government, after they had done their work,—died,—then they were never in the church, and what becomes of Braden's dead apostles which he claimed were in his church? If you take the ground that they were in the church as officers as they were, then they were not in a delegate capacity, but in a similar position to what Washington occupied during his Presidency in the government. Hence, the true likeness of the officers in the church is not found in the framers of the Constitution of the United States, but in the *officers* in the government of the United States; and the true Constitutional maker of the church of Jesus Christ is the God and Father of all. I shall not permit my opponent to reason Him out of existence. When Jesus sent his disciples out to teach, he told them to teach whatsoever he *had* commanded them. He did not send them out making *constitution*. He would not do that himself; but said: "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." Hence he commanded his disciples—the officers under him: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever *I have commanded* you." Matt. 28: 19-20. He did not send them out then, "making constitution every day," did he? This brings to my mind another point. "Baptizing them *in* the name of the Father," etc. Now Braden's church baptizes *into* the name, instead of "*in* the name of," for the reason, I understand, that they have no right to use the name, having no especial authority to baptize. Am I not right in this?

My opponent tries to cover himself first, and associates in his church secondly, with glory, and says, "they are the only ministers who have been able to meet our people." At the same time he is the first of his church I have ever met who tried to stand fire, while I have debated with a

number of ministers of other persuasions. It won't do for him to assume quite so much nor to think he is getting along, because he denies all work and power of the Holy Spirit in the church. Why? "This belief in the work of the Holy Spirit will lead a man into polygamy," he says. How will it? If a man follows the guidance of the Holy Spirit do you say, he will land in polygamy? If so, that would make polygamy right. It will "guide into all truth," Jesus said.

Braden seems to be upon the Brighamite fence here, and claims it will lead a man into polygamy. I say it will lead him into nothing of the kind. By this same Spirit came the teaching of monogomy. Would it turn around and teach polygamy next? But, says Braden, the people professing to be guided by it would be deceived and led into polygamy. Why would they be deceived? The moment the governing spirit of the individual taught anything contrary to that already taught, the person must know that it is not the right spirit. We are commanded to not only "worship in Spirit, but in truth." This reference to truth shows that the Spiritual direction, to be of God, must agree with that which is already written. Is there in fact, then, this danger Braden speaks of? Not at all. If a man's spiritual direction is contrary to that already given, it is of the evil one and not the good spirit. Hence Paul says, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write are the commandments of the Lord." What shall we do, then; get along without the Spirit? No; for without this Spirit we cannot be guided into the truth. This is to guide into all truth. Therefore Paul says: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the Sons of God."

Ah! here is the secret, then; we must have both the Spirit and the truth. But Braden will not have the Spirit, hence he cannot have the truth, and this is the secret cause why he is found so universally at variance with the Bible.

Again, upon this profound logic of his, that the basis of polygamy is a belief in the work of the Holy Spirit he builds his false castles and says: "This is the reason Joseph Smith was in polygamy here in Kirtland etc. But both basis and conclusion is false. Joseph Smith was never in polygamy while here in Kirtland; no well informed man of any party who regards the truth at all, will claim that. Those of the polygamite church, in Utah, denounce the claim as entirely false. No well informed man among them claims that polygamy was ever intimated or believed in by any man in the church for five years after the Saints left Kirtland. This is wholly without any truthful basis. Joseph Smith was never in polygamy and never had but one wife. I am, as I before stated upon this stand, willing to negative the question, that he was not, upon any platform and against any man, either out of, or in Utah.

But Braden can talk to try to prejudice his case through with this audience. Why is he not willing to affirm the proposition with me that Mr. Smith was a polygamist, if he knows so much? I am ready to meet him upon it. But the belief in the inspiration of the Holy Spirit will lead men into polygamy and other crime, he says. Jesus and Peter and John and all of the apostles believed in it and were led by it. Did it lead them into polygamy or other crime? Did Paul's belief in the present direction of the Holy Spirit lead him into wrong doing? Remember Braden's claim is that a belief in the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit will lead men into these things. If so, why did it not lead the early Saints into these things? They believed in the present and immediate direction of the Holy Spirit. My opponent's charge is not true. Neither as to the Latter Day Saints nor as to others who believed in the immediate power and direction of the Holy Spirit as an essential thing in the church.

(Time called)

MR. BRADEN'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My opponent spent much time last night jabbering about Mr. Campbell's authority to organize churches after the apostolic pattern, baptize and breach. We showed him that every child of God is a king, a priest, made a royal priest by God himself. Such persons have a divine commission to preach, baptize, and do any and all acts required in the Kingdom of God. The members, all of them who were driven out of Jerusalem, went everywhere preaching the word. Aquilla and Priscilla instructed Apollos, taught, preached, and had a church in their house, without any pretended commission from any Joe Smith of their day. As kings and priests by the act of the Almighty, they had their authority direct from heaven and not from the hands of any one. It required miraculous power to do the work that the public workers in the church did in the days of the apostles. It took miraculous power in creation to bring animals and plants into being, but it does not now, when the law of God is that they shall come into being by process of natural law. It required miraculous power to give the word of God and attest its inspiration. It does not require miraculous power now when it is complete, to use it and obey it. We do not deny a divine call. We believe God has called us and made us kings and priests unto himself. If my opponent's church is the church of Christ, all are kings and priests by God's acts, and not by the act of Joe Smith or any other impostor. I call Joe an impostor because he pretended to be what the Bible declares he could not be. If a set of men were to set themselves up as a constitutional convention I would call them impostors, because the people had not called them to any such work.

Let us now examine New Testament history for a few minutes. After revelations ceased with Malachi, the Israelites were under the written word of God, in the Old Testament. John the Baptist preached unto them repentance toward God, and announced unto them the coming of the Messiah. Jesus came, preached and instructed his apostles to prepare them for the work they were to do after his departure. Joel, John and Jesus promised that the most complete manifestation of the Holy Spirit ever given to men should usher in the perfect dispensation. Jesus promised the Comforter to his apostles to do for them what he had done while with them; that they should be endued with power, by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which should usher in his kingdom with power. Jesus abrogated to Mosaic dispensation by his death. The apostles began the work of building the church on the day of Pentecost. They preached and baptized persons into Christ.

They had their converts, met as Christian-worshipping assemblies. So long as the congregations were not too numerous, the apostles took personal charge of them and taught them. They did not organize them fully at first, but took charge of them themselves. There was not a perfectly organized congregation until long years after the day of Pentecost. The Old Testament had ceased to be a complete word of God. It could not be such to the congregations of Christians. The apostles gave to the congregations the inspired teaching they needed. When congregations became so numerous that an apostle could not be with them, the apostles laid hands on suitable persons and imparted to them the spiritual gifts described in I. Cor. xii. Their object was three-fold. I. To supply needed inspired teaching. II. To govern the churches. III. To attest and confirm the inspiration and teachings of these teachers and governors. There is no dispute between my opponent and myself that these miraculous powers were in the church in the days of the apostles; that they were necessary then.

The issues are then, I. Was the church then a model? Was it in the condition that was designed to be permanent. II. Does the word of God ordain that all that was in the church then, is to remain always in the church? My opponent admits that the New Testament is the constitution of the church. Just as the people through state legislatures selected delegates to form our National constitution, so God, through Christ selected the apostles to give the constitution, the New Testament, to the church and to organize the church under it. The apostles gave the word of God orally at first, and organized churches. Then they reduced it to writing and left it in writing with the churches they had organized, under the oral announcement of the constitution. God, Christ and the Holy Spirit gave the church every word of the constitution, through apostles or companions of the apostles. Our fathers in constitutional convention gave to the people the constitution. They ruled the people under the articles of confederation. The people adopted the constitution and organized a national government under it. The articles of Confederation, the government under them ceased and the constitutional convention ceased when it had done its work. The people now live and act under the constitution. They have only such officers as it ordains; only such officers as it ordains have successors. Miraculous power was to give inspired teaching, or give the constitution, or to rule provisionally the churches. It was constitution-making power. The apostles were the constitutional convention of the church. I hope my opponent will not be so silly as to repeat; "God gives the con-

stitution not the apostles." The people through their delegates ordained our constitution. God through his chosen delegates ordained the constitution of the church, the New Testament. The difference between my opponent and myself is here. I believe that when miraculous power had given revelation, the constitution, then miraculous power, constitution making power ceased. He would have constitution making power perpetual and the only power in the church. I believe that when the constitution makers did their work, gave the constitution, then they ceased to act. He would have them perpetual, and the only power in the church. I believe that the constitution makers perfected their work. He would have constitution making go on for ever. I believe that constitution making, and the constitution makers prepared for a perfect government under the constitution, and ceased when that the perfect government was constituted. He contends that constitution making and constitution makers shall continue for ever and never give place to what the constitution ordains. They are forever preparing, getting ready for something that never comes. The constitution provides for constitutional officers and their successors, but it does not ordain that constitution-making and constitution-making officers shall go on for ever. It does not provide for actual constitution-making and an actual succession of constitution makers. Judas had a successor just as a delegate who dies while a convention is in session is succeeded by another person, selected by the people through their legislature. Paul was the apostle of the gentiles just as Canada might have had delegates in our constitutional convention, had their independence been acknowledged and had they applied for union with us. But no apostle had a successor when the constitution was made, the New Testament was completed, any more than our constitution makers have had successors. We can fill vacancies in offices ordered by the constitution, but we do not fill vacancies in constitution-making offices now, for there are no such offices. The apostles are such officers, and have no successors. We now lay hands on men to set them apart to work under the constitution, the New Testament. We do not lay hands on them to impart miraculous power, constitution-making power, for the apostles completed that work, and we have neither constitution making nor makers, nor do we impart constitution making power. The fallacy of my opponent's application of the many passages of Scriptures he reads, is this: He reads of what was done by the constitution makers and what existed and was necessary before the constitution was completed, and the church completed under it, and applies it to an entirely different period, and state of affairs, the Church after the constitution is completed, and the church completed in organization under it. If he can show that the constitution ordains that what he reads

was to be permanent in the church, he has accomplished his object. Until he does, his reading is as bootless as to read what was done under the law of Moses. Christ gave apostles, prophets and evangelists, shepherds and teachers with miraculous powers, during the constitution-making period, and until the constitution was made, for such were constitution-making powers. But when the constitution was made, such constitution-making power ceased. Proving that they existed before the "until" does not prove that they must exist after the "until." Let him address himself to the last work. God set in the church the nine miraculous powers. Yes, they were constitution-making powers, and he set them in the church during that period before, "The more excellent way" when the constitution was made had come. Let him show that the constitution makes them a part of the more excellent way. Then he will prove his point. God created animals and plants by miracle, before natural law prevailed. That does not prove that he does now. Because God set miraculous powers in the church before the constitution was completed, as constitution-making powers, it does not prove that he sets them in the church under the constitution, after constitution-making is no longer needed. A man has guardians while a minor. That does not prove that he has guardians when a man. No, we reason that what he needed in his childhood has ceased, being no longer needed. God set miraculous powers in the church in its childish condition.

When the church became a man it laid to one side such childish things, as Paul declares. My opponent claims that we have no prophets and apostles in our church. The people of the United States have the work of the Constitutional Convention in the Constitution and the government in accordance with it. They do not need to have an eternal Constitutional Convention, an eternal constitution-making, to have the work, the Constitution. Indeed such an attempt would prevent the people's ever having their work. It would be like a general's eternally organizing the army and never using it in the work for which all organizing is done. We have the apostles in our church, just as we have Christ. In the constitution they gave us, in their law, in their work. Just as we have our Constitutional Convention in our Constitution and the government under it. My opponent grew witty over his gun illustration. That gun will kick him so that it will do more harm at the breech than it will at the muzzle. The difference between us is this. I take the gun just as it came from the armory of heaven and use it. He throws away the gun and tries to use Joe Smith's bogus gun making machine, pretended miraculous power to make another. I take the gun as it came from the armory of heaven. He substitutes from Joe Smith's bogus gun factory, a new barrel in the Book of Mormon, a new stock in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, a new lock in the

Book of Abraham, and keeps on throwing away what was manufactured in heaven's armory and putting in what came from Joe's bogus gun factory until he finishes with a bran new and appropriate touch hole in Joe's polygamy revelation. And when he is done, his gun bursts and blows his brains out and kicks his remains out of sight. He grows witty over my quoting the language of the Devil. Yes, I quoted it to him. He regards it as "the fullness of the Gospel," Smith's lying fraud, "the Book of Mormon." The Devil is the father of lies, and the Book of Mormon the most monstrous of his progeny. I concluded if he valued so highly the Devil's work in the Book of Mormon, he would accept as gospel a direct quotation from him. Since my opponent regards "Mormon" as a Scriptural name, and so precious a name, and the word means "a ghost," "a hobgoblin," doubtless he regards Beelzebub, the father of Hobgoblins, as a choice Scriptural name. I do not. He wants to know why I say, baptize "into." I care not whether *in* or *into*. The one baptism *in* the church is in the name. Holy Spirit baptism is not. It is not in the church. He has not answered and dare not answer our questions. Were the Samaritans children of God before the apostles went down to them? Had they been born of God? Born of water and the Spirit? If they had not, did the apostle give the Holy Spirit to sinners, when Jesus says such can not receive him? He wants to know why the apostles imparted the miraculous influence of the Spirit to the Samaritans and others. The constitution, the word of God, was not completed, and they needed miraculous power to supply inspired teaching until inspiration was completed in the New Testament. When inspired teaching was completed in the New Testament such power was needed no longer.

As my opponent is so good, his religion makes him so good, I dare not say he willfully misrepresents me. No, he is honest, no doubt. So good a man would never misrepresent me. I must charge it to his ignorance and lack of sense enough to understand me and the word of God. I have said that there are two influences of the Holy Spirit; one manifested in miraculous power. The other manifested in moral power, through the truth he has revealed. My honest opponent in his extreme ignorance and lack of ordinary sense, says that I say there are two Holy Ghosts, when I never used the word "ghost." Can you understand, sir, one Holy Spirit, who has manifested himself in two ways, who has influenced men in two ways? Just as a man can influence another by mesmerising him, or by the truth he presents to him. My good, honest, ignorant friend cannot understand the word of God when it declares "There are different gifts, but the same Spirit." "There are different operations (of the Spirit), but one God." Nor when it declares God bore the apostles witness with manifold powers and distributions of the Spirit. He, honest, ignorant soul that

he is, supposes that it means different holy ghosts, manifold holy ghosts, and his infidel lackies, and Danites in the audience, whose brains are in their heels instead of in their heads, stamp, yell, whistle, clap and cheer such honest idiocy.

I said that the miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit was not a moral influence on the one it influenced or inspired. I repeat it. It was given to wicked persons such as Balaam, Saul, King of Israel, Caiaphas, the Pharaohs, the Abimelechs of the Bible. It left them just as it found them. Such was the case with all of these parties. They did not, while under its influence, utter what they wanted to utter. They did not often understand what they had uttered. It used them to reveal truth which is God's power unto salvation, which begets, which sanctifies. I said that the condition of the church while it was dependent on the fragmentary revelations uttered by men with Spiritual gifts was inferior to that state when it had the complete word of God; all these fragments united in the New Testament. So Paul declares. The condition of a man who has completed his course of study and has the full course in his library and head, is superior to his condition when his teachers were giving him a fragment at a time, no matter how talented such teachers may have been. Here again my honest, good opponent misunderstood me. He represents me as teaching that the imparting of Spiritual power reduced persons to a lower condition than they were in before such powers were imparted. Poor, honest, ignorant, good soul that he is. How his ignorance and lack of sense is to be pitied; but then so good a person must be honest in it. Because I claim that a man who has completed his studies and is no longer under teacher's supervision, is superior to his condition under teachers, of course I teach that when his parents took him from his condition before he had teachers, and put him under teachers, they put him in a lower condition than he was before he had any teachers. Because I say that our condition under our completed constitution is better than when the constitutional convention was in session, of course, I teach that when the people set that convention to work, they put themselves in a much lower condition than they were in before they set it at work.

Because I assert that the world is in a higher condition now, when creation has been completed and it is under the operation of natural law, than when God was bringing animals and plants into existence by miracle or direct creation, of course I teach that when God changed the world from chaos to the beginning of his course of creation he reduced it to an inferior condition. So good a soul as my opponent must be honest in all this. If so, his stolidity is to be pitied. No doubt he was honest, the good soul that he is, in representing me as teaching that the direct and immediate influence of the Spirit led to folly, impurity, crime, and polygamy. I said that such an

influence was not exerted now—could not be received now; that men mistook their own frenzies for such influence, and gave loose reins to their heated frenzies and passions, and *that* had given to the world such abominations. No doubt so good a man, with such a religious spirit, was honest in that outrageous falsification of my language. I never said that the Book of Mormon taught polygamy. It does leave the door open for it. But, good, honest soul, he is mistaken in that. I said that a pretence to a direct influence of the spirit led to that lying revelation. I said Ananias was a special apostle. An apostle is one who is sent. Ananias was sent by the Holy Spirit to do a special work. If it were his usual prerogative to impart the Holy Spirit, why did the Holy Spirit by miracle tell him that he could and should do such a work? Ananias said, "The Holy Spirit has sent me to you that you may be filled with the Holy Spirit." I will accept all cases of such persons who by miracle or direct revelation have been sent to do a certain work. Has he found any other? The very fact that God had to speak to Ananias and give him authority to do this work, proves that none but an apostle could do it. Paul declares that the gift of God that was in Timothy was by the laying of hands. He speaks of a gift that was in Timothy that was given by prophecy by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. If the gift was different, Paul imparted the miraculous power and the Presbytery did not impart any miraculous power, for Paul had already done that. They set him apart to his work as Saul and Barnabas were set apart.

We give more proof that only an apostle could impart the Holy Spirit.

Galatians, 3-5. "He that supplies to you the Spirit, and works powers in you, does he do it by works of law, or by the message of the faith?" II Cor. 12-12. "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you, in all patience in signs and wonders and in mighty power." Rom. 15-19. "I will not dare to speak of anything, save these that Christ wrought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders—in the power of the Spirit of God." Rom. 1-11. For I long to see you that I may impart unto you some spiritual gift to the end that you may be established." From these Scriptures we learn: I. There were those that supplied the Holy Spirit, and worked in the saints miraculous powers. II. That Paul or an apostle alone could do this. III. That the power to impart these spiritual gifts, miraculous powers, was the sign of apostleship. With this accords the declaration in Acts viii: 18, "The Holy Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostle's hands." This declaration, that the Holy Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostle's hands settles the matter. He never was given in any other way.

We will now move on to the real battleground, Eph. iv and I Cor. xii, xiii. In

Eph. iv we read that when Christ ascended he gave gifts unto men. We are agreed that these gifts were miraculous powers. He gave men to the church to be apostles. Their work required miraculous power. It was constitution-making work, and it required constitution-making power. And he gave some men to the church to be prophets. Their work was miraculous. It was giving revelations, uttering the ideas of inspiration. He gave men to the church to be evangelists. Some of the evangelists, if not all, in that state of the church had miraculous power. It was needed in the state in which the church was then. He gave some men to the church to be shepherds and teachers. Some of the shepherds and teachers of the church in the state it was then in had miraculous power. They were needed in the state the church was then in. These miraculous powers were given for what purpose? "For the perfecting of the saints." The saints were to be perfected for what? "Unto the work of ministering." They ministered for what? "Unto the building up of the body of Christ, the church." The church was to grow up in all things into Christ, who is the head of the body, the church, "From whom all the body fitly framed and put together, through every joint of supply, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love." These miraculous powers were to perfect the saints for the work of ministering. They were to be perfect for building up of the church. Then the church was, by its own parts, joints and members to build itself up. This miraculous power was not to do it.

The constitutional convention is appointed to perfect the people for the work of organizing the body, the government. When that is done, then each part that the constitution ordains, the government that it ordains, builds up itself. The constitutional convention does not continue to build what it has already built and completed. Constitution-making and government-organizing are done. The man has reached his growth. The government now performs its functions as a perfect government. The man now performs his duties as man. He does not continue to grow or live as a minor under teachers. We will now go back and look at it again. These powers were given to the church, and were to perfect the Saints for the work of the ministry, and this ministry was the building up of the church. Common sense would say that when that was done the work was completed, and they would cease, just as when the constitution is perfected and the government organized under it, all constitution-making powers cease, having accomplished their work. So the Holy Spirit declares. It declares these miraculous powers, these constitution-making powers, were to do their work and exist, "until." There is a period before the "until," the constitution-making period. There is a period after "until," the period when the church is

under the perfect construction and perfectly organized in accordance with it. Until when? "Until we attain unto the unity of the faith," the word of God, until the constitution is completed, and "of the knowledge of the Son of God" through his completed gospel. Also "unto a full grown man," until the body of Christ has become a full grown man, until the government is completely organized under the completed constitution, the complete word of God. "Also unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." It is until that time. When that is accomplished these constitution-making powers cease. They exist until then. After that constitution-making powers cease, having accomplished their purpose. That takes that passage away from him.

If my opponent will divide the language at the "until" he will find that all miraculous, all constitution-making power was before it. After the "until" there is no miraculous or constitution-making power. It has accomplished its purpose. The constitution declares miraculous or constitution-making power exists "until" it has made the constitution, and the government is organized under it. Then it ceases, having accomplished its purpose. My opponent absurdly contends that because he finds constitution-making power before the "until" while it was making the constitution, it must exist after the "until" when it has completed its work in completing the constitution, and the government has been completed in accordance with the constitution. His own passage is fatal to his absurd position. His position is a flat contradiction of all sense and all teaching of the Scriptures. Cannot he understand that the period before the "until" and the one after it, between the constitution-making period and the one when it has ceased are different.

We come now to his last struggle. God had imparted to the Corinthian church nine miraculous gifts and set nine miraculous powers in the church. The Corinthians erred not in each one wanting to exercise all gifts, as he falsely asserts; but in each one thinking that his one gift was better than all other gifts; and for that reason he should be the chief one and the one most honored in the church. The apostle beautifully illustrates the church and the exercise of these powers by the human body and its members, and shows that all are essential and all should be honored alike. He did not approve of Mormon hierarchy of a score of officers from president down. The Corinthians erred also in regarding these Spiritual gifts as the great end of the religion of Christ. Paul exposes that error also. He says, "But desire earnestly the greater gifts, and a more excellent way I will show unto you." My opponent, through ignorance no doubt, for so honest and good a soul would not do it wilfully, represents the apostle as saying that he had shown unto them a more excellent way than for each one to exercise all gifts. As the Corinthians had each but

one gift and had never dreamed of exercising any other, for each thought the gift he had far above all other gifts, the apostle did not warn them against what they had not dreamed of, and he did not show them a more excellent way than a way that never had existed, could not exist, and they had never dreamed could exist. My honest, pious opponent blundered grievously in that falsification of the apostles language.

Next he innocently, good, pious soul that he is, transposes the members of the sentence and violates all grammar and sense and has not a manuscript or a scholar in the world to sustain him. Blatantly forbid such transposition. Finally he heaps the climax of his pious honest falsifications of the language by changing the tense from "I show you," into "I have shown you," making it refer to what the apostle has said before, and not to what he is about to say; as the truth of the case declares can be his only meaning. So good a soul as my opponent would not do this wilfully. No doubt he is honest and did it innocently, ignorantly. If through ignorance how great is that ignorance. But when we open our Bibles and discards his falsifications, it still reads, "Desire earnestly the greater gifts and a more excellent way I show unto you." More excellent than what? As the way he had just mentioned was the exercise of the greatest Spiritual gifts, the more excellent must be some other way than the exercise of the greatest Spiritual gifts. Common sense will allow no other interpretation. The fact that the Corinthians regarded Spiritual gifts as the great end of the Gospel proves that Paul meant that. He denounces that idea as an error, by declaring that there was a more excellent way than the exercise of the best of these gifts. That such was his meaning the sentences immediately following show. He declares all gifts are worthless unless they aid in producing Christian love, Christian character. He then enters into a eulogy on Christian character, and declares the great purpose of the gospel is to produce that; and anything that does not do that is worthless. Spiritual gifts are worthless unless they do that. Having thus exposed this error in making spiritual gifts the end, instead of only a means to a higher end, he explains the only way of producing Christian character, the way that is better than the exercise of the best spiritual gifts. He declares prophesying, the prophesying of which he spoke in the xii chap., all speaking by inspiration; all knowledge, the knowledge, the revelations of which he spoke in the xii chapter; all tongues the signs of which he spoke in the xii chap., all the spiritual gifts of which he spoke in the xii chapter, shall be done away, cease. The more excellent way than the exercise of the greatest spiritual gifts is a state of the church in which they will be done away. He says this prophesying, this knowledge, these revelations of which you think so much, are only partial, a fragment, a part of God's word. When that is completed,

or when the perfect word of God has come, these partial revelations will cease, being no longer needed for the church will be in that more excellent way having a complete word, instead of a partial revelation, a fragment of it. That is plain common sense. Just what the language means. The apostle goes back to his figure of the human body used in the xii chapter. In the xii chapter he uses a body. In the xiii he uses his own body, illustrates and personifies the church with his own body. He says just as I perceived as a child, thought as a child, when I was a child, so the church, now under these spiritual gifts, perceives, thinks and speaks as a child. And just as I put away child's things when I became a man, so the church will put away these childish things, these partial revelations under these spiritual gifts, when it becomes a man, having the completed word of God.

Under these spiritual gifts the church sees as in a mirror darkly, its knowledge is only partial, and a fragment at a time; but when the word of God is completed it will see what it ought to be, the image will be perfect, and it will know what it ought to be, as God knows what it ought to be. The partial and complete do not refer to the church before Christ's second coming and its condition afterwards. There is not a hint of such an idea in the whole context. It refers to two states of the church under the apostles. One was the state under spiritual gifts which were partial in their revelations. The other and more excellent state, was when the word of God, revelations were not partial, but perfect in God's word, when gifts would cease, having accomplished their purpose, and being no more needed.

MR. KELLEY'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My opponent seems much worried over my exposition of the language, "Yet show I unto you a more excellent way." He could take up a plain and positive passage like that of Jesus in John 3: 5, and try to translate for you. But when I interpret according to other Bible passages this sentence which shows upon the face of it that there is a mistake somewhere, he thinks I am outside of my province entirely. Now such a position as that is too frivolous to take up any time with argument.

There are many passages in the New Testament which require an interpretation, by reason of something being left out or put in the Bible manuscripts which were copied from the original. It is the true minister's province to interpret these so as to agree with and not contradict any other part of the Bible. And a rule of interpretation laid down by a distinguished Bible critic is: "To bring all scripture bearing upon the point in controversy together, and if you thus form no contradiction you are right."

Take the passage in John: "No man hath seen God at any time."

I turn back to Exodus 24: 9 & 10, and read that "Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in

its clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink."

This passage in John upon its face then raises a question of explanation. And the evident reason is, that the qualifying clause has been omitted by the transcriber at some time. It is not difficult from all the passages bearing upon this to tell what it was, however.

Take the language again of Jesus, "All who ever came before me are thieves and robbers." Why, John came before him, and was not. The true explanation is to be made: "All who came before me (who testified not of me) are thieves and robbers."

Again, "Whosoever is born of God *cannot* sin."

It is a flat contradiction of the Hebrew letter.

"Whosoever is born of God (will not continue) in sin."

Thus with the text, "Yet show I unto you a more excellent way."

The thought at once springs to the mind the question, was Paul to give these saints at Corinth a new order of instruction in church government and the uses and blessings of the spiritual gifts to what he had then written, and to what he gave the saints at Ephesus and the church of Jerusalem? Hence, comes in the work of the minister of Christ to teach and instruct. The Eunuch said, "How can I (understand it) except some man should guide me." Acts 8: 31. And

the man must be instructed and sent of the Lord who guides, or he will not guide aright. Theological schools and institutes of learning are all good in their place, but they can no more supply the place of the Holy Spirit in leading the mind and take the place of the true guide, than they can supply the place of the work of the Holy Spirit upon the mind and heart. But it is as Paul says, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? How shall they hear without a preacher? And *how can he preach except he be sent.*" Sent of God and duly authorized. Keep this before the people.

He claims now that he did not divide up the Holy Spirit, but only divided its work. Why did he use the term "Miraculous Holy Spirit," indwelling Holy Spirit," etc., for then? "Indwelling Holy Ghost and Miraculous Holy Ghost." They are not my terms. I claim the Holy Spirit to be only such, whatever the form, and whatever the administration, in fact, whether of indwelling, sealing, adopting or confirming, it is in all instances inspiring and miraculous. The Holy Ghost to man is miraculous in all of its manifestations. I still say, Mr. Braden, that you made an unwarranted and incorrect division and distinction, and one that is calculated to deceive.

Again he reflects that the Book of Mormon is the cause of polygamy.

Mr. Braden: I did not say the Book of Mormon taught polygamy.

Mr. Kelley: You made the argument last night that polygamy was the outgrowth of it. You will not be permitted to misrepresent me before this audience on the polygamy question, sir. If the Book of Mormon does not teach it, nor the Saints, whom I have the honor to represent, believe in it, as they do not, why do you persist in bringing it into your argument? We are now upon the question of your church, its faith, teaching, etc. What has that to do with polygamy? I understand the object of your references to this.

My opponent drops apostles and prophets from the church for the reason, he says, that they were placed in it for the purpose of "perfecting"—giving us the constitution. But he also drops out all the spiritual gifts, or gifts through the Spirit: "The word of wisdom," "knowledge," "faith," "gifts of healing," "working of miracles," "prophecy," "discerning of spirits," "divers kinds of tongues" and the interpretation of tongues; these include pretty much all that was calculated to beautify, enlighten, adorn, develop and purify the church, excepting the gifts of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers which he has excluded. These other gifts were not given for the perfecting of the constitution, he will hardly claim either; and since they were not, will he tell this audience why his church drops them? Or is it for the wise reason which is sometimes given, "Because they are no longer needed?"

But again he demands that I must show

that some one has the Holy Spirit now, that brings things to his mind, or it is plain that it is not needed. But the question is not does any one enjoy the Spirit now, but does Mr. Braden's church correspond with the church of Christ as described in the New Testament. The Saints enjoyed it then, and the promise was to all if they would keep all his commandments. Miraculous gifts, he says, were to continue until the one faith was completed, or the word "perfected." The word, the gospel, was perfect when preached by Peter, yet Paul received his knowledge of it by revelation, and he concluded that it was so absolutely perfect, that he said, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other let him be accursed, or if any man preach any other, let him be accursed." Gal. 1:8. The gospel was perfect then; called by James the perfect law of liberty; yet the church was in the highest state of spiritual enjoyment at the same time, and always would have continued thus had there not been a falling away and the Christians turned heathen again and had only a dead form left.

Let us see how many times the law has been made perfect and complete according to Mr. Braden's ideas of perfection. Far back in Moses' time it was not to be added to. Deut. 4:2. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." Did he mean to close up the avenues of inspiration and shut God out of the world? Ps 19:7: "The law of the law is perfect, converting the soul." This was more than a thousand years before the birth of Christ. Shall we discard all that was given afterwards because perfect then? That is the argument of my opponent and his church. Jesus says, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Here it is again: "Teaching them to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you.*"

This was said in the year 33 of the Christian era. But because of it shall we reject the other writings which were made 10, 20, 30, 40, 50 and more than 60 years afterwards? All of the epistles of Peter, John, James, Jude, Paul and the revelations? What an absurd predicament my opponent has placed himself in. He sends these persons out as constitution makers. But Jesus sends them as publishers of his commandments only. Jesus says, "My doctrine is not mine but his that sent me." "The Father which sent me he gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." Here is where we find the framer of the Constitution. It was God, the Eternal Father, and in the different ages he sent forth his servants into the world to publish this Constitution and teach it to the people, but these servants the people killed and would not hear. Then he sent his Son with

the message, saying: "They will reverence my son;" but they called him an impostor, a fraud, collected all the lies they could scrape up which they told about him; charged him with being a "deceiver" and an enemy to the government and put him to death. They did not want him making constitution for them, as they called it, they had enough constitution, they claimed Moses and the prophets. Don't want any more constitution. "We know that God spoke to Moses, but as for this man we know not from whence he is." Afterwards as Paul says: (God again) "Committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech you by us." Why! How Paul does differ from Braden? Instead of being a constitution maker, Paul says he was only an "ambassador," a messenger, agent, one sent to instruct in and urge obedience to the law, or constitution, and not to make laws and constitution.

But the people were not content with the death of the Son, the heir, but, see Acts 6th, they determined to put down all others who claimed to be preachers of the word; they therefore opened a discussion with Stephen, selecting the best men they had in their synagogues to carry on the discussion on their side; but, (verse 10), "they were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he (Stephen) spoke." What did they do then? Let every man think for himself and show a willingness for the principles of truth to triumph? No, that would have been too Christlike; verse 11. "Then they suborned men which said, we have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God. And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes and came upon him, and caught him and brought him to the council. And set up false witnesses which said, this man ceaseeth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law. For we have heard him say," (such and such things). Was not that a pretty way to do Stephen after they had agreed to discuss their differences and abide the issue from what was written in their law? Which side there, my friends, showed that it was willing to abide by the faith as set forth in God's word, and which showed a greediness for the falsehoods and stories? I ask my opponent here, to answer? But after they bring in their stories they permit Stephen again to answer, and he begins citing them to the law and testimony as written in their Bible, (the Old Testament Scriptures), appealing to that to prove his cause, and as he proceeds, the Spirit of God is sent forth to aid him, so that it is perceptibly felt and realized by the entire audience, and his appeals to the law and the testimony of Moses and the prophets is so powerful and cutting because of their hypocrisies, false manner of attack and evil works, that they get so mad they will endure it no longer, and so determined to get rid of him another way, and rushed upon him with stones and clubs and mercilessly beat him to death, although

he had shown in his work that he possessed the true spirit that belonged to the law of God from the first. He stood upon the doctrine of appealing to the law in fairness. Not to the stories told, or violent means. Now, I will hurriedly read to you a sketch of the manner the Disciples (Campbellites) met and vanquished the Saints, at Hiram over here, where they have the Restored Church, in 1831, from their own history. History of the Disciples in the Western Reserve, page 220:

"Perhaps in no place except Kirtland did the doctrines of the Latter Day Saints gain a more permanent footing than in Hiram. It intruded itself there so strong that its leaders felt assured of the capture of the town. Rigdon's former popularity in that region gave wings to their appeal, and many people, not avowed converts, were under a spell of wonder at the strange things sounded in their ears. "To give particulars of the Mormon excitement in 1831 would require a volume. A few words must suffice. It has been stated that from the year 1815 to 1835, a period of twenty years, all sorts of doctrines by all sorts of preachers had been plead, and most of the people of Hiram had been disposed to turn out and hear. This went by the specious name of 'liberal.' The Mormons at Kirtland, being informed of this particular state of things, were soon prepared for the onset."

I call your attention particularly to the appeals made by the Saints, then, as set out by their enemies, in behalf of their religion. There was no fraud or deception in this—no fear manifest of meeting the issues honorably. As men advocating principles which they believed to be true, wherever they found a place where they would be permitted to compare their views with others, as the saints of old, they gladly accepted the opportunity. However, they were not always met with the same godlike way of working, as you will soon see from this Campbellite historian. He continues:

"In the winter of 1821, Joseph Smith with others had an appointment in the South school-house in Hiram. Such was the apparent piety, sincerity and humility of the speakers, that many of the hearers were greatly affected, and thought it impossible that such preachers should lie in wait to deceive."

"During the next spring and summer several converts were made, and their success seemed to indicate an immediate triumph in Hiram.*** Accordingly a company was formed by citizens from Shalersville, Garrettsville and Hiram, in March, 1832, and proceeded to headquarters in the darkness of the night, and took Smith and Rigdon from their beds and tarred and feathered them both and let them go. This had the desired effect, which was to get rid of them."

What a grand spread Braden made last night over the success, as he termed it, of the elders of the Campbellite church meeting the Saints when other denominations could not do so! Oh, no! But they knew just how to do it. They circulated around among the people in an underhanded way false stories and all manner of lies against the Saints, and appealed to the prejudices of their poorly-instructed followers, and in this heathenish way raised a mob and "got rid of them." Was this a "restored" feature in Mr. Campbell's church? one taken from these Pharisees who stoned Stephen to death? I have never yet seen in their publications where they denounced it, neither have I ever heard one of their preachers publicly do so. How is it with my opponent? Do you denounce the outrage thus perpetrated by your members or approve it? Do you defend freedom of con-

science and of speech, and a trial of the religious issues in a polemic encounter, or do you urge persons, as in the case of the Jews against Stephen, and the Campbellites and others against Smith and Rigdon, to use against men who oppose you the carnal weapons possible?

Will you answer the question to this audience? But I will continue the line of my argument upon the "perfect law." Paul to Timothy: "From a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation!" 2 Tim. 3:15. Why, here Paul finds enough to make a man wise unto salvation in the Old Testament; the New, was not yet written. He called it "the Holy Scriptures." Shall we then say, Since you had enough Paul, you had better stop the inspiration bureau, and thus cut out all of the New Testament? Paul again says, Rom., first Chapt., as early as the year A. D. 60: "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed." Is revealed in the year 60; and yet, the New Testament writers go on revealing and talking by inspiration for nearly forty years after. Take James 1:25. This was written in the year 60, also: "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty and continueth therein," etc. Did he mean a complete law? Let us see. Read by substituting the word complete: "Whoso looketh into the (complete) law of liberty,"—this changes the idea and does violence to the wisdom of God. It is the perfect law, in the same way as the Psalmist spoke of the perfect law; but being such, it does not cut off all of God's perfect law, written after this time. Take up the text that he is willing to stand on, so he says: And I will say here that he has been hunting about like a man lost at sea for something to hang to, ever since the discussion began and never found that which would satisfy him till last night. Here it is, 2 Peter, 1:3: "According as his divine power hath given unto us *all things* that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue."

I shall try to examine his strong text, fairly and impartially. Does it mean that Christ has spoken all that is ever needful for man to know and that there is to be no more revelation, prophecy, divine instruction from this date? "Hath given," the apostle says: "Not, *is giving or going to give*, but 'hath given!'" Notwithstanding he had then given, we had written afterwards: Paul's 2nd epistle to Timothy, the three epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, the Book of Revelations, and John's gospel. Then he did not mean that all that God wanted to say, to the human family had been said and there was to be no more inspiration? Certainly not. Such a thought would have appalled the inspired Peter. What did he mean? Just what he said, "Hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." What are the things that pertain unto life and godliness. 1st, the Comforter; "If I go away I will send

him, and he will guide you into all truth?" This then pertains to life and godliness. "This is eternal life that they might know then the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." How can they attain to this? Answer, by the means ordained to lead to life and godliness. The inspiration of the Holy Spirit. See Paul's letter: "No man can say (know) that Jesus is the Christ but by the Holy Ghost." This is the principle upon which Jesus said "I will build my church." Not begin to build, remember; he had already begun, but was to continue building, and is yet building; and he says, "I will build," upon the principle of immediate and direct revelation. Hence, Paul says, "After I heard of your faith I ceased not to give thanks that He would give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him."

This principle was the great and crowning one of the all things that pertained to life and godliness, and without it, Christ's church was not, nor could not have been builded. Will you discard it then? Now, Mr. Braden, let us hear from you on your strong text which you are willing to rest your case upon.

I next call your attention to his blunder on Mark ix:1. "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." Here is another of his strong pillars; he rests his case here again.

No difference to him that Jesus had said to the Pharisees "the Kingdom of God is within [among] you," and that "from the days of John the Baptist it had suffered violence," and that men then "pressed into it;" it was only on Pentecost it came with power, and that is the time he says, this was fulfilled in Mark ix:1. "There be some standing here who shall not taste death." Well, it was a pretty large sum if he referred to Pentecost, for all of them were there except Judas Iscariot. Yet the language is "There be *some*." What did Jesus refer to? I answer, to the coming of himself in his kingdom, in power and great glory. Was that on Pentecost? No. He did not so come then as predicted here. Did any of them see it? Yes. Who? Answer, Peter, James and John. Begin with the second verse of the same chapter: "After six days Jesus taketh with him Peter, James and John and leadeth them up into an high mountain apart by themselves; and he was transfigured before them." Jesus is transformed, changed, so that his countenance did "shine as the light." This is the time for the introduction of important evidence in the church. There are to be witnesses to something else than the mere reinstating of the church on earth; it is for the establishment of the promise, that Jesus will come *again* in his kingdom, in "*power and great glory*."

Hence, he takes his chosen three witnesses,—all were not permitted to see him even of the twelve; only three witnesses behold this grandest of all things in hope and promise to the human family. They

are overcome with its splendor, grandeur and power; Moses and Elias appear, the voice of God is heard verifying the truthfulness of the event, and the prophecies are truly confirmed. Afterwards the world through the witnesses is permitted to know of a surety of the coming of the Kingdom of God in power. Then, does the statement refer to the setting up of the kingdom on "Pentecost day? No, sir. Turn to the description of the event and testimony by Peter himself. Second Peter, 1:16. "For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honor and glory when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

When did the event of witnessing this glory and power of Jesus coming in his Kingdom with the just of earth take place? See verse 18: "And this voice which came from heaven we heard when we were with him in the Holy mount."

Here then is the fulfillment of Mark ix: 1, as declared by Peter himself, and it was not on Pentecost day. So another pillar has gone from under Braden's church.

Again, they are the "royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people," he says. All kings and priests. No queens among them. But you cannot touch a Disciple without coming in contact with a king and priest. The other evening, however, he hooted at the idea of any one having the royal, or Melchizedek priesthood. Christ was the last of the line, and he entered into the vail, and was their prophet, priest and king. Now, he says, all are priests and kings; and yet not a sign of Priesthood. No, no; only such impostors as "Joe Smith," he says, "claim such things," and he says, "if I have proven him an impostor I have a right to call him one." Yes, and if he has not proven any such thing (and truly he has not even bordered on to proving it), he has no right to use the expression; but to the priesthood question.

I can see how Peter could speak of the church then, as a "chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." Because they were chosen of God by his Spirit for their work; called by inspiration. The church was built up "an habitation of God through the Spirit." All were in the bonds by virtue of the love of God shed abroad in the heart. They were in possession of the royal, or Melchizedek priesthood, and conferred it; hence, the right of ordination and conferring of something. As Jesus was sent, so he sent the apostles, and he was made a priest after the order of Melchizedek, the royal line. I can see all this, but where does it harmonize with a church with no one sent; no priesthood; no Holy Ghost; no habitation of God through the spirit?

But, he says, he gets his in Revelations, 1:6 and 5:10: "And hath made us kings and priests unto our God." When are they?

Now? Read on, "and we shall reign on the earth." What! reign and minister before the kingdom is conferred? Can you enter upon your work in the priest, or kingly office before you have received your authority? Paul was chosen when Jesus first met him in the way; but long afterwards he was authorized and set apart by the instruction of the Holy Spirit for the special duties of a minister. But they are all kings and priests in Mr. Braden's church now. No authority *can* be conferred. They are all away up at the top of the ladder. Let us see further. Revelations, 20:6. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." Shall reign with Christ if they have part in the first resurrection. And this is why they are called kings and priests. But our Campbellite friends have the cart before the horse, and are reigning and ministering before the time of the resurrection and the thousand years. Does not this prove Mr. Campbell a restorer? And remember, my friends, that these disciples are not heirs, simply. There are no princes even among them. They are kings and priests now, according to Braden, and have, therefore, entered upon their inheritances, and we must look out, for *they are reigning*.

He says again, that an event that always attends preaching is no confirmation. This is a mistake. Preaching is just as edifying once a week as twice a year. The enjoyment of the Spirit is just as comforting and confirming received every day, and more so, than but once a year; or, as the Disciples have it, never. The confirming of Peter and John did not answer for Paul. He required a similar confirmation, as do all the children of God. It is not an impeachment of the word to require the manifestation of the Spirit, or new revelation, for the word of God no where forbids it. "I will give you line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little"—as God wills—is the thought expressed in the revelation of his word. But Mr. Braden's position is: Bar on God, and Christ, and angels, and the Holy Spirit. If you wish to know anything about these things, just read what Paul said he knew about such things, and that will be all sufficient. Is this a correct one? No, never. Every child of God needs, and is entitled to, the revelation of the Spirit to him or herself, that they may have the testimony of Jesus and attain to the knowledge of God. "This is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent." "No one can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." But he says, there are two states of the church represented. One under the gifts, the other without them, and that the church without the gifts is the more excellent one. Let us see: In First Corinthians, 12, Paul likens the church unto the body of a man, and says:

"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." Verse 12. "For the body is not one member but many; if the foot shall say, 'Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body, is it therefore, not of the body? If the ear shall say because I am not the eye I am not of the body, is it therefore, not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set every one of the members in the body as it hath pleased him. Now there are many members, but one body.'"

Paul goes on to tell what he means by this illustration as applied to the church. He says, "and God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments and diversities of tongues." The apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, tongues, interpretations, &c., were to the church what eyes, hearing, tasting, smelling, hands and feet are to the body of a man.

The perfect man with eyes and ears and mouth and tasting and smelling, hands and feet, &c., represents the true church of Christ as set out by Paul. But Mr. Braden says, "This perfect man did not represent the highest state of the church; that this is Paul in infancy playing with toys; but the perfect church, or full grown man, and higher developed church came after." Then it would be appropriately represented by a man who has no eyes, nor ears, nor mouth, nor smelling, nor hands, nor feet. Hence the Campbellites gouge out Paul's man's eyes, (apostles), and tear off his ears, (prophets), deprive him of smelling and tasting, close up his mouth, against interpretations, cut off his hands and feet, (helps and governments inspired of God), and then present their blind, deaf, dumb and maimed man to the world and mount the old Christian constitution with an assumption claim that they "stand on the Bible and the Bible alone," and swear in their wrath that they have restored Paul's man to life,—that the old church has come again. Paul's was full of light, and hope; could see, and hear, and smell, and taste, and walk, and work, and grow in grace and the knowledge of the Lord; but theirs is the more excellent one, Braden says. He is blind, and deaf, and dumb; cannot walk or use his hands, and has no life or sense. What a similarity indeed, there is between these two churches! What a restorer Mr. Campbell must have been!! They go on and argue that the seeing man was to be done away, but the blind, and deaf one, was to be continued,—not done away.

My friends, Paul's child church is the church of Christ on earth, seeing and knowing in part by the aid of prophecy and tongues, and all other spiritual gifts; and the full grown, or perfected state of the church, will be, when a full knowledge is revealed, when Christ is come,—when "we shall know as we are known and see as we are seen." Then that through which only a part could be revealed will be done away. Paul did not convey the thought that another church would arise that would eclipse in glory the one which he set forth, and which he labored to build up, which

might appropriately be illustrated by a blind, deaf, mute, lifeless, man. No, never thought of such a thing. But, that the church established on earth with authority, power, and gifts as the means by which it should be built up and guided would, at some time, be ushered into the full glory of Christ and this time was at *his coming*; and that all partial gifts not essential to that age of light and perfect knowledge and glory would be done away. It is plain enough for even a wayfaring man to see.

But Braden goes on and tries to make out that the gospel never was preached in fact until the day of Pentecost. In order to support this assumption he proceeds to divide the gospel into several parts, and has the gospel in prospect, and the gospel in process, and the gospel in fact; but where does he get the gospel of prospect and the gospel of process? Not in the Bible. With all the revelations of ancient and modern days, it was left for the Campbellites to reveal the gospel of prospect and process. Christ is the central figure of the gospel, and it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. This was true before the days of Christ's earthly ministry as it was after. The only difference is, the saints in the olden time believed that he would come, and the saints now believe that he has come. Jesus' existence was just as much a reality before the time that he was born of a virgin as it was after. He was as "a lamb slain from before the foundation of the world." "Before Abraham was, I am," says Christ. He was in the church in the wilderness. Christ was so truly known, and the gospel so really preached in olden times, that Job exclaims, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," and after that skin worms had destroyed his body (or after the resurrection), standing upon the earth, in the latter days in his flesh he should see God. "Immortality and eternal life is brought to light by the gospel." Immortality and a perpetuity of light is not revealed or attained through any system but the gospel. In it Enoch's hope was founded, and he looked forward and saw Christ coming with ten thousand of his saints. But this is the gospel of process, according to Mr. Braden, as the event has not transpired as yet. Enoch had the gospel just the same as Paul preached; knew of Christ, and was made partaker of the powers of the world to come because of his faith in God, which is one of the first principles. Heb. 6:1, "The gospel was preached to Abraham," and he became the father of the faithful. So all that are saved through the gospel are to be saved with faithful Abraham. Nothing is said about a gospel in prospect, process, or in fact. Abraham heard and understood the gospel, which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." It was preached to the Israelites in the wilderness, but they would not abide by it, and God added the "schoolmaster," (the law of Moses), which did not make the comers thereunto perfect. It was a "yoke too hard for us or our fath-

ers to bear," says Peter. The old iron yoke is one thing, and the gospel of liberty understood by Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and presented to the Israelites, is another thing. The Israelites rejected the gospel, just as they rejected God when they chose to have a king. But let us come a little nearer home. "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God," Mark 1:14. Again, "And Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom," Matt. 4:23. But, says Braden, "this was in process, or prospect." But Matthew and Mark say nothing about process, or prospect, or fact. That was left for the Disciples to add to the Bible. Gospel was gospel with Matthew and Mark, whether preached before, on, or after Pentecost. It was all the same with inspired men. But Disciples do not want any gospel until Pentecost; if so, it will have to be modified a little with process, or prospect, or fact. That was a great day with the Campbellites as old men dreamed dreams and young men saw visions, the sun was turned into darkness and the moon into blood, and Joel's prophecy was limited to those on whom the apostles laid their hands, while the kingdom came in its glory. But this is Disciple theory only. Jesus said, "The kingdom of God is within (among) you," before Pentecost day. Paul says, "The kingdom of God is not in word, but in

power." Jesus was advocating its claims and preaching its principles, and men and women were obeying just as truly and really before as they ever did after Pentecost day. "So John came into all the country about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," Luke 3:3. "Thou shalt give knowledge of salvation unto his people by the remission of sins," Luke 1:77. Here John is preaching the knowledge of salvation. Paul says, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation." John was preaching the gospel. No wonder "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," Mark 1:4. "Then went out unto him all Jerusalem, and all Judea, and the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him, confessing their sins," Matt. 3:5, 6. Or, as stated elsewhere, "for the remission of sins." What is the use for men to say, then, who pretend to believe the Bible, that the first gospel sermon in fact was preached on Pentecost. Faith in the Savior was taught by all of the prophets; repentance and baptism for the remission of sins were universally conceded to be right; so that John never had a single controversy with the Jews on this question. Baptism of the Holy Spirit was taught. So much for the prospect, and process, and fact gospel.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Does the constitution of the church of Christ ordain that miraculous powers shall cease out of the church? We announced in our opening speech on the first proposition that this question is the central idea of the discussion, this is the vital issue of the debate. If my opponent can show that miraculous powers were to remain in the church, he has a basis for his claim for the inspiration of Smith, and that the Book of Mormon is a revelation, and that his organization can possess these miraculous powers. This would only, however, raise the real issue. Was Smith inspired? Was the Book of Mormon a revelation? Does his organization possess these powers? Proving that a thing is possible does not prove that it really exists. That is a question of fact and not of possibility. If we prove that miraculous powers were to cease out of the church, we prove that they cannot exist now, and that the claim that Joseph Smith was inspired—that the Book

of Mormon is a revelation—that Latter Day Saints possess miraculous powers, is an utter impossibility. I propose now to do this so thoroughly as to leave no room for cavil. There is no dispute over certain facts. I. There is a Divine person, the Holy Spirit. II. That he inspired all that the Bible declares spoke, wrote or acted by inspiration from Adam to Malachi. III. He inspired all who spoke, wrote or acted by inspiration from John the Baptist till the last one died to whom an apostle had imparted spiritual power by the imposition of his hands. IV. That he was promised by Joel and other prophets—that he should be poured out in a wonderful manner at the beginning of the Christian dispensation. V. That he was promised in baptism by John and Jesus. VI. That Jesus promised him as the Comforter to his apostles. VII. That Peter promised him to all whom the Lord should call. VIII. That Jesus promised him in his last commission, in miraculous power, to all of his apostles who should

believe and preach the Gospel. IX. That he was given in baptism on the day of Pentecost and at the house of Cornelius. X. That he was imparted by the imposition of the apostles' hands, and existed in miraculous powers in the apostolic churches.

The issue is this: Do these promises extend to the church now? Does the Holy Spirit exert miraculous power now? My opponent first claimed that because the Holy Spirit exerted miraculous power once, he does now. We replied, that is no proof. Because God once exerted miraculous power in creation is no proof that he does now. He next claimed that because he was promised, and because it was prophesied that he would exert miraculous power, he does now. We replied, that is no proof. Because the prophets prophesied of Jesus and his work, and promised him, doesn't prove that he is on earth doing his work now. This drove him to the third position. That the promises and prophecies include the church during all ages, and that the church now possesses these miraculous powers. We took up the promise and history of the baptism in the Holy Spirit and proved that there were but two occasions of such baptism and that it cannot and does not exist now. Persons who claim it are as absurd in their talk as if they were to claim power to create by miracle. We took up the promise of the Comforter and proved that Jesus was giving his last lecture to his apostles before his death. He was about to leave them. But he would send the Comforter to take his place with the apostles, as he had been with the apostles. This Comforter would recall to the minds of the apostles what Jesus had said to the apostles. Jesus had left a work for the apostles to do. A work they finished, and no one can do it after the apostles died. The Comforter was to qualify the apostles to do their work, this work that Jesus left to the apostles alone, and that none but an apostle can do. Hence, he is not given as Comforter to any one now, for no one has the work to do that he, as Comforter, enabled the apostles to do. We have settled that issue.

We have now the issue on the miraculous power promised by Joel, Jesus and Peter, and that existed in the church. Joel's promise was to all flesh without limitation. Jesus limited his promise to believing apostles: His promise was to apostles who believed and preached the Gospel. Peter's promise was limited to those whom God should call. Joel, Jesus and Peter were proclaiming the same law. The Holy Spirit in Joel and Peter and the Word in Jesus do not contradict. As the time was ready for a more complete definition of the promise, when Jesus announced and limited the promise to believing apostles, so the time was ready for a still further definition of the promise, when the Holy Spirit in Peter defined and further limited it, and he limited it to those that God should call, and those alone. The sole issue now is: How did God call them? The Samaritans believed had been baptized, were pardoned,

had received the Spirit in his ordinary indwelling in all believers. The apostles had to come down and lay their hands on them, and *call* them before they could enjoy the promise of Joel and Peter. Saul of Tarsus believed and was baptized, but Ananias, a special apostle, sent for this purpose, and with power to work miracles and prove his divine authority, had to be sent to Saul and impart the Spirit by his hands. John's disciples at Ephesus were baptized. Then Paul laid hands on them and they displayed miraculous power of the Spirit. Timothy received the Holy Spirit as a miraculous gift by Paul's hands. Thus we show that the promise was limited to those that God called. And he never called them except by the imposition of an Apostle's hands. We have no instances of persons exercising these gifts when an apostle had not been with them to impart them. We have no instance that any but an apostle imparted them. We have no instance where they descended to a third person. An apostle was one who had seen Jesus. Then when the last one who had seen Jesus died, all power to impart these gifts ceased. When the last one to whom an apostle had imparted them by his hands died this miraculous power ceased. Here we might leave the matter: we have settled it historically but we will do more:

All of God's work is progressive in its character. All of his work has a purpose. This purpose determines. I. Time of beginning. II. The manner in which the work is conducted. III. How long it shall continue. IV. When it shall cease. The transgression determined the beginning of the revelation of the plan of redemption, contained in the Bible. The necessities of the work of revealing the plan of redemption determined the manner in which it was done, as recorded in the Bible. The object, the revelation of a perfect scheme of redemption, determined how long it should continue, until that was perfected. The perfection and completion of this plan of redemption determined when inspiration should cease. It ceased when the revelation of a completed plan of redemption was completed. Just as God created animals and plants by miraculous power, until he completed his work of creation in man, and then ceased creation by miracle, for he had completed the work of creation by miracle, and left the introduction of animals and plants to a higher law, the law of natural production; so when God had by miraculous power, in inspiration, completed the revelation of a scheme of redemption in the New Testament, he ceased miraculous power in inspiration, for such miraculous power had accomplished its work when the revelation of a plan of redemption was perfected. As he accomplishes all introduction of animals and plants by a higher law, natural production, so he accomplishes all results in salvation by a higher law, the operation of perfect divine truth, as recorded in the word of God. As God is in his higher law, natural production in

a higher sense than he was in miraculous power in creation; so he is in his word in a higher sense than he was in miraculous power. As miraculous creation was preparatory to natural law, so miraculous revelation and inspiration were preparatory to a higher law to the moral power of truth in God's word. One error we want to remove. As God's miraculous power in creation was not a part of the things created, but merely what produced them, and ceased when that work was completed, so miraculous power in inspiration was not a part of the things it produced, the word of God and the church; but what produced them, and ceased when it had done that work.

My opponent unwittingly admitted this when he used the constitution of the United States as an illustration of the New Testament. The illustration is a most appropriate one. The condition of settlements before England gave them charter governments corresponds to the antediluvian dispensation when God had individual followers but no organization. The condition under charter governments corresponds to the patriarchal dispensation, when God had families as the organizations. The condition under the Colonial Congress corresponds to the revolution, corresponds to the Mosaic dispensation, when there was a nation with whom God was dealing. The condition from the Day of Pentecost to the completion of the New Testament, and the completion of the organization of the church under it, corresponds to the condition from the recognition of our independence on through the forming of a confederacy under the Articles of Confederation, the calling of a constitutional convention, the framing of the constitution until the government was organized under it. The apostles were the constitution-making power. Christ gave the constitution through them. The apostles and those they ordained, and those to whom they gave miraculous gifts were the government under the Articles of Confederation. Miraculous power was constitution-making power and provisional power to rule the church during that provisional period. It supplied inspired teaching when an apostle was not present, and when one was, until the completed constitution, the New Testament was completed and the government constituted under it. Miraculous power was constitution-making power and not what was made a part of the constitution. It ceased when the constitution was made, as the constitutional convention ceased when the constitution was made.

My opponent argues that we need miraculous power now. As well say we need constitution-making powers; in the shape of a constitutional convention to be perpetual, and that it should be forever making constitution, when we have completed the constitution. He says we made the constitution the work of the apostles. We reply the work of God through the apostles, just as a constitution is a work of the people through their delegates. We do not remove God out of the church, any more

than we remove the people out of the government, when we claim that as the people now act through the constitution they have ordained, God acts through the constitution he has ordained, the New Testament. My opponent seems to think that the only way that God can act is through miraculous power. As well say that the only way that the people can act is through constitution-making power. As the people are acting through the constitution, in a higher sense, than they did when they were making the constitution, so God is acting in a higher sense, through his word, than when he was constitution-making through his miraculous power. We have now narrowed the question to what does the constitution ordain? Does the completed constitution of the church ordain miraculous powers as a part of the organization, the permanent form and powers of the church. It can do this in two ways. It can ordain officers whose powers are miraculous. Or it can ordain miraculous powers. My opponent claims that it has done both. We have examined all his proofs especially Eph. iv. I Cor. xii, xiii, xiv. But we will not review them and prove that they teach exactly the reverse of his claim. Eph. iv. Paul declares that in the constitution of the church there is provided, I. One God. II. One Lord. III. One Spirit. IV. One faith, the faith, the scriptures, the faith once delivered to the saints, and the completed constitution of the church. V. One baptism. VI. One hope. VII. One body, the completed church organization, organized under the completed constitution. VIII. One name. He says that when Christ ascended out of Hades, he led forth a multitude of captives, and when he ascended on high, to the right hand of his Father, he gave gifts unto men. This was done before the day of Pentecost. He gave to men who were his followers, some men to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, some to be shepherds, some to be teachers. It is freely conceded that the very office of apostle and prophet required miraculous powers in the day of the apostles. The questions are:—Do apostles, and prophets exist now? Does the completed constitution ordain them in the church? Does the constitution ordain miraculous powers to evangelists, shepherds and teachers? This is the real issue.

Because they existed or were given once does not prove their existence now. Because they were needed once does not prove that they are needed now. It is a question of fact. We object to the claim that they exist now. Apostles, prophets and miraculous powers were constitution-making powers, and ceased when the constitution was completed, and constitution-making ceased, because it was completed. The constitution declares it shall cease. It says these gifts—miraculous gifts—were given "for the perfecting of the Saints unto the work of the ministry," and were given "for the purpose of building up the body of Christ." The body of Christ is his church. They

were given for the purpose of building up, organizing this body, the church, and ceased when that was done, when the organization was completed. The apostle declares they were to exist "until we all came into the unity of the faith," the one faith, the faith delivered unto the Saints, the Scriptures. The "faith" means the Scriptures as it did above in verse 5, and it does in Jude; "the faith delivered unto the Saints." These were to continue until we came into the unity of the faith, into the one faith, until the word of God is completed. These gifts were given until we attain through the one faith to a perfect knowledge of the Son of God. Until we attain to a full grown man. This man is the one body Paul mentions above, the church. They are to continue until the church organization is completed. The constitution tells just how long they were to remain. It declares they were to cease when that was done. The constitution declares that they shall continue only until the constitution, the one faith, is completed, and the one body is organized under it.

We come now to the last passage of Scriptures, and one that settles the matter forever. I Cor. xii, xiii, xiv, Paul in these chapters points out certain errors of the Corinthians in regard to spiritual gifts. I. That they were the highest, the grandest, the especial things of the gospel. My opponent's error. II. That men were to be honored especially for them. III. Errors in using them. He tells us in the XII chapter God gave miraculous gifts as follows: I. Word of wisdom. II. Word of knowledge. III. Faith. IV. Gifts of healing. V. Working of powers. VI. Prophecy. VII. Power to discern spirits. VIII. Power to speak in unknown and different tongues. IX. Power to interpret these unknown and different tongues. In the latter part of the chapter he tells us that by giving these miraculous gifts, God has set in the church—I. Apostles. II. Prophets. III. Teachers. IV. Powers. V. Gifts of healing. VI. Helps. VII. Wise counsels. VIII. Those who speak with tongues. IX. Those who interpret tongues. He then corrects their error in each one, claiming that his gift was best, and that he should be honored above all other possessors of gifts. He does it by the beautiful figure of the human body and its organs. He then corrects their error, the error of my opponent that spiritual gifts, on which they prided themselves, were the highest, greatest and especial features of the religion of Christ. He says "desire earnestly the best spiritual gifts" now while they are needed, "but nevertheless I show unto you a more excellent way" than the exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts. That is his meaning. The thing he has been discussing is the exercise of these gifts. He says desire the best of them while this is the way, but I will show unto you a more excellent way than the highest exercise of the best of these spiritual gifts. Observe, then, that Paul says there is a more excellent way than the highest exer-

cise of the best of these spiritual gifts. In this he differs from Mormons, that regard these spiritual gifts as the highest, the greatest element of the religion of Christ, in fact as the religion of Christ.

Paul unfolds this more excellent way. He declares that Christian love, Christian spirit and character are the aim of the Gospel, as he says to Timothy that "the end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, and unfeigned faith." All gifts, all things are worthless unless they produce Christian love, and are valuable only as they produce it. Miraculous power itself cannot do this, for as we have showed, it is not a moral influence. It produces no moral change. Paul after declaring that spiritual gifts are worthless unless they produce Christian love, Christian spirit and character, unfolds the more excellent way (than the best spiritual gifts) to produce Christian love. As they can produce it only as they reveal truth, that alone can produce it; the more excellent way is a perfect revelation of the truth that alone can produce Christian love. Paul declares Christian love, Christian spirit and character are to remain for ever, and that what will produce them best will remain for ever. He declares all prophesying, all utterance by inspiration, shall cease; all miraculous speaking with tongues, all signs of miraculous power shall cease; all knowledge imparted miraculously shall cease. My opponent admits that they shall cease. The query arises "When?" That is the sole issue. Common sense would say that as Paul is comparing the state of the Church when the best of the miraculous gifts exist, with a more excellent way for the Church; that the more excellent way is when they cease. That as Paul says they are valueless, unless they produce Christian love, they cease when the completed word of God, the perfect way of producing Christian love is finished. Children of God are made "perfect in teaching, in reproof, in correction, in instruction in righteousness, and are made perfect, and thoroughly furnished unto every good work," not by miraculous gifts, but by the Scriptures. Paul says, "For we know in part we prophecy in part." That is during the existence of the best of these spiritual gifts, knowledge imparted by inspiration was but a fragment at each time, was partial, prophesying was partial, but a fragment of the truth was uttered at each time when prophesying was done. "But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away." The question now is:—What is that which is perfect? That is the only issue. Common sense would say that as the partial is partial revelations, that are the highest exercise of these spiritual gifts, that the perfect would be complete revelations. The partial that is to be done away is partial revelation, by means of miraculous gifts. The perfect is completed revelations, when these gifts pass away. As Paul is discussing the condition of the Church, and mentions, as the partial, the condition of the church, when those mi-

raculous gifts exist; the perfect is when the partial—these gifts—have passed away, the condition of the church under the completed revelations, when these gifts have ceased. That is the perfect, the more excellent way that the apostle was to show. My opponent admits miraculous gifts are to cease but claims it is after the resurrection has made us perfect, for our eternal resurrected state. I object. The apostle is not discussing the eternal state, but the state of the church. He is not contrasting the state of the church during all time with the eternal state. But the state of the church under the best of these miraculous gifts, with the state of the church when they shall cease, and as the imperfect state was on earth, the perfect state is on earth as the imperfect was when these gifts existed, the perfect is when they shall not exist. Kelley foists in the idea of the perfection of saints in the eternal dispensation, after the resurrection, out of all connection, sense and logic. It is preposterously absurd and out of place.

What is that which is perfect? As the partial was partial revelations, by spiritual gifts, the perfect was a perfect revelation, when they had ceased. "The law of the God is perfect, converting the soul." There we have the perfect. "The Scriptures are perfect for teaching reproof, correction for instruction in righteousness, for they make the man of God perfect, and thoroughly furnished for every good work." There we have the perfect. Paul says in Ephesians these gifts are to remain until we attain to the unity of the faith, the one faith, God's completed word. Then we have what is perfect. That settles the matter. For we do not contrast imperfect revelation with a thing entirely different, the state of the righteous after the resurrection; but we contrast imperfect revelation under miraculous gifts with perfect revelation after these gifts have ceased, having perfected the revelation. Paul now returns to his figure in the xii chapter, where he compared the church to a body and these gifts to the organs of the body. He personifies the church by himself. He puts the man, the body, in the first person. He says, "When I was a child, I felt as a child." That is the church that he personifies by himself is in its childish condition while receiving the best of these gifts. They are partial and it can only speak as a child. Its revelations are partial childish. He continues "But when I became a man I put away childish things." That is when the church which he personifies by himself becomes a man it will put away these childish things, these partial things, when prophesying, inspiration and miracle working shall cease. "Now we see in the mirror darkly." Our revelations are partial, childish, and they are an imperfect mirror. We see imperfectly "But then," when partial things, these revelations and gifts have ceased, "we shall see face to face." As James says: "A man who is a hearer of the word and not a doer is like a man who

beholds his face in a mirror and forgets what manner of man he was. But he that looks unto the perfect "Law of Liberty" (God's word) and continues there shall be blessed." The mirror is God's perfected word. The mirror is imperfect during these partial revelations. It will be perfect when the word is completed and they have passed away. "Now," under these partial revelations, "I know in part." The Church that he personifies knows in part under these partial revelations. "But then," when the word is completed, when the perfect, the completed word has come, when the mirror—God's word—is perfect, "I shall know" the Church shall know "even as I am also known." The Church shall know what it ought to be, after a perfect revelation has been made, as it is known to God, as he knows it, and intends it to be, and as he will reveal it, and the Church shall then know it. Paul concludes that perfect faith, God's perfect word, hope, God's perfect promises, Christian love, produced by God's perfect word will remain for ever. With this harmonizes the idea that as God ceased miracle in creation, so he ceased miracle in revelation, when each had accomplished its work. In each case miracle prepared for a higher work of God by operation of perfect law. With this harmonizes the fact that as revelation ceased with Malachi when the Old Testament was completed, until Christianity came, so revelation ceased when the New Testament was completed, until the next dispensation, the eternal, is introduced. With this harmonizes the idea that constitution-making ceases when the constitution has been perfected. With this harmonizes the idea that none but an apostle could impart this miraculous power, this constitution making and provisional power. With this harmonizes the idea that this power never descended to a third person. With it harmonizes the idea that when the last one, to whom an apostle imparted this power by his hands died, it ceased. It harmonizes every portion of God's word. It is in accordance with sense. With it harmonizes the idea that the religion of Christ embraces all religious ideas and expresses each perfectly, and man now needs no higher or better revelation of these truths. He can learn more of their scope and grasp, but never outgrow them. As man has reached absolute truth, universal principles in the law of gravitation and in the Copernican law of the universe, so he has reached absolute truth in religion, in Christianity. As man cannot outgrow the law of gravitation, so he can never outgrow the infinite truths of Christianity. As man only learns more of the scope and grasp of the law of gravitation, so he can only learn more of the scope and grasp of Christianity, of its truths revealed in the New Testament. As he can never outgrow the law of gravitation, and needs no other law, so he can never outgrow the revelations in the New Testament, needs no more revelation. Finally we have

challenged our opponent to name one new idea or truth that all his pretended revelations have given to the world. He cannot give one. We have had no new revelation. We have challenged him to name one single truth that his pretended revelations have given in a better manner than in the New Testament. He cannot name one. We have no new revelations. What is not stolen from the Bible is balderdash. What is stolen is mangled by the thief. It is proof that his inspiration is the ass trying to wear the skin of the dead lion. After declaring that the New Testament is the constitution of the church given by God to the church, my opponent attempts to destroy the fatal effect of the analogy on his theory by raising the objection that as the people who appointed the delegates to frame our constitution had to ratify their work, so God who appointed the apostles as his delegates would have to ratify their work. The people's delegates were not inspired and infallible. God's delegates were. The Mormon God and his inspired instrument, Joe Smith, were so fallible in giving the constitution of the Mormon organization, that he has had to revise that last and most perfect work of inspiration from title-page to finish. He has made seventeen changes on one page, and over five thousand in all. As the delegates, the apostles, who gave our constitution, the New Testament, were not inspired by the Mormon God but by Jehovah, their work needed no revision or ratification.

The way in which my opponent will deliberately falsify God's word when it contradicts his errors can be seen in his falsification of the passages we quoted. Peter declares that those he addressed were kings and priests and had been made so before he wrote. John declares that Christ *has* washed those of whom he spoke and made them kings and priests. Both are past. Kelley deliberately falsifies the language and declares it is to be done in our glorified condition. He claims that because saints are called kings and priests in that state, they cannot be saints now. He falsifies the word of God to avoid its flat contradiction of his hobbies.

By what authority does my opponent assert that the passage, "Desire earnestly the greater gifts, and a still more excellent way I show unto you," has been transposed by copying? He has not a manuscript, a commentator or scholar to sustain him. He impudently changes it in violation of all authority and the sense of the context of the passage, as he impudently changes the tense from present to perfect, the time from future to past, and reads, "I have shown," instead of "I show." A more impudent, deliberate falsification of God's word was never perpetrated. Sealing of the Spirit and the miraculous influence of the Spirit are different. One is not a moral influence, the other

is. Each one is sealed for himself by the Holy Spirit, but not by the miraculous power of the Spirit. That he assumes, in flat contradiction of God's word. Moses declared his law was perfect for the purpose for which he gave it, to prepare for a better—the law of Christ. The teaching in each grade in a school may be perfect for its purpose to prepare for a better grade, and the last prepares for a still better state when the pupil becomes a man and is in school no more. The building of the church is going on now. It is not in the sense in which he uses the term. Our government is not being organized now. We are not adding to our officers. Nor do we have a Constitutional Convention in session. New persons are succeeding those who pass away. The number of States and citizens is being ever increased, but our government is not changed one particle. So the church receives new members and sends out missionaries, but is not changed one particle. Christ through the apostles perfected the church.

The royal Priesthood of Peter and John was not the Melchizedek priesthood, for Christ was the only priest of that order, and had no successor. I cannot sufficiently denounce the falsehood that we have no Holy Spirit in our church. We have him as sons of God, in accordance with God's word, and do not set up, a lying claim that any Joe Smith has or had him in miraculous power when the Bible declares such miracles have ceased. Our church is not another church from the Apostolic church, but the same church having, as the apostle declared, laid to one side childish things, and having entered on the more excellent way. We have Christ in his word and law, just as God ordains. Mormons cut off Christ the head, and substitute that fraud, Joe Smith; gouge out the eyes, and substitute Mormon impostors as prophets, cut off the ears and substitute Mormon frauds as apostles. They cut off every member of God set in the church, and substitute their frauds and load the mangled remains with councillors and over twenty monstrosities of their own manufacture of which the Bible knows nothing and call the monstrosity the church.

We have now placed before you the simple Apostolic church with its eight foundation stones. I. One God. II. One Lord. III. One Holy Spirit. IV. One faith—the faith, God's word. V. One immersion. VI. One hope. VII. One body—the church of Christ. VIII. One name—"Christian," for individuals, and "Church of Christ," for the organization. The building is made of living stones saints, deacons or servants, overseers and evangelists who are made perfect by God's word. It is the perfect man as God perfected it.

MR. KELLEY'S CLOSING SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Let me call your attention at once to the misrepresentation of my reference to the calling of Paul and Barnabas, in Acts 13: 2-3. My opponent stated that this laying on of hands was not for the purpose of giving the Holy Ghost; but what did he say that for? Who said it was for the purpose of conferring the Holy Ghost? The position which I took was that it was for the purpose of conferring authority upon these parties to enable them to discharge the duties to which they were called as ministers. My position differs from my opponent in this:—He and his church think it was but an idle or void form; that there was no special authority conferred by the act of the elders at Antioch laying their hands upon these two persons, for elders did not have the right to lay on hands to confer the right to the Holy Spirit by confirmation as did the apostles, or to confer especial authority by virtue of the authority of this Holy Spirit, in setting persons apart for the work of the ministry. But I claim that the facts are against them. That this compliance with the ordinance in the instance of Barnabas and Saul at this time, was that they might receive something of the right of authority, which they had not. That it is a similar case to the one which I presented from 1 Tim. 4: 14; and of which my opponent has taken no notice, where, Paul calls Timothy's attention to the fact that in his (Timothy's) ordination under the hands of the elders he had in fact received something, and by the power of the Holy Ghost which was in those officiating. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery—[eldership]." Here is an emphatic declaration that there was in this ordinance of the imposition of hands a conferring of gifts.

But Braden says, they (his church) lay on hands to merely set men apart, but that they do not confer anything. No authority is conferred thereby. This is as I have claimed all the time; I knew that they did not by so doing confer anything, for they have nothing to confer;—not being elders in fact in the church of God. But it is entirely different to the action and methods of the church in the days of the apostles, and therefore, proves beyond a doubt, by Braden's admission, that his church is not in harmony in faith and practice with the New Testament church.

In the early church, as I have shown, there was also a regular order in the calling of the minister, as by the example of Jesus, (not the congregation,) calling the apostles. Math. 10: 38. "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into the harvest." And Luke, 6: 12-13.

"And it came to pass in those days, that he went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God. And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles." And also as contained in Luke 10: 1. "After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come." In Acts 1: 15-20 verses, it is recorded that when an office in the church was vacant, as I have before fully shown you, the apostles applied to the proper authority, and head of the church, for instruction as to the filling of it. As Jesus did, so did they, "Pray the Lord of the harvest that he may send forth the laborers." They did not usurp the prerogatives of the "Lord of the harvest," and go themselves; or send others to their liking, as do the congregations of the so-called Christian or Campbellite churches.

So these apostles pray when they are to select a minister: "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." They knew well enough that it was not their right or place to call and make apostles, but that the officers in the church had to be chosen by the great head of the church. So it was in the instance in Acts 13: 2. "The Holy Ghost said, separate me, Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." Not the congregation called them, as Braden holds, but as God calls them. This also, as I have shown, accords with the practice and faith of Paul as set forth in his first letter to the saints at Corinth, 7: 17: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all churches."

But is this the way with Braden's church? Oh, no. As the imperfect, short-sighted and often fanatical congregation calls, his church ordains. The apostle, as I have shown, believed in the doctrine, that when Christ ascended up on high "he gave gifts unto men." And that these gifts were for the purpose of qualifying them for the duties they were called to in the church, both as officers and lay-members; and that a man could only be properly ordained to an office when it was done in accordance with the distribution of these gifts; and hence, he must wait till the Lord designated where the gift should be bestowed as he instructs in Rom. 12: 6 and 8: "Having, then, gifts differing according to the grace that is given unto us, whether of prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith. Or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth on teaching," etc. The idea, as before pointed out, is full and clear; men must work in accordance with the gift and calling of God unto them, and hence

must wait till God designates the gift of their calling before they can properly beset apart to act.

This brings to my mind his comment on the declaration of the apostle in Heb. 5: "And no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Paul did so teach, and it is in harmony with the instruction given upon this calling of the ministry by him, and Jesus, and all of the apostles whose words we have.

"But," says Braden, "Paul referred to the rule and requirement under the Mosaic economy." What does he refer to it for? Why did you not answer that? He refers to it as a basis of argument to show to the Jewish Saints how they must act under the later law; maintaining that the same rule had been adopted under the order in the Church in his time, and must be followed as in the case of Aaron. This is shown in the next verse: "*So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest; [he did not call himself nor permit the congregation to do it;] but he that said unto him, 'Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee.'*" As he saith also in another place, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek." This application of his own argument, by the apostle, is too plain to be gainsaid. Jesus would not call himself to be a minister; a congregation could not properly do it, but he must be called as was Aaron, by revelation through the Holy Ghost that giveth utterance. This same Jesus was in his obedience and observance of the rules of law and government, to be "our example in all things." Therefore, "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that was called of God as was Aaron." Can you see that Paul was teaching and laying down a governing principle in the Christian economy now, Mr. Braden? But it is the reverse of your system as admitted by yourself. Again he says, "That if Joseph Smith had denied revelation, there would have been no Mormonism, nor Mormon polygamy."

Now is this not a sweltering argument? How does it come that the belief by Mr. Smith in revelation brought polygamy in Utah, when the belief by Paul and Peter in revelation did not bring polygamy among the followers of Nicolas, one of the *Seven*, ordained under the hands of the apostles at Jerusalem? Will he answer this? This is like the argument so often made by infidels, that if in the beginning the Devil had not been created, there would have been no evil whatever in the world; therefore, the Lord wholly responsible.

Do you accept the theory, Mr. Braden? And can you not see there is no basis to our reasoning? If there are parties in the world who shall take advantage of their privileges, and stations, and the blessings which God may have to give to his children, does that argue that none of the children shall have the blessings?

But, if Mr. Smith had not believed in the principles of revelation there would have

been no Mormonism. Oh, no! Then according to himself Mormonism is the result of a *belief*, not a *disbelief*, in revelation; and Smith was no deceiver, impostor, pre-tentious fraud, etc., as he has called him. He was a man, then, who acted from conviction and taught what he believed. Will you now take back the false accusations you have before made against him?

But permit me to turn this profound (?) logic over a moment. He will not dispute that if all the people of the world had believed like the Campbellites do, and Mr. Campbell did, that there never would have been a revelation. No, they deny the principle of present revelation. (They are not like Mr. Smith.) But denying, they stand in such a relation and position to God that had the men of God in the world's history believed as Mr. Campbell and Braden and their church, no revelation could ever have been received, and we should be without Moses and the prophets; without the Psalms; without the gospels and all of the inspired epistles of the apostles; without the Bible; without the presence of the Holy Ghost, and without God and Christ in the world. Aye! my friends, had the prophets of old, and Jesus and the apostles believed as these Campbellite friends of ours, all to-day would be darkness and gloom, and Christendom as the raging heathen who has no divine record, no communion with the Father and Son, and no gift of the Holy Ghost. Who will desire to stand up for a faith the effect of which is to leave the world in this benighted state? It will not do. The Pharisees of old cried out, "We know that God spoke to Moses, but as for this man (Jesus) we know not from whence he is." The position was one of error and darkness, and it finally led them into destruction and death. Jesus' position was that of present revelation: "Upon this rock I will build my church;" "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine;" "If ye believed in Moses and the prophets ye would believe in me, for Moses wrote of me." You must not only believe in revelation in the past, but for the present, for this was to "guide into all truth;" and this system of present revelation has given light and glory to the world, and would have shined far brighter than it has had it not been for the persistent teaching of the evil one, telling the children, Ye cannot hear from your "Father who art in heaven," now.

"The greatest curse upon the world," Braden says, "is the belief in the direct and immediate influence of the Holy Ghost." That is just the position the ancient Scribes and Pharisees occupied towards Jesus, and the apostles, and the martyr Stephen. See Acts, 6th. Has Braden fairly represented you, my Campbellite friends? If so, I would say, "Come out of her and be not partaker of her sins."

But, says Braden again, "Mormons by this belief in the gifts of the Holy Spirit can go into and practice polygamy." There is where he and the world have been mis-

taken for years. Will he turn and show me even a pretended present revelation through the polygamic church? I know the world have had it in mind that the people of Utah profess to enjoy present inspiration and the gifts of prophecy, tongues, wisdom and interpretations, etc., but they have only deceived themselves. There is not by the Utah people even an open claim, that I have ever heard of, to the receiving of a revelation directing affairs, ever coming to the Utah church through either Mr. Young or Mr. Taylor, the only two heads. They are on the common basis with my Campbellite friends out there. "That these things are not necessary by them, for they say we have a living priesthood." It is the same old dodge, but placed upon a different basis. What good is the living priesthood when the life-power, the manifestation of the Holy Ghost, is taken away? No; they are not persons who are "led by the Spirit of God" out there, and for this reason "the sons of God;" but they are all "kings and priests" in Utah, except Governor Murry. They differ from our Campbellite friends in that they also have an especial belief in *quens* as well as kings.

He again comes to the front with his assertions, and defies me to show that there is more than one baptism in the church. He forgets that he is in the affirmative on this question and that it is his place to prove and to stop his *asserting*. I shall not undertake to prove that there is more than one baptism in his church, for I am satisfied there is not, nor never was. Indeed, I deny that he has any baptism in fact, in his church, and have all along. The requisites of a valid baptism is not only a proper administration in water, but an authorized officer to perform such administration. This I have questioned from the first as being in his church, and he has failed to show that they had; therefore I must conclude that there is no baptism performed in his church that God will sanction or ratify by giving to the candidate the "seal of adoption," the gift of his Holy Spirit; and Braden admits that not one in his church ever had the gift of the Holy Spirit, or the seal of adoption; No; it would have made Mormons of them, he thinks. However, I have already fully shown, that there were two baptisms in the Apostolic church. "I, indeed baptize you with water, but he that cometh after me, is baptizeth than I, he shall baptize you with fire and the Holy Ghost." John, Math. 3:11. Again, "Ye shall be baptized by the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." Jesus, Acts 1:5. "Born of the water and of the Spirit." Jesus, John 3:5. "Repent, and be baptized, everyone of you, and ye shall receive the gift [baptism] of the Holy Ghost." Peter, Acts, 2:38. "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Acts, 8:17. "By one spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit." Paul, 1 Cor. 12:13. "Faith,

repentance, baptisms laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment." Heb. 6:1 to 3.

"He saves us by the *washing of regeneration* [baptism in water] and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" [baptism of the Spirit.] For the next verse says that this renewing was as follows: "Which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior." When Jesus so shed this forth on Pentecost day, it was a baptism of the spirit, and just so too, in every other instance.

But notwithstanding all of this, Braden defies me to show two baptisms. I can show it readily enough in Jesus' church, I assure you. Then, in Eph. 4:5, it is written: "One Lord, one faith, one baptism." [Complete birth, as I have shown you; washing of water and renewing of the Holy Ghost.] This is also in accordance with the teaching in the preceding verse: "There is one body, and one Spirit even as ye are called in one hope of your calling." What is this one Spirit for? Not for anything in Braden's church, for he admits they have none by denying all of its office-work. But in Christ's church it was for to bless the believer by clothing him upon with the new man, Christ Jesus, and sealing their hearts in love to him; hence, "As many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ have put on Christ." Jesus, John, Peter, Paul and Luke were right in their teaching then; there is in the church of God a baptism of the water and of the Spirit.

It seems hard for my opponent to give up the point on the application of the constitution argument to the apostles and New Testament. He has a new theory now. The sovereign people he now says made the constitution through their delegates, and so God made, as the likeness would go, the constitution of the church by his delegates, the apostles. Let us see how it will work: After the delegates had framed the constitution themselves, the people doing nothing except sending them there, they return it to the people for acceptance and ratification. Now, according to this, in the church, after the apostles had got up a constitution according to their own wisdom, they send it back to the Lord, who made them delegates, for his acceptance and ratification. Is not this the exact claim of Col. Ingersoll? That the Lord did not give this law, but that the apostles and some others got it up themselves? Why, Braden has by this last turn of his, made it worse than before. Making the people to represent the Almighty in his suppositions case, he has clearly left the word of God without any inspiration at all. In preparing the American constitution, the people selected men who were wise enough, they thought, to frame a constitution for them. Did then the Lord select some one to frame him a constitution, as did the people of this government? Nonsense. There is not a half-witted person in the state of Ohio but who ought to see farther than that.

When the constitution of the United

States was framed it was done by the wisdom of the delegates chosen by the people. The people was the principal and the delegates the servants. When done it was submitted to the principal, the people, for ratification, and after ratification and adoption, messengers and officers were chosen thereunder.

The work of the apostles under the Christian constitution begins where this delegate work of forming a constitution ended. God framed, devised and adopted it, and then selected his officers under it, and the officers were first apostles, secondarily prophets, etc. The same as the people after adopting the constitution placed in the government thereunder first a president, etc. Braden's suppositious case is in no sense a parallel one, and I am certain you can see that it is not, my friends, whether he can or not, so I pass along.

Again he claims that we have a perfected constitution now, but that it was not perfect while Peter, Paul and John were in the church; but what right has he to say so? When they were in the church they had more constitution than we have now, there are many writings referred to in the New Testament as being in their possession which we have not, besides they had much of all we do have. Why does he persist in saying then, that the Gospel law is perfect now but was not then? James called it perfect then, as I have shown? It was perfect in the Psalmist's time in the same way, and there is not a single scrap from Genesis to Revelations intimating that it would ever be perfect any other way, until the time when Jesus shall come in clouds of great "glory and bring all his saints with him, taking vengeance on all them who know not God and obey not the Gospel." When "we shall know and see him as he is, for we shall be like him."

Until this time it will be as Paul says of the Gospel: "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed *from faith to faith*, as it is written, the just shall live by faith." Not received in full, all at once. It is quite impossible to so dispense or receive the Gospel,—but *revealed from faith to faith*; and just about the time a man thinks he has got the whole thing and there is nothing else for him to learn, then is the time that he is under sin and "the bonds of iniquity." There is something in the Gospel to bless man all the time and enable him to grow in grace and the *knowledge of the truth*; and when he gets all truth it will be after he is far ahead of where Paul was who says, "Now I see in part and know in part,—through a glass, darkly,—but then shall I see as I am seen and know as I am known."

It is just as was the creation of the plants and animals, which I have before referred to, the Lord created them and established the law of life by which they are perpetuated. He created his church and established a law of life by which this living church is perpetuated, and just as certain as there is found an absence of this animal and vege-

table life where the true conditions of life are not recognized, just so sure are we to find an absence of the true life and power in the church, and, per consequence, true church where the conditions of spiritual life are violated. Hence, the apostle talking of the true church says: "We have not come to the mount that might be touched and that burned with fire nor unto blackness and darkness and tempest." * * *

"But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God, the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. And to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel." Heb. 12:18-25.

Paul's church was one of light, and life, and glory; they had the blessings of grace in the heart; the gifts and life of the Holy Spirit; inspiration, administration of angels, communion with the church of the first born from the dead, and Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, [the power of the Holy Ghost writing the law in the heart.]

Compare now, my friends, this living, enlightening, glowing church of the first century, with the dark cloud that is prefigured in Braden's church, and judge for yourselves if he has even so much as of grandfather's old gun left as a resemblance. Without apostles, prophets, gifts, wisdom, knowledge, healings, tongues, prophecies, living testimonies, the Holy Ghost and all of its manifold manifestations; devoid of doctrine, tongues, revelations, psalms and wisdom; without the ministration of angels and far from all communication with the church of the first born; without the new covenant and the placing of the law in the heart and writing it in the inward parts; without Jesus the mediator of this new covenant whom no man can receive "but by the Holy Ghost." Truly it is "a cloud without water carried about of winds; as a tree whose fruit withereth; without fruit." "Having men's persons in admiration because of advantage." "Those be they who separate themselves, sensual, having not the Spirit." Jude. 19th verse. "But we," says the same apostle, "beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, *praying in the Holy Ghost*, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life." Can you my audience catch a glimpse of resemblance between his and the church of the apostles? If there is any, it is in the fact that they have "a form of godliness but deny the power thereof." The work in the New Testament church was all the time under the direction and life giving power of the Holy Ghost; it, indeed, was the fashioner and builder, and let us not deceive ourselves that we can ever become "lively stones in the building" of Christ, the church, without the gifts and power of the

same; for this reason I have shown that "a manifestation of the Spirit was given to every man to profit withal."

SUMMARY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: The question under discussion for the last four evenings has been with relation to the claims of the Disciple or Campbellite church. There has been no consideration of the claims of the church of Jesus Christ, which I claim to represent, but merely of canvassing the positions of the body of people of which it is affirmed in the question, conceived as I judge and formulated by my opponent himself, as follows, to wit:

"Is the church, of which, I, Clark Braden, am a member, identical in faith, teaching, practices, doctrine, ordinances and organization with the church of Christ as left perfected by the apostles."

I have claimed that it is not. That it is not in any sense of the term.

In the presentation of my argument, I showed you:—

First, That in the consideration of the question we must come to an understanding as to the proper way to find out how the church was left by the apostles. Where do we have the history of it? Do we find the history from which we must ascertain this condition in the New Testament? Or, is it to be had in the writings of those termed, "Church Historians?" As he refused to answer me directly where this history of the church which was left "perfected by the apostles" as he says, was to be found, I have taken the trouble to set forth the condition of the early church as shown in the New Testament and also in the history of the practices of the church during the *second* and *third* centuries.

Second, Having fully ascertained the true status and condition of the church as set forth in the New Testament, and also subsequent history, I took up the faith of his church as set out by himself and reflected in its publications and compared it with the history of the church established by Jesus and the apostles and the continued practices of the same as shown in the history of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. What has been the result:

1. I showed that his claim to having the right name, was a myth; for he had no right to drop the name Jesus as shown in Ephesians third; or to just call his church disciples, or Christians, for neither of these names were ever recognized of God as the distinguishing name of his people in any place in the Bible.

Then I proved to you by ten citations of Scripture that the true and proper name by which the children of our Heavenly Father is known and recognized by him here, and by which they are to be recognized by him hereafter is that of Saints. Has he even attempted to reply to it?

2. He claimed he was identical with the ancient church in faith. I took up the faith held by the ancient saints, by which they had access to God through his Spirit. Showed it was a living, and active principle that

actuated the members of the early church, being the power by which they could move forward to mighty deeds of greatness and that it was this that they were exhorted to contend for; and what was his answer to this: "Let Kelley remove one of these Kirtland hills." But it was not Kelley's faith which was on trial, it is the faith of Kelley's Campbellite opponent. What answer had he? None besides this. Why should he claim they are identical in faith therefore? Jesus said of his church members, that if you shall have faith, you shall do many wonderful works, and afterwards they did to them Braden's church, then, is not identical in faith.

3. I showed that *repentance* in the early church consisted of not only a sorrowing for sin, but if any one had wronged another he must restore the wrong. That simply being sorry for a theft, robbery or evil and injurious act was not sufficient.

Braden's church has not been shown to believe in the true repentance of the Bible even.

4. Baptisms as practiced in the early church was canvassed as referred to by Paul in Heb. 6:1 to 4, where the apostle enumerates the *first*, or *fundamental* principles of the doctrine of Christ, and Braden at once admitted that they had no baptism in their church except in water, nor never have had.

Why does he claim that his church is identical in doctrine and practices with that of which the New Testament is a history, then? In that, they had the baptism of the water and of the Spirit, and Braden himself admits they were baptized of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost and at the household of Cornelius.

5. Another of the *first*, or foundation principles in the church of which the New Testament gives a history was the doctrine of "Laying on of hands." Remember, it was a *first*, or foundation principle upon which to build, and consequently recognized as the right of every believer to receive, as in the cases cited and practices established. Acts 8:17, 9:17, 19:2 and 4, where hands were laid on after baptism for confirmation and the giving of the Holy Ghost.

My opponent admits they have nothing of the kind in his church. Why should he say they are identical with the church as left by the apostles then? From the history of the practices of the church in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th centuries I showed that this practice of laying on of hands was had in all instances where there was a true baptism, by the church long after the year 98, and that the Lord confirmed it by giving the Spirit, and he has not even attempted a reply. No. He don't accept any thing of a history outside of the New Testament. He ought to accept the practices as laid down in that then.

6. On the question of the calling of the minister I showed conclusively that the New Testament order was by the Holy Spirit as God directed. His answer to this is that the rule is now changed. If so

why is he claiming to be identical in faith and practice with the New Testament order and practices? That is the question. If the rule is changed why does he not manfully say so, and then tell us that his church is *not identical* with the New Testament church in faith, practices and ordinances.

Why humbug his members into the belief that they are like an assembly that Peter or John constituted in their time, when in fact there is hardly a show of agreement? Who changed the order of calling the minister? Has he answered that? Has he found a single passage in the Bible going to show that God would change his order of calling his ministry? No; he knows he has not.

7. The organization of the early church, I showed, was with apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers, helps, governments and gifts, and that their rule of practice was, when one of these places in the church was made vacant, to fill it up with a like officer; as Matthias was called, in Acts 1:24-25, Barnabas and Saul afterwards to the apostleship and so on when vacancies occurred, until they were filled to the number of nineteen, which I was enabled to trace from the record.

What was his answer to this? Only that this order had been done away, and a new order instituted. Well, does that make him identical in practice and organization with the church the history of which alone is set forth in the New Testament?

Is it not apparent by this time, my friends, that Mr. Braden undertook a big job when he set out to show that Mr. Campbell was a "restorer?" A restorer not only of the church but the ancient church itself?

I called attention to the nine different spiritual gifts exercised by the members in the early church as set out in Jesus' language in Mark, and the 12th of 1 Corinthians by Paul, and what does he say to that? All done away. But why does he claim an identity with them if they had all of this with them, and Braden has not a single one in his church?

That wise reason: "Because that's done away;" "It's not necessary now," has deceived more people, my friends, on all of the principles of the doctrines of Jesus Christ than my opponent could enumerate for an evening. What a formidable reason that is to hand out to thinking men and women, "they are done away." Nobody says that God did them away. That Jesus commanded that they cease. That the apostles refused to exercise these gifts and stamped them out. No; as long as there were any persons in the world whom God approved, they stood for these things, and it has been left for those who, as the apostle said, "have fallen away," not having the true faith; who have "heaped to themselves teachers having itching ears," and thus made their own ministers to do these things away.

The "more excellent way" referred to by the apostle I have shown clearly to point to the way he taught; that men should have, and exercise these gifts, and so continue

until we should all see as we are seen and know as we are known, and not that one person should have all the gifts, or that the church should consist of just one class of officers, all apostles or all elders or deacons; but that all the officers must be in the church to have a true body, as much so as that all the members of the body have to be intact so as the man shall have a perfect body, and that a church which has only elders and deacons in it can no more be in fact the true church, the body of Christ, than a pair of hands and a couple of toes can make the full body of a man.

The more excellent way, in other words, I showed was that which Paul set forth in the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 28th, 29th and 30th verses of the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians, and the 1st, 2d, 39th and 40th verses of the 14th chapter, and which he said in the 13th chapter of the same letter should remain in the true church till that time should come when they should "see as they were seen and know as they were known."

9. They were placed in the church as I have shown "for the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come into the unity of the faith unto a perfect man unto the knowledge of the Son of God." Eph. 4:12. But this is just the opposite of what Braden has held, for he took the position it was for the "perfecting of the law." Is he with the pattern again? No, certainly.

10. The tenth difference I showed between his church and the New Testament was the principle of intolerance to others who differed with them religiously. Braden has not denied this nor denied that his "restored" members of Mr. Campbell used violent measures against the Saints when they could not meet them in argument. Neither has he denounced such measures. No such practice was ever engaged in by God's children, Jesus or the apostles. But it was "whatsoever ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them."

11. Braden's church preaches gospel of promise, gospel of process, gospel in fact; but the gospel was all that John, Jesus, Peter, Paul or any of the Saints knew anything about, either before or after Pentecost.

12. Braden's church claims that Jesus did not establish any church; that there was none till after Jesus' death, and not then till Pentecost. I have showed beyond cavil that the church did exist before Pentecost day, and was established and organized by Jesus during his ministry.

13. His church denies the gift or baptism of the Holy Spirit to all of their followers. I have shown that it was promised to all the believers in the early church, and the apostle taught, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free; and have all been made to drink into one Spirit." His answer to this was Paul meant "baptized by the command of the Spirit," but it is evident Paul meant no such thing.

Why should he persist, then, in saying they are the "restored" church, and that their's is the one "*restored*" gospel which Paul preached?

14 The church of which Braden is a member claims there is no Holy Spirit given to the believer in Christ, except through the medium of the word, the letter of the law; Whereas, The practice in the early church was to administer the Spirit as shed forth by Jesus Christ, not through the medium of the word, but sent down from heaven on the converts after they had believed and obeyed the truth. This is exactly the reverse of the faith and practice of Braden's church.

15. Braden's church professes to be built upon the Bible, and the Bible alone. I have shown you that God did not build his church on this but the rock of *present revelation*, which his church denies to its adherents, and therefore his church is not built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. It takes present revelation and a present enjoyment of the promise of the Holy Ghost to build in this way and it is not enough to simply believe apostles and prophets and Jesus once existed in the church.

(Time called.)

MR. KELLEY'S OPENING SPEECH ON THIRD PROPOSITION.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is with considerable pleasure that I again appear before you, to investigate a question touching directly upon the faith in the gospel of Christ as I believe it. The people generally are as ignorant of the actual faith and principles of the church I represent as the ancient Scribes and Pharisees were of the faith and doctrine Jesus and Paul preached. For this reason, if there were no others, I am glad to-night, being assured in my heart that when I shall be rightly understood by you, and the people whom I represent shall have been truly known by you, that we shall find in your hearts a warmer feeling than is possible to exist in the absence of such knowledge.

I delight also to engage in a friendly investigation of the facts underlying my faith in the Redeemer, because I have so carefully considered and criticized it, that I know that there is nothing contained therein, but that will appeal to man's intelligence, and is entitled to a place in the highest impulses, and worthy to be honored with the noblest sentiments of the human heart.

The question, the discussion of which we enter upon this evening, reads:

"Is the Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints the church of God in fact, and accepted with him?"

I am well aware that to begin with, my friends, I have the unpopular side of this issue; and that even men and women of much intelligence, look upon a person who accepts the faith of the Saints, as being not only visionary, but actually fanatical. But notwithstanding this, I can truly say that the ablest critics and most profound reasoners that it has been my lot to meet among any people I have found among the Latter Day Saints. I ask you then to accept, for the time of this investigation at least, the injunction of the wise man, and hear this issue discussed, before passing upon the merits of it: "He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is a folly and a shame unto him." Yes, and those who are ready to condemn a man, or people, before they give them a fair and full hearing, are not only unfit to be called children of God, but are in fact, bad citizens and evil doers in the government itself. I ask you then to discharge your minds of such prejudice, or bias, as would otherwise prevent you from judging the arguments to be produced in this discussion, upon their merits, and as free men and women, think and act for yourselves, and of yourselves, instead of being led by the mischievous influences which may have by reason of your relations in life, been thrown around you. It may appear to you that in the very fact of the claim that the church which I represent is

the church of God and accepted with Him, it is shown that I have not sufficient charity for the work and feelings of others. But, think of it! Is it really a thing to be condemned, or not rather an affirmation to be admired?

Would you expect me to belong to the church I do, and seek to promote its interests, if I did not think it was the church of God in fact, and accepted with him? I am sure that upon a second thought you would not. Well, if I really believe it, is it wrong to tell you candidly what my belief is? You cannot but answer me that it is not. "But," says some of my friends of the other churches, "You ought not to believe that yours is the accepted church of God." Let me ask, is not that what you all believe?

What church member present of whatever name or denomination, who does not believe his church is the church of God, and accepted with him? If there is such a one I would like to see him. What does he belong to it for, if it is not God's church? Does he expect to be saved by reason of belonging to some man's church, or does he think Deity has hundreds of churches on the earth all teaching adverse views and principles and impelled by diverse motives? Such a view degrades the character of our Heavenly Father. It is a fact, my friends, that he does not approve of all that takes place in the name of religion in this world, and the sooner we admit this and seek to sustain and attach ourselves to that only which we are satisfied our Heavenly Father does approve of and accept, the better it will be for us, and the more actual good we will be enabled to perform in the world.

But it is not *your* church that is affirming this evening, my friends, neither that is on trial. It is the one I represent. Is *it* the church of God and accepted with Him? I claim that it is, and for the purpose of *proving* this claim I shall proceed to compare it with the *Divine Code*, the fundamental law, contained in the book called the Bible, and ascertain if there is an entire agreement.

To compare with this fundamental law, it will be necessary that I first set out the fundamental principles of my faith; you will want to know whether they are in agreement with the law. To maintain the proposition which I affirm, it will be requisite for me to show:

1. That the principles and faith of the church are in harmony with the word of God. Are, indeed, the good seed of Christ's Kingdom, which, when men have sown, brings forth the proper fruit—that which is acceptable with Jesus Christ: providing it has fallen upon the good ground.

"When any one heareth the word of the kingdom, and understandeth it not, then cometh the wicked one, and catcheth away that which was sown in his heart. This is he which receiveth seed by the wayside."

"But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundred fold, some sixty, some thirty." Matt. 13:19 and 23.

This parable is also plainly set forth by the evangelist Luke, 8:11 and 15. Jesus says:

"Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God." "But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it and bring forth fruit with patience."

It is the same thought, yet illustrated in a different way, that is found in Luke's gospel, 6:47 and 49:

"Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like." "He is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock."

This was a sure way in which to build; and so in building in the church of God, the only place where we may hope to find true work and a building that will stand the test of an examination of the Master, is that which is built by the word of God. The sowing and planting the good seed in good and honest hearts. For this reason it is written:

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8:31 and 32.

After satisfying you as to what this seed (word of God) of the kingdom is, I must show:

2. That the church which I represent in its work is in fact sowing this good seed; distributing the word of God; abiding in God's word in its system of faith and doctrine.

I shall, therefore, now set forth the fundamental principles of our faith, together with some of the scripture citations, which we claim to reflect and enjoin these principles, as follows:

PRINCIPLES OF FAITH AND DOCTRINE.

1. We believe in God the Eternal Father, and in his Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28:19. 1 John 1:3. St. John 11:26.

2. That men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression. Ecc. 12:14. Matt. 16:27. 1 Cor. 3:13. Rev. 20:12-15.

3. That through the atonement of Christ, all men may be saved by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel. 1 Cor. 15:3. 2 Tim. 1:10. Rom. 8:1-6.

4. That these ordinances are:—
(1st). Faith in God and the Lord Jesus Christ. Heb. 11:6. Pet. 1:21. 1 Tim. 4:10. John 3:16, 18, 36. Mark 11:22. John 14:1.

(2d). Repentance. Matt. 3:2, 8, 11. Luke 13:3; 24:47. Ezek. 18:30. Mark 1:15, 15. Acts 2:38. Rom. 2:4. 2 Cor. 7:10.

(3d). Baptism by immersion for the remission of sins. Matt. 3:13-15. Mark. 1:4, 5. Luke 3:3. John. 3:5. Ac. 2:38, 22:16; 2:41; 8:12, 27, 38. Mark 16:16. Col. 2:12. Rom. 6:4, 5. John 3:23. Acts 8:38, 39.

(4th). Laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost. Deut. 34:9. John 20:21, 22. Acts 8:17; 19:6. 1 Tim. 4:14. Acts 9:17. 1 Cor. 12:3. Acts 19:1-6.

5. We believe in the Resurrection of the Body; that the dead in Christ will rise first, and the rest of the dead will not live again until the thousand years are expired. Job 19:25, 26. Dan. 12:2. 1 Cor. 15:42. 1 Thess. 4:16. Rev. 20:6. Acts 17:31. Phil. 3:21. John 11:24. Isa. 26:19. Ps 17:15.

6. In the doctrine of Eternal Judgment, which provides that men shall be judged, rewarded or punished,

according to the degree of good or evil they shall have done. Rev. 20:12. Ecc. 3:17. Matt. 16:27. 2 Cor. 5:10. 2 Pet. 2:4, 13, 17.

7. That a man must be Called of God and ordained by the Laying on of Hands of those who are in authority, to entitle him to preach the Gospel and Administer in the Ordinances thereof. Heb. 5:1, 5, 6, 8. Acts. 1:21, 25; 11:23. Eph. 4:11. John 15:16.

8. That the church should have the same kind of organization that existed in the primitive church, viz: Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, Evangelists, &c. 1 Cor. 12:28. Matt. 10:1. Acts 6:4. Eph. 4:11; 2:20. Titus 1:5.

9. That in the Bible is contained the word of God so far as it is translated correctly, and further that the canon of scripture is not full, but that God, by His Spirit, will continue to reveal His word to man until the end of time. Job 32:8. Heb. 13:8. Prov. 29:18. Amos 3:7. Jer. 23:4; 31:31, 34; 33:6. Ps. 85:10, 11. Luke 17:26. Rev. 14:6, 7; 19:10.

That the believers in Christ are entitled to the powers and gifts of the everlasting gospel, viz: the gift of faith, discerning of spirits, prophecy, revelation, healing, visions, tongues, and the interpretation of tongues, wisdom, charity, brotherly love, &c. 1 Cor. 12:1-11; 14:26. John 14:24. Acts 2:3. Matt. 28:19, 20. Mark 16:16.

11. That marriage is ordained of God; and that the law of God provides for but one companion in wedlock, for either man or woman, except in cases where the contract of marriage is broken by death or transgression. Gen. 2:18, 21-24; 7:1, 7, 13. Prov. 5:15-21. Mal. 2:14, 15. Matt. 19:4-6. 1 Cor. 7:2. Heb. 13:4.

12. That the doctrines of a plurality and a community of wives are heresies, and are opposed to the law of God. Gen. 4:19, 23, 21; 7:9; 22:2, in connection Gal. 4th and 5th c. Matt. 21:8-10. Mal. 2:14, 15. Matt. 19:3-9.

13. That in all matters of controversy upon the duty of man toward God, and in reference to preparation and fitness for the world to come, the word of God should be decisive, and the end of dispute; and that when God directs, man should obey.

14. That the religion of Jesus Christ, as taught in the New Testament Scriptures, will, if its precepts are accepted and obeyed, make men and women better in the domestic circle, and better citizens of town, county and state, and consequently better fitted for the change which cometh at death.

15. That men should worship God in "Spirit and in truth;" and that such worship does not require a violation of the constitutional law of the land. John 4:21-24.

16. We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, allow all men the same privilege, let them worship how, where or what they may.

Other than these we esteem as a sacred injunction the observance of the Lord's Supper, or Eucharist; and under proper circumstances and place, the washing of feet. But I will not catalogue further at this time.

Now, I have presented to you our system of faith. It is proper, and necessary to examine the faith and doctrine a people represents, in order to ascertain whether they are right or wrong. It is the only possible correct test. You cannot judge by the stories told about them, nor from outward appearances; but you *can* tell whether they speak that which is found in the word of God, if you will take the trouble to examine your Bibles.

It is, therefore, an established principle in Christ's kingdom, that by the *word*, a man shall stand justified or condemned.

"He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son."

This is an absolute truth, and all the power of Satan, and works of evil men combined, will fail in the effort to overthrow it. The salvation of an individual, from a Bible standpoint, rests upon the condition of whether he will accept the principles of the doctrine of Christ, and adhere to them.

Hence, Jesus says, "For whosoever doeth the will of God, the same is my mother, my sister and my brother." This is the standpoint from which the church of God is represented upon earth to-day, if represented at all. Those who abide in, and represent His truth, abide in and represent Him; and are, therefore, His children, and for that reason Jesus said, I am not ashamed to call you my brethren. Will my opponent then enter upon an investigation of these 16 prominent principles and help you to ascertain if a single one is contrary to the veritable doctrine of the Messiah, as revealed in the Bible, or whether in this System of Faith, there is lacking, or the absence, of a single principle of the Gospel, taught and enjoined by Jesus and the apostles?

Jesus in the commission says: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The promise is as true now, as when uttered; and it is the distinctive mark by which the true minister may be known to-day; and the apostle, therefore, urged in his time, "If any man preach (teach) any other gospel, let him be accursed." Gal. 1: 8-9. It is by their teaching then that we are to judge of the merits of the claimants, now under trial. Not by some story told around the corners about them. Never!

But I shall not only prove that we are in harmony with the principles and doctrine of Christ, but will also show:

3. That this church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, was founded by Christ himself, in accordance with the promises made through the prophets. A work foretold by them to be accomplished in the last days, or in the "dispensation" of the fullness of times."

As bearing directly upon the work and time of reinstating the gospel and organization of the church your attention is called to the prophecy of Isaiah, Chap. 11: 12, 13 verses.

"And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

"The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim."

Here is fully set forth the fact that at some time in the world's history the God of heaven should undertake to fulfill the promises made to the patriarchs and Moses to establish their posterity permanently. The time is fixed, too, after the destruction of Jerusalem in the year A. D. 70; for it says, "and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the *dispersed of Judah* from the four corners of the earth." Judah was not dispersed till about the time above referred to; for although the other tribes were outcasts—driven from the promised land of Canaan—it was said of Judah, Gen. 49: 10: "The *scripter* shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

This is full and explicit. Judah was not

to lose a national existence *until* Christ should come; but after that time it is evident from the prophecy that they would, for it is declared, "unto him (Christ) should the gathering of the people be." They were to be scattered then as prefigured in the prophecy, after the Shiloh should come. But notice, "*unto him* they are to be gathered: Hence, he is to set up an ensign" (raise the gospel standard) after the dispersion of Judah, and from that beginning gather not only Judah but all the outcasts of Israel, even though so far scattered and dispersed as to the "four corners of the earth."

The same work is pointed out in Isaiah 62: 10 and 11:

"Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people.

"Behold, the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world, 'Say ye to the daughter of Zion Behold, thy salvation cometh; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.'"

The prophet here sets forth the work of bringing again the people from their dispersion, and the preparation to be made for this work; the *standard* among other things is to be "lifted up," as declared in the former citation; and this is just before the *second coming* of Jesus, for it says: "Behold thy salvation cometh: behold his *reward* is with him, and his work before him." Jesus when he came before did not restore the Jews—they were not then dispersed; neither did he then "come to *reward* every man according to his work." Here, however, the prophet points to the time when he shall come bringing his "*rewards*" with him.

Let us pass on to the statement made by the prophet Jeremiah of this same work. Jeremiah 16: 16-20. In the 16, 17 and 18 verses the prophet speaks of the restoration of Israel in the time when it is declared he "will send forth many fishers and they shall fish them; and many hunters and they shall hunt them from every mountain and from every hill and out of the holes of the rocks." Then, in verse 19, he says:

"O Lord, my strength and my fortress and my refuge "in the day of affliction, the Gentiles shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth and shall say, Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit."

"Shall a man make gods unto himself, and they are no gods."

"Therefore, behold, I will this once cause them to know, I will cause them to know mine hand and my might; and they shall know that my name is The Lord."

Here the condition of society is vividly set forth and the evil teaching that is to do so much mischief to the Gentiles. Israel, it is predicted, shall be established, although the false teachers among the Gentile nations have told the people it would not be done. The Lord of all the earth is to do a work and command and authorize his servants, although the people had been taught that they could call their own preachers and *set up* their own ministers, God's hand is to be revealed. He is to actually declare his purposes as in the olden time, although the

people have been taught that revelation and the immediate work of God among them "has been done away." For these things the Gentiles will yet be surprised, because of the great things coming upon the earth, and they shall wake up but to exclaim "Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity and things wherein there is no profit." That they have been deceived and "have set up gods unto themselves and they are no gods." Let me tell you, my friends, there is coming a time when there is to be a change, and then there will be a weakening all around among these self-constituted revivalists.

The prophet further refers to the work of the Lord, *ibid.* 23; 1 to 5 verses:

"Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter
"the sheep of my pasture! saith the Lord."

"Therefore, thus saith the Lord against the pastors
"that feed my people; ye have scattered my flock and
"driven them away and have not visited them; behold
"I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the
"Lord."

"And I will gather the remnant of my flock out of
"the countries whither I have driven them; and I
"will bring them again to their folds and they shall
"be fruitful and increase."

"And I will set up shepherds over them which shall
"feed them, and they shall fear no more nor be dis-
"mayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the
"Lord."

Thus it is further shown that it comes from the unsound work of the teachers, that the people of the Lord are scattered and divided in every place, and there will commence a work of change in the right direction, when he shall begin to select, call his own shepherds, teachers, ministers, and send them forth with the true gospel standard which he has declared he will set up.

But hurrying on in these prophecies, I cite you the 20th of Ezekiel, 33 to 37 verses: The same work is here outlined and to be done, as before indicated, in the last time; and the *manner* of it is clearly set forth in verse 35:

"And I will bring you into the wilderness of the
"people, [not in a desert wilderness this time,] and
"there will I plead with you face to face."
"Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilder-
"ness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you,
"saith the Lord God."

There will be a revelation of God's hand then this late in the world, and revelation and inspiration are not things of the past. They are certainly to be again employed in the work God shall be concerned in, in the last days, when he shall set his hand a "second time to recover his people from every country."

Notice next in this connection the testimony offered upon the question of the final change to take place as to the relative situations of the Gentiles and Israel, by the apostle Paul: Rom. 11:25 and 27.

"For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; [Paul is writing to the Gentile saints and desires to open their eyes to the fact of some changes to be made:] that blindness, [or hardness] in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in."

"And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, 'there shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.' "For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

This Deliverer was to come after Paul's

time, and the restoration and revelation made after that time. Who shall say then that God shall not reveal himself again, and that his "hand" shall not be made manifest as he has declared.

Open your hearts, my friends, to the sublime fact that the promise of revelation is for our time, and this, when God shall set up his church, "no more to be thrown down or left to another people."

Jesus in the 21st chapter of Luke, speaking of this wonderful transformation in the situations of the people says:

"And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and
"shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jeru-
"salem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until
"the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

Will my opponent say, that then it shall not cease to be trodden down, and that the Lord shall not at that time be found pleading in the wilderness of the people for the old paths, and the removal of Israel's sins? But, says the enquirer, how shall this sin be removed and all of this work be brought about? This leads me to consider another feature entering into the discussion of this proposition, showing:

4. The means used in the accomplishment of the work mentioned in these prophecies, or the *nature of God's work.*

It is to be identical in kind with the work of the first century. I understand there is to be no change so far as Deity is concerned, in carrying on his work.

Jesus says:

"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Matt. 24: 14.

He evidently refers by the word "*this*," to the kind of gospel his will be, that is preached, and the *end of the world*, as the time of preaching it; for he is answering the following questions asked him by his disciples; see verse 3:

1. "Tell us, when shall these things be?"
2. "What shall be the sign of thy coming?"

3. "And, [what shall be the sign] of the end of the world?"

He uses the language relating to "*this* gospel of the Kingdom" in connection with the answer to the third question. Hence, I conclude, it is not to change, but in the end of time, be the same old gospel. This is as the Revelator viewed it, for he says:

"And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven,
"having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them
"that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and
"kindred, and tongue, and people."

"Saying with a loud voice, fear God, and give glory
"to Him; for the hour of His judgment is come; and
"worship Him that made heaven, and earth, and the
"sea, and the fountains of waters."

There are two prominent things set out in this language bearing upon the proposition:

1. That it is the "*everlasting gospel*." It is always the same thing;—does not change,—and hence, equal to "*This gospel of the Kingdom*," of which Jesus spoke.

2. That it is placed by John as being committed to earth and preached in the

"*hour of God's judgment.*" The exact time to which Jesus refers,—"*the end of the world.*"

I will proceed to examine it then, and ascertain if possible, what it is, and what, if anything, is connected with it wherever it is found. It is stated in the record by Matthew 4: 23.:

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people."

It is set forth in Luke 4: 18 to 30, in the same light:

"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised."
"To preach the acceptable year of the Lord."

He at this time says to the people:

"Ye will surely say unto me this proverb, Physician, heal thyself. Whatsoever we have heard done in Capernaum, do also here in thy country. And He said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is accepted in his own country."

Jesus recognized the fact that of a truth where the gospel of his kingdom was, there was power also; providing, the people were in a frame of mind to receive it; for he says in another place: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." Matt. 12:28. The power was, as the preaching of the gospel, one of the necessary evidences. Therefore, the answer was returned to John the Baptist, when he sent to Jesus to know of a truth whether he was the one that should come, or do we look for another:

"Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again, those things which ye do hear and see: The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them." Matt. 11:3, 4 & 5.

This is a fair statement and description of the work of preaching the gospel, and building up of the kingdom of God; and it is the example set by Jesus himself. Hence, we read in Luke 4: 40.

"Now, when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases, brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them."

The publication of the gospel then, which is the distinguishing feature of Christ's kingdom, is the initiatory means of this work of the last days, and this gospel is to be not merely in name, sound, or word, but as delivered by Jesus and the apostles. The gospel is properly described as being:

1. In word—God's truth, and
2. In power and the Holy Ghost.

Upon this Paul says:

"For our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance: as ye know what manner of men we were among you for your sake." 1 Thess 1:5:

"And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power." 1 Cor. 2:4.

"For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power." Ibid, 4: 20.

"But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God then the Kingdom of God is come unto you."

So declared by Jesus, and the converse of the proposition is, that where there is an absence of this manifest work of the Spirit of God in power, there is an absence of the church and kingdom of Jesus Christ.

I shall, then, ladies and gentlemen, have fully established my proposition by the Bible, if I am successful in maintaining these points:

1. That these principles which I have set forth as embodying the faith of the church are indeed in harmony with the word of God, the good seed of the kingdom.

2. That the church is doing the work of sowing this good seed.

3. That it was founded in pursuance of the statements made by the prophets.

4. That the manner of work is after the pattern established by Jesus, not only by the administration of the letter that killeth, but also "the Spirit that giveth life."

"Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God; but he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ he hath both the Father and the Son."

If we abide in this doctrine we shall have both the Father and the Son, and that will prove that it is God's church, and accepted with him.

(Time called).

MR. BRADEN'S FIRST SPEECH ON THIRD PROPOSITION.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—It is freely conceded that Mormonism contains much that is good. So does Mohammedanism. Yet both are impostures, one as much as the other. It is conceded that its organization has features that are identical with some features of the church of Christ. So does a Masonic Lodge. The Masonic Lodge is a human institution that has copied some of the features of the church. So is Mormonism. It is to be expected that Mormonism should teach some things that are good, for its religious utterances, in the Book of Mormon and other pretended revelations, plagiarize large portions of the Bible. It is to be expected that it should imitate the church of Christ, for a counterfeit is always made as much like the original as possible. We should not accept Mormonism because of the stolen portions of the Bible in its pretended revelations, any more than we should take poison because placed in a dish of food. Mormonism steals from the Bible for the same purpose that treacherous enemies will assume the uniform, flag and name of reinforcements that the garrison is expecting, in order to effect an entrance by deception and capture the citadel. It is a fraudulent use of the word of God to deceive. We do not accept Mormonism on account of the features of the church of Christ that it has counterfeited. The closer the imitation the more dangerous the counterfeit. The question to be settled is this: "Is the Mormon organization the true church of Christ." It is not. "Does Mormonism utter some good things?" The devil can do that. Nor "does it have some things that the apostolic church had." The counterfeit has some features of the genuine. The question is, "Is it genuine?" To determine that question we shall examine the teachings of Mormonism in regard to the eight great features of the church of Christ, as given by Paul in Eph. iv. I. One God. II. One Lord. III. One Spirit. IV. One faith. V. One baptism. VI. One hope. VII. One body. VIII. One name. By a comparison of the teachings of Mormonism with the teachings of the Bible in regard to these great features of the church of Christ we will expose its grossly unscriptural and anti-Christian character. I shall not be deterred from doing this work by any regard for the feelings of the disciples of Mormonism or of sympathizers with it. I shall do it truthfully, unsparingly and fully. I shall tell the truth, the whole truth, without mercy, even if it does anger the Mormon Devil who cannot be shamed.

Let us compare the teachings of the Bible and Mormonism in regard to the "One God" who is the Father of all, over all, in all and through all. The Bible teaches that there is one self-existent, independent, self-sustaining and eternal Spirit, the origin of all

derived being, of all being except his own; and the cause of all phenomena. Mormonism is a gross system of idolatry, a gross compound of idolatry and materialism. It assumes the self-existence of matter. Smith did this in his teachings years before his death. P. P. Pratt published his "Eternal Duration and Regeneration of Matter," years before the death of Smith, and it was a standard, and the universal teaching of Mormonism. Orson Pratt in public discussion advocated the eternity and self-existence of matter, and declared that God was matter, and had form organs of man, even to those of digestion, evacuation, and procreation, and that he used them as much as man and the same as man. Logically and consistently Mormonism denies the omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience of God. If matter and God be co-existent, mutually dependent on each other, and mutually sustain each other, each must be finite and limited by the other. If matter be self-existent, independent, self-sustaining and eternal, then God is a product of matter, and includes but a part of matter and its energies. In either case God can not be omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, and infinite for in one case he has been eternally limited by the eternal laws of matter; in the other he is the creature of matter. They hold that matter has ever existed and never was created, since that would presume the existence of a creative spirit, anterior to matter which is impossible, since Spirit itself is matter. The theory of creation advocated in standard Mormon authorities on the topic, is this:—"In eternity two elementary particles of matter met in consultation and compared intelligence. Then these two atoms called to their aid a third passing atom and the three uniting in one will, the three atoms became the first power. To the dignity of this first power no other subsequent power could attain, because the first power had the priority, and by uniting more atoms together, it would always have the precedence and advantage of all other combinations of power." This is bald atheism. It is Ingersoll's theory of the origin of all things almost word for word. He says in his "Gods," "Let us suppose that two atoms of matter come together. We have then cause, effect, order, and law." And he consistently adds, "without God or any need of one." But Mormonism absurdly makes a God out of these two atoms that have accidentally met. Out of this first combination, the First Power, the Head God was begotten, not made, and other Gods have sprung from him as his children. Sex is a cardinal, universal, and eternal attribute and law of all being, physical and moral. Therefore there are Kings and Queens in heaven, and there are Fathers

and Mothers of our Spirits, that were begotten by these higher beings, having sex, in heaven; and wait to become incarnate, as men and women give them opportunity by intercourse with each other. This is the basis of the Doctrine of Spiritual Wifery, that Rigdon advocated in Kirtland long before Joe announced it as a spiritual revelation. God himself was married or how could he do the work of a father? All spirits are literally the Sons of God, who is literally the father of spirits having begotten all in the ordinary course of generation. God has had therefore nobody knows how many wives and concubines. This is clearly proved by the words of the psalmist. "Kings' daughters are among thy honorable women; Upon thy right hand does stand the Queen in gold of Ophir." The apostle told the Hebrews, "We have had fathers in our flesh who corrected us and we gave them reverence. Shall we not much rather be subject to the father of spirits and live?" "Father of spirits" which are in the form and shape of mortal beings proves that spirits were begotten as fathers beget, and of course spirits have mothers as well as fathers. Such was the teaching of standard Mormon books before the death of Smith. Such is Mormonism.

The Book of Mormon pages 505-6, we read: Jared's brother saw the finger of the Lord and it was as the finger of a man, like unto flesh and blood, and he said, "I saw the finger of the Lord; I knew not that the Lord had flesh and blood." And the Lord said unto him, "Behold I am Jesus Christ; I am the Father and the Son. Seest thou that ye are created after my own image. Yea, even all men were created in the beginning after my own image." This teaches that Christ before his incarnation had flesh and blood and a body just like man's body and that God has also. Then he has a human material organization with all its organs of flesh and blood of eating, digestion, evacuation, and procreation. He is limited and finite. He is not spirit, as Jesus declares, for a spirit has not flesh and bones. The Mormon God is an idol a mere man. Orson Pratt declared in a public discussion years before the death of Smith, and the language was a favorite opinion with Mormons years before Smith's death—we quote it from a publication printed in 1843, "We worship a God who has both body and parts—who has mouth, eyes and ears, (and as we have shown they teach that he has organs of digestion, evacuation, and procreation, has organs of sex) "who speaks when he pleases, and to whom he pleases. "Our God is as good at mechanical inventions, architecture, tailoring, smithing, stone-cutting, &c., as any other business." Orson Pratt, P. P. Pratt, Taylor, and scores of Mormon leaders, years before Smith's death taught that God ate drank and did all of the acts that man performs and has all of man's organs. The "Millennial Star," Vol. VI, quotes Joseph Smith himself as saying, "What is God? He is a material organized intelligence pos-

sessing both body and parts. He is in the form of man, and is in fact of the same species;" (hence, according to Joe, he has organs of eating, digesting, evacuation, and procreation.) "He is the model and standard of the perfection to which man is destined to attain, he being the great Father and head of the whole family. This being cannot occupy two distinct places at once, hence he cannot be everywhere present; (God's infinity omnipotence, omnipresence and omniscience positively denied. According to Joe he is limited in form, in place, in time and in knowledge.) "What are angels?" They are intelligences of the human species. Many of them are the offspring of Adam and Eve. Of men it is said, being Gods or Son's of God," endowed with the same powers, capacities and attributes, that the Heavenly Father and Jesus Christ possess. The weakest child of God that now exists upon earth will possess more dominion, more property, more subjects, more power, more glory than is now possessed by Jesus Christ or his Father, while at the same time Jesus and his Father will have their dominion subjects and kingdom increased in proportion."

Then you have revelation and inspiration of Impostor Joe. Spiritual gifts ought to exist to reveal such blasphemous stuff as that. No doubt Joseph the Seer, is the greatest prophet of God, and the Book of Mormon that he gave to the world, the acme of revelation "The fullness of the Gospel." God is matter, he had a beginning. He is a creature of matter. He is finite, very finite, since he can increase so wonderfully. He has all of the organs of the human body, sex, eating, digestion, procreation and evacuation. He eats, drinks, digests, evacuates, procreates like mere man, and very properly, for he is mere man. Mormonism teaches that the Father is not eternal in his existence, or without a beginning, for he had a father and a grand-father, and a line of progenitors, extending back almost ad-infinitum until they reach the great head God, who was generated when two atoms of matter met and called in a third atom, and in the process of generation begat the First Power. In the *Times and Seasons* of Feb. 15th, 1845, the leading editorial declares "Mormonism embraces a plurality of Gods, as the apostle said there are Gods many and Lords many. We say Jesus Christ had a father and mother of his spirit, and a father and mother of his flesh, and so have all of his brothers and sisters. That is not all. The first line of Genesis, properly translated should read: "the Head God brought forth all of the Gods with the heavens, and with the earth." Schmucker quotes similar language from Joe Smith himself, from the King Follett sermon, and Joe adds "the head God, has had any number of offspring that he has begotten by ordinary process of procreation." Who can doubt that the best of spiritual gifts and highest of inspiration exist in a system that is based on such stuff as that, and that they were needed to give

the world such stuff, and that such stuff is the last and best revelation vouchsafed to men.

We charge then that Mormonism as taught by Joseph Smith and its leaders, chosen and approved of him, and in works that were standards under Smith's prophetic control, is a revolting system of Paganism. It is a polytheism of the grossest character, a return to the most loathesome idolatry and paganism. It is bald materialism. Matter is its God, matter precreated its Head God. He has pre-created other Gods. Its Gods are finite, very finite, mere idols. It blasphemously carries into heaven all human organs and actions, eating, drinking, digestion, evacuation, procreation, and all of the acts that are their functions. It with, transcendent blasphemy, attempts to foist them into the being of the One Absolute Self-existent and Eternal Spirit, and to make him like unto themselves, with all their organs, appetites, passions and sins. Such is Mormonism as taught by its founders, and as presented in its standards.

We will now examine the teaching of Mormonism in regard to the one Lord. The Spirit of Christ was begotten in heaven by the Father on one of the Queens of Heaven. His body was begotten of one of the terrestrial concubines of the Father, Mary of Nazareth. The Father descended and wooed Mary as Jupiter wooed Latona or Semele, and then consigned her to the arms of the complaisant Joseph. As the result of the celestial amours, the Saviour of the world was born. The amour of the Father with Mary is like the amour of Jupiter with Europa or Alcmene, Io or Latona or other victims of supernal lust. Jupiter in the form of swan, bull, or shower of gold, outrages purity, and the victim of supernal lust is compelled to bear Perseus, Hercules and Apollo. The Father as literal dove or in some other material form compels Mary to bear Jesus. The heathenism of Greece and Rome was elevating in comparison with Joe Smith's beastly, sensual teachings, in regard to things celestial and divine. The hoary Jupiter of Olympus whose nod shook heaven and earth, was a much more noble being than Joe Smith's head God, and his sway over the world was much more intelligent and divine than the sway of Joe's head God, who is so finite that the weakest mortal will soon eclipse him. Such is the teaching of Mormonism in regard to the origin of the Divine Logos, the Divine Messiah. We object that Mormonism denies that Jesus was, through his inspired apostles, our only Divine prophet, our only source of revelation, and it adds to his completed revelation in the New Testament, the Book of Mormon, and other pretended revelations, extending from Joe Smith down to the vagaries of visionaries and fanatics of the present hour. It denies that Jesus is, through the New Testament, our sole king, and that his commands, completed in the New Testament, are the sole constitution and law of the church, and

adds the pretended revelations of Joe Smith and others from Smith down to the present hour. We have examined the Book of Mormon, we will examine others in their proper place.

Mormonism errs in its teachings in regard to the one Holy Spirit. In writings extant before the death of Smith, it is taught that the Holy Spirit is merely the concomitant will of the Father and the Son, the one mind possessing, actuating and harmonizing both, and which gives vitality and unity to their thoughts and purposes. The Holy Spirit differs from the Father and the Son in being merely a spiritual attribute, and not a person possessing body and parts, which they teach all persons must have, and without which there can be no personality. As the Holy Spirit is not a person we cannot see how our opponent can claim such spiritual powers, as he does. We have already sufficiently exposed the fallacy of Mormonism in claiming that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is now in the Church, and that it is now enjoyed by them. The fallacy of their claims to inspiration and revelations. We have sufficiently exposed the unscriptural and character of such claims. We now submit a practical test. We challenge and defy my opponent to present one instance of miracle, inspiration or revelation, that ever occurred in Kirtland, the head centre of Mormonism for years, the shrine of Joe, Sidney, and all the inspired men of Mormonism. Present one utterance and prove that it was and must have been inspired. Present one miracle ever wrought here. Stop the idiocy of eternally vociferating that you have the cause, spiritual gifts, inspiration, miraculous powers,—that all your officers had it while in Kirtland—that all have it now—that your members had it here—that multitudes have it now—until you present one effect, one utterance, that must have been a revelation, one miracle, one proof of your claim to inspiration and miraculous power. It is an insult to all reason and common sense for you to vociferate this impudent lying claim any longer. Give us one proof or be silent with shame.

The one faith—the one system of teaching, the faith once delivered unto the Saints. To this one faith, the word of God, the Mormon adds the Book of Mormon, the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, and the pretended revelations of Joe Smith and others, published as revelations in their publications; and in their congregational action, they add the vagaries of visionaries, who profess to have received revelation. We hear much of the toleration and charity of this people. In the Book of Doctrines and Covenants we read, "Those who receiveth it" (the Book of Mormon) "in faith and work righteousness, shall receive a crown of spiritual life; but those who harden their hearts in unbelief and reject it (the Book of Mormon), it shall be to their own condemnation." Joe says to his apostles and emissaries, pretending to speak for Christ, "verily, verily, I say unto you, they who

believe not on your word and are not baptized by water in my name for the remission of sins, etc., shall be damned. And this revelation unto you is in force from this hour upon all the world." Book of Mormon. "He that denies these things let him be accursed." Book of Doctrines and Covenants. "And this condemnation resteth on the children of Zion even all. And they shall remain under their condemnation until they repent and remember the new Covenant, even the Book of Mormon." "That Joseph Smith and those to whom these commandments were given might have power to lay the foundation of this church—the only true and living church now on earth."

In a public discussion in 1840 a high priest of Mormonism defined it, "Mormonism is to believe that Christ is the Son of God" (truth), "a firm belief in the Scriptures" (truth), "in faith, repentance and baptism for the remission of sins" (truth), "laying on of hands for the reception of the Holy Ghost" (imposture), "having the church organized according to the New Testament pattern" (truth, but Mormonism has departed from it in a score of officers, ordinances and practices), "and to live by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God" (truth, but Mormonism falsely pretends that the Book of Mormon and Joe Smith's revelations and other revelations proceed from the mouth of God as much as the Bible). "All who reject this belief (Mormonism) will be damned if the Scriptures be true." All who reject Mormonism will be damned if Mormonism be true. This high priest coolly tells that all who reject the Mormon idea of laying on of hands for the imparting of the miraculous influence of the Holy Spirit, will be damned. All who do not believe in a Church according to Mormon pattern with presidents, vice-presidents, councillors, seers, revelators, translators, patriarch, priests, high priests, twelve apostles, several quorums of apostles, and so on ad infinitum, will be damned. All who do not accept the Book of Mormon and all Mormon frauds will be damned.

One of the apostles, one of the Pratts, years before Smith's death, thus defines Mormonism in one of his books:

"Some of the leading characteristics of Latter Day Gospel are as follows: It declares that all of the earth, Christian and Jew, heathen and pagan, are living in wickedness and unbelief, and without a knowledge of God. It declares that the religion of Jesus established on the earth in the days of the primitive apostles has been long perverted into human institutions, without either the form or power of Godliness, and consequently are not acknowledged of God. It declares that all those calling themselves Christians in the nineteenth century are nothing less than idolaters living under a broken covenant. It declares that God has now spoken from the heavens and given a commission unto men to go forth and usher in the fullness of the times (Mormonism) by opening the Kingdom of God (Mormon Dispensation) to both Jew and Gentile. It declares that all who will not humble themselves and go forth and be baptized for the remission of their sins, and have the imposition of hands for the reception of the Holy Ghost by those whom God has called (Mormon emissaries), will never enter the Kingdom of God and be saved with the everlasting salvation. It declares that all who are without prophets and apostles, the spirit of

inspiration and immediate revelation from God, together with the Holy Ghost, which will enable men to dream dreams, see visions and prophesy, speak in unknown tongues and work miracles, are not yet fellow-citizens with the Saints, or of the household of God. It declares that this (the Mormon Dispensation) is the stone cut out of the mountain, without hands, spoken of by Daniel and the prophets, and that it will roll on until every hostile power has fallen before it, and it has become a great mountain and has filled the whole earth."

Such is Mormon charity and catholicity, of which our opponent boasts.

The one baptism. We object to Mormonism that it teaches that there are two baptisms in the Church, when inspiration declares there is but one. That it claims the baptism in the Spirit, when the word of God teaches that the baptism in the Spirit ceased with miracles, and that it was administered by Christ but twice—when the gospel was first proclaimed to Israel and to Gentiles. It was the power with which the kingdom was to be ushered in. We object that Mormonism confounds being born of the water and Spirit, being begotten by the Spirit through the word, and being born of water and the Spirit in baptism—with being baptized in the Spirit. That it makes what was miraculous a part of conversion, which can be accomplished only by moral power. We object that Mormonism teaches baptism of the living as proxies for the dead. The first public announcement of this farce, was in a sermon by Joe Smith to a conference at Nauvoo, October 3rd, 1840. In April, 1841, Rigdon preached it to a conference. It was stated thus "The gospel has been, and we infer, is still preached to the dead, that is to disembodied spirits. The departed spirit is still in a probationary state, capable of being affected by a proclamation of the gospel. Christ offers salvation to the departed on the condition of faith in person, and baptism by a living kinsman in his behalf." In May 1841, in a conference held in Kirtland, nearly all of twenty-five baptisms, were for the dead. In a general conference in October 1841, at Nauvoo, Joe Smith declared "The doctrine presents in a clear light the wisdom and mercy of God in preparing an ordinance for the salvation of the dead. Being baptized by proxy, their names are recorded in heaven, and they are judged according to the deeds done in the body. This doctrine was the burden of the scriptures. Those saints who neglect in on behalf of their deceased relatives, do so at the peril of their own salvation." After this declaration, Joe tells the faithful that the Lord will allow no more baptisms for the dead until the temple is completed, and lashes them like Tetzels with his indulgencies, to pour in the money to build the temple, so that they can save their dead, who are to stay in hell till that font in the temple is finished. Will anyone swallow such stuff as revelation.

We would like to hear from Bishop Kelley an answer to these queries: How can the departed know anything about what his living proxy has done? How can the living proxy know what the departed has

done? What degree of relationship will make the baptism valid? If the departed believes, and no living person can or will be baptized for him, will he continue in hell? If the living is baptized and the departed does not believe, what good does this ignorant farce, this blundering in ignorance, do any one? We hope Bishop Kelley will clear up this matter.

We object to Mormon teaching in respect to the "One hope." They convert it into a sensualistic materialistic paradise, like the paradise of a Mohammedan. The earth is to be changed into a fit theatre for sensual enjoyments. The Saints will be resurrected and reign over Gentiles for a thousand years. Jesus, as temporal ruler, will reign at Jerusalem. Then will come a renovation of the earth by fire, and the Mormons will all become Gods. Smith declares, in the King Follett sermon, "You have got to learn to be Gods yourselves, to be kings and priests unto God, the same as all other Gods have done, by going from one small degree to another, from grace to grace, from exaltation to exaltation, until you are able to sit in glory as doth those who are enthroned in everlasting power." Mormons teach that men are the offspring of God the Father, and brothers of Jesus Christ. They were formerly intelligent spirits in the presence of God, and were with him before the creation of the world. Men are capable of receiving intelligence and exaltation in such a degree as to be raised from the dead, with a body like that of Christ, and to possess immortal flesh and bones, becoming in fact Gods, endowed with the same forms, attributes and capacities which God the Father and Christ possess. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares that "The Saints shall be filled with the glory of Christ and shall be equal with him." We can see why the devotees of this system despise all others. Gentiles will be the slaves of the Saints. The Saints will become Gods. The Gentiles will not. Such teaching fosters spiritual arrogance and pride. It is not the

humility of Christianity but the pride of the infidel philosopher, the arrogance of the Mohammedan slayer of the unbelievers, that is inculcated by the hope of the Mormon.

We object to Mormon teaching in regard to the "one body." It has a fiction in regard to a Melchizedek priesthood when the Bible teaches that Christ was the only Melchizedek priest and had no successor. It has a fiction about an Aaronic priesthood and absurdly declares that all such priests must be "literal" descendants of Aaron. What balderdash. All priests must be called as Aaron was. Christ alone was so called. Mormon priests blasphemously place themselves on an equality with the Son of God. Then there are presidents and vice-presidents, councillors, bishops, elders, pastors, teachers, seers, revelators, patriarchs, prophets, twelve apostles, several seventies of apostles, quorums, presiding elders, traveling elders, presiding bishops, traveling bishops, translators, priests, high priests, until not even an inspired Mormon can tell all the lingo of official additions to the simple church organization of the New Testament. Is this army of officials the simple apostolic Church, with its evangelists, overseers and servants of the church!

The one name. The Disciples were first called Christians at Antioch by the apostles. Mormons were first called "Latter Day Saints" by Rigdon at Kirtland. The congregations were called "Churches of God," "Churches of Christ." The Mormon organization is called "the Re-organized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." Of course it is the true church of God. This modern monstrosity adds to the ordinances of the church, laying on of hands to impart spiritual gifts, that was confined to the apostles of Christ, and blessing of children and has patriarchs as blessers. It enjoins baptism at eight years, whether there is faith and repentance or not. Of course it is the church of Christ.

MR. KELLEY'S SECOND SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Before taking up the line of affirmative proofs, I shall notice a few of the assertions indulged in by the negative.

I. That of the witness of the brother of Jared to the coming of the Messiah in the flesh. Braden says that the Book of Mormon teaches that Christ's physical body existed away back at that time. Why did he not read to you the entire passage, if it said anything bad, or not strictly correct? I will read it:

"And the veil was taken from off the eyes of the brother of Jared and he saw the finger of the Lord; and it was as the finger of a man, *like unto flesh and blood*; and the brother of Jared fell down before the Lord for he was struck with fear. And the Lord saw that the brother of Jared had fallen to the earth; and the Lord said unto him, Arise, why hast thou fallen? And he saith unto the Lord, I saw the finger of the Lord, and I feared lest he should smite me; for I knew not that the Lord had flesh and blood. And the Lord said unto him, Because of thy faith thou hast seen that *I shall take upon me flesh and blood*; and never has man come forth before me with such exceeding faith as thou hast; for were it not so, ye could not have seen my finger."

What is there in this entire passage that any person who believes in God at all, can object to? The statement is:

1. That the finger of the Lord, as revealed to the brother of Jared, was *like unto flesh and blood*.

2. That this was to show him that Jesus would take upon him flesh and blood.

II. He objects, because he says we believe in a material God. A personage composed of matter, &c. But what is matter? If we believe God to be material and composed of matter it is because we believe Spirit to be material and composed of matter. If he means by the term "matter" that of the nature of the substances with which we commonly come in contact here, then he misrepresents us. We claim that the element of spirit itself is material, and in this sense God is material. To believe in anything else, is to believe in no God at all. It is to take Braden's theory of religion that the spirit of God when given, has no effect on the individual; is not an agent, influencing men and women to do good; and consequently there is nothing to it. This, we claim, is anti-Bible and anti-Christian. So it would be with his view of God. He makes out God to be a spirit, and then makes out God to be immaterial—that is, having no properties or materiality, and consequently nothing;—and by this, he is able to make God out to be nothing, and this is in perfect accord, as I have claimed from the first, with the whole tendency of his arguments; that they were calculated to cause men to have less faith and confidence in God, instead of strengthening them in the belief of an existing Creator.

We do not accept the materiality idea of

God, as set forth by Mr. Pratt, or Mr. Young, or anybody else that claims that God is the same kind of a creature as man. That theory is on the other extreme from Braden's view. He has one absurd notion in relation to the tangible existence of God, the people of Utah have another. The only difference between them that I can discover, is, that Braden's ideas upon this, (if they can be called ideas), are more absurd than those of the polygamists. They do hold to the idea of God, although in a *misconceived* materialistic way; while my opponent in his scouting the idea that spirit is material and therefore composed of matter, makes out beyond question that his God is nothing at all. John saw the Spirit when he descended upon Jesus; it was distinctly visible on the day of Pentecost; when David was imbued with it, it was perceptibly felt glowing in his heart; when the Saints of old were visited by it, it was felt, seen and heard. Shall we conclude then it is nothing, immaterial—is unperceptible to the senses, occupying no space and having no extension, just because it is of a different quality of matter to that with which we more frequently come in contact? No. There is no special form or degree of substance required for the existence of a thing before it can be called matter. The iron from the earth is material, having the properties termed matter. But because it is material, containing such properties under a certain form shall we say that the common gases, or the subtle electric fluid, are not also material and composed of matter?

The statement of God's word is: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in truth." I have shown you that the Spirit through which we may worship Him is something; can be seen, felt, and heard, is perceptible; shall I then take the absurd view that the being worshipped through this Spirit is an absolute nothing, that cannot be seen, felt, heard or perceived? Never, if I wish to be right. My opponent should remember that all matter is not the same, any more than that all flesh is the same; and when he refers to the Saints' belief in God as being materialistic, he mis-states, and misrepresents them, unless he means by this reference to materiality of Deity, that God is a Spirit, and that Spirit is composed of spiritual matter, and that it is in *that sense*, they believe that God is material. He should not seek to misrepresent our ideas of what these properties of matter are, in order to try to make out that we have an absurd view of the actual character and attributes of Jehovah. It is easy to see that either my opponent is no philosopher, or else he has not studied to know what the views of my church are upon this question. Christ

existed in reality before he took upon him an earthly tabernacle. And the apostle so understood it.

"For as much then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same."

"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels but he took on him the seed of Abraham."

There is then, I conclude, in fact a nature belonging to man, a nature of angels and a nature of spiritual existence beyond this, of the which is the nature and existence of Deity himself. But shall I conclude that the existence of man and angels is something, but that the existence of God is of nothing? This would be following in the old trail of theological absurdity that has kept the minds of the people darkened for the last thousand years; and from which many philosophers have drawn their ideas and thereby been led to apply wrong and absurd definitions to spirit and materiality. In the translation of the Bible by Joseph Smith, the Seer, as contained in the first chapter of Genesis is clearly set out the true idea of God. I will read it:

"And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Behold, I reveal unto you concerning this heaven and this earth; write the words which I speak.

"I am the Beginning and the End; the Almighty God."

There is no absurd view of God, or thought making him out a finite being to be fairly drawn from any standpoint from the passage. This is from what is termed the Inspired Translation of the Scriptures; a work which we claim contains more of absolute merit than any translation of the Bible extant. We use generally, however, what is termed the *King James' Version*, because that is the one generally accepted by the people, and so far as proving our faith is concerned, we can do that, we think, by any of them. Mr. Braden's argument on the materiality of God and his quotations about the head gods and Adam and begetting spirits, etc., reminds me of a little notice I saw in one of the Pittsburgh papers a few days ago. In giving an account of this discussion it stated that "Mr. Kelley represented the Re-organized church of the Latter Day Saints, and Mr. Braden represented the Brighamite or Polygamous church." Now it seems to me that if the reporter of that paper has chanced to drop in here again this evening and heard Mr. Braden's speech just made, he will again be put down for a Brighamite. (Applause.)

Over at Wilber, Nebraska, I took occasion to tell him that Joseph Smith never held the absurd views of God attributed to him by the Utah people. Nor did he. We do not accept the statements in the works published after his death, of what some one said he said, to find what he believed; but go directly to what he said himself. The trouble with the sermon called the King Follet sermon is, in the fact, that it is not published as delivered. It was not published in his lifetime, was partially written up after its delivery by others, and the full sermon never published anywhere, at any

time, and shall you say we shall accept this as his views with reference to God when it contradicts that which we know he wrote himself, and when many who heard the discourse attributed to him tell us it reads entirely different to what it was as delivered. The trouble is in that publication that it does not contain what he said. But if it did and was then contrary to what is in the inspired works of the church, we would be bound to reject it and hold to the idea of God as reflected in the Bible and the Book of Mormon and the Revelations to the church which are in harmony necessarily with these books. Is this the best Braden can do for an objection?

The religion of Joseph Smith was, and is, as I set it forth in my opening speech upon this question. This was set forth by an endorsement under his own hand in 1841, to Hon. John Wentworth, then editor of the *Chicago Democrat*; and on the 5th of June, 1844, only 22 days prior to his death in a letter to an English publisher, thanking him for setting forth the faith as it was, for he had found that almost universally those who had referred to his religion had done so only that they might misrepresent and demean him.

I have set forth the faith which the church accepts to which I belong. My opponent, notwithstanding this, has occupied the greater part of his time in pretending to tell you what I believe. The greater part, too, of what he has stated, is wholly false and slanderous, copied from works in part which were written for the purpose of destroying the faith of the saints instead of placing it fairly before the public. A man who is so ignorant or prejudiced as not to see that I am the proper one to say what our faith is, in this discussion, is certainly in a forlorn state.

Nothing can be more ridiculous than that upon a question touching the validity of my own faith that my opponent can be permitted to set up anything he pleases and say it is that, and undertake to overturn that, instead of my argument and positions set forth by myself.

Does he propose in the discussion of this question to set up a man of *straw* and attack that all the time, as he did in the first proposition? And expect you to know no better than to accept such a course as argument applicable to the issue? I expect that you are a class of people who are not so overly greedy for anything to beat the "Mormon" with, that such a marshaling of insinuations, stories and wicked aspersions will at all satisfy you.

I will state to my opponent right here, once for all, that so far as the faith of the Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is concerned, as compared to the faith of the followers of Brigham Young, or the people who are usually termed polygamists, I claim that it differs *more widely* from that people, than does the faith of the Disciple or Campbellite church. And remember I am willing to affirm the proposition from this platform, that we

differ more widely from the doctrines of the polygamous church than does the church of Mr. Braden, and am prepared to enter upon a test of that question at the close of the present. I hope that he will either accept this challenge or quit trying to confound our views and faith with that *faction* of the early church that went west and went into all manner of evil.

Besides this, I invite him to take up the polygamous sentiment and affirm that Joseph Smith was in any sense the author of the purported polygamous revelation, or that he ever had more than one wife. I will deny either, or both, and Braden can have time to tell all he professes to know upon this question, and he need not then run off on side issues during the discussion of the question now before us. I am here for the purpose of giving my opponent an opportunity to tell all he knows (and find he is telling a great deal more), and shall not close down the debate until he has all the time he wants, only let the discussion be orderly.

III. Let me ask: Was Joseph Smith directly responsible for everything that took place in the church prior to his death even? Such a position would destroy the work, example and character of Peter, James and John, and in fact all of the apostles. We cannot hold men responsible for crimes or actions of others unless they are personally connected with them and approve of such. The best men that ever lived have been beset with those who were bent on evil. It is such that Satan seeks to surround with evil designers that he may overthrow them. That bad men got into the church during the life time of Joseph Smith is no discredit to his religion or his church government. If his was the church of God, it could not have happened otherwise. Jesus says: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net, that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind."

IV. We do not pretend to claim that everything Joseph Smith did in his lifetime was just right, nor did he ever so claim for himself. Far from it. But the question under discussion is not how much bad he did, or how little he did that was bad. The question is as to the *accepted faith* of the church. What is that? Is it good or bad?

Do not deceive yourselves by imagining that the Saints are expected to take everything that Mr. Smith or any other man said as law or gospel. His own revelations teach the reverse of this, and that even the people are not expected to receive anything as true that should come claiming to be a revelation even, until they shall have first examined and ascertained for themselves as to the evidences in favor of its authenticity. There is no more independent people under the sun, so far as action and thought is concerned, than those whom I represent here. Those of you who attended upon the session of our General Conference here in Kirtland know this. Our men and women think and act in accordance with their respective

judgments more independently than any other body of people I have ever seen convened. They are taught to do this. That they must render an account to the Master, the head of the church, for their own acts and that no one can act as proxy or answer for them.

So much as to the character and manner of thought of our people.

V. Again, he takes up the question of baptism, and says that we differ from the Bible because we believe in two baptisms instead of one. Oh, no! We don't differ from the Bible in that, only from the Campbellite church. He is evidently comparing my views now with those of his church. Of course he must expect that we shall differ from them, because they are not with the Bible, as I was enabled to show fully in the former proposition.

The Bible teaches, in the language of John: "I indeed baptize you with water, but there cometh one after me who is mightier than I; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." And yet only one baptism, Braden says. Jesus said, "Born of the water and of the Spirit;" but Braden says, only one baptism. Paul says in the Hebrew letter "baptisms," in the plural.

Mr. Braden: Paul says one baptism.

Mr. Kelley: He not only says one, but one more—"baptisms." Heb. 6:2. "Washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3:5. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. Baptized with water and the Spirit, the same as Jesus instructed upon this question. And he says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Cor. 12:13. But Braden wants to fix this up by saying: "By command of the Spirit we are baptized;" and over in John, 3:5, he wants to change that so it will read something else instead of *Spirit*. He don't dare take the position that the term "born of the water" don't mean baptized in that element, so he is fastened on "born of the Spirit," as meaning baptized of the Spirit. All the shuffling in creation cannot get around it. There is not a passage to be found anywhere in the Bible saying there is only one baptism and that is in water. In Eph. 4:5 I showed clearly that it did not exclude the baptism of the Spirit in my argument on the *second proposition* discussed. I am willing that my argument upon that shall be put to the test.

The difference between us touching the prophecy of Ezekiel, 20:33-36, is in this: He says the Lord will never have anything more to do with the people, towards revealing Himself to them. That all inspiration and Divine communications were confined to the first century. The prophecy in Ezekiel is yet to take place, and it says the Lord will plead with them "face to face, like as he plead with Israel in the wilderness." He plead with Israel in the wilderness, by revelation, and so he must again, or the prophecy is false; the text is strictly applicable then. Paul places it, when the

"fullness of the Gentiles be come in," the fullness of the Jews had just come in, when Paul uttered the language.

Here, I leave his objections for the present, and take up the

MAIN ARGUMENT UPON THE QUESTION.

In the first century, the evidences of the decay and dis-establishment of the church was in the turning away from the truth, and cessation of the gifts of the gospel. Will it not follow then that if the church is to be re-established, that the first evidences of that work, will be in the fact of a returning and adherence to that same truth, and the restoration of the Holy Ghost and Spiritual power. Herein lies the distinctive difference between the church of Christ, and churches of the world in any age. Jesus says: "Not every one that saith, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven."

We cannot do as we choose, or select the way we will walk, outside of the commandments of God, and still keep within the promises. "In vain (says Jesus), do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." True worship cannot be had in this way. For we are taught better: "They that worship the Father, must worship him in spirit and in truth." There ought not to be any controversy about this, among professing Christians, but all of you know there is, and a wide one too; that the multitude of worshippers to-day, pretend that it don't make any difference what you believe, so you are honest. This was one of the false seeds which was sown, that tended to first corrupt the faith of the early saints—and turn them from the truth. Hence, the falling away from the faith came.

Jesus predicts the event: "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold." Matt. 24:12. The apostle Paul in referring to this, says: "For the mystery of iniquity doth already work." 2 Thess. 2:7. Again, verse 3: "Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a *falling away* first, and that man of sin, be revealed the son of perdition."

This falling away, was to be from the *faith, the truth,* and the spiritual light and power; not simply going out of the church. Such an event as merely going out of the church, would have no more alarmed Paul, than those to whom he refers upon another occasion, when he says: "They went out from us, because they were not of us." It is the waxing cold in their love for the truth, that was the troublesome fact before the mind of the Savior, and also the apostles.

Paul addressing the elders who were called together by him, says:

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

"For I know this, that after my depart-

ing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock." Acts 20: 28, 29.

The full thought here is plainly brought out: "Speaking perverse things,"—perverting the ways of the Lord, and thereby turning men and women from the truth. As expressed in his letter to the saints of Galatia, 1: 7. "There be some that trouble you, and would *pervert* the gospel of Christ." Again in his charge to Timothy this danger of leaving the truth and turning to other things, he is especially warned against 1 Tim. 4: 1:

"Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."

The manner of the falling away can no longer be in doubt after this charge,—they are to "*depart from the faith*;" Not only this—but turn to other doctrines than those taught by the Savior. Paul in the beginning of this letter, 1: 3, says to Timothy:

"I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach *no other doctrine*."

In his second letter to Timothy 4: 2, 3, 4, it is written:

"Preach the word; be instant in season and out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables."

Who shall demand more positive proof than this upon this question? This shows:

1. That there would come a time of great apostasy.

2. That it would consist in the fact of a departure from sound doctrine and having a delight in the fables, concocted schemes, and inventions of men.

3. That these fables would be fed to the people by the very men they should select of themselves to do such work—preachers, "teachers," made in numbers, or "heaps," at the instance of the people or congregation. The fulfillment is as perfect and complete in the state, work and condition of what is termed "popular religion," in our own times as though the apostle were present to describe it.

No wonder with this vivid picture of apostasy from the faith before the mind of the gifted apostle he should again charge his co-laborer:—"Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

Whatever others should do, Paul desired that the devoted Timothy should not lose sight of the sound doctrine which Christ had taught, and be buried neath the clamor of those who desired simply to pursue those things that were pleasing to their own hearts.

As he charged Titus, he wanted him to continue:

"Holding fast the faithful word as he has been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."

The apostle Peter has added his testimony upon this with the many others; he says:

"But there were false prophets also among the peo-

ple, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

"And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."

My opponent seems to think it a terrible thing because that the Latter Day Saints and their faith are spoken against so much; and is willing to gather up and peddle out all of these false tales for sound logic on his side. The apostle Peter, tells the people, however, that the *truth* should be spoken against, in this same way, and this shows again that Mr. Braden has followed a course, all through this discussion that has ever been taken, and likely to be again, by those who fight against Jehovah and his work, instead of for him.

If any of his friends console themselves in the narration of these stories and tales against the Saints, they are welcome to the the comfort for me, because I know it will last at best but for a little time.

But I return to the apostacy. It is clear from these evidences that the church in the first century began to depart from the faith and that in this, there began that general work of sowing the seeds of evil (tares) instead of the good seed, the *word* of the kingdom, (and a receding from the spiritual powers consequently), which eventuated in the complete change of the established order of Jesus. The church, as in the figure was carried into the wilderness and the prophecy of Jesus fulfilled when he said: "From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Matt. 11:12.

And do not lose sight of the thought that the evil consisted in the planting of different principles and faith of church organization and the working of the ministry, from that planted by Jesus and the apostles. After the apostles had fallen asleep, this evil seed or doctrine was sown, differing as it did from the good and afterwards we find that its fruit was different. Hence tares. It is complete in the likeness Jesus gave in Matt. 13:24 to 30.

"The kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field.

"But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way.

"But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also."

The explanation was that the enemy had done this. And it had been done while men slept. While the people slumbered, and there was no voice or wisdom of the master sought by the people. And the effect of the sowing of this false doctrine was tares or persons who are not fitted for the garner of the Lord although they may have grown in the field. Having imbibed another set of principles than those Jesus taught, they had indeed become subservient to a different ruler and king, as the apostle says:

"Whomsoever ye list yourselves servants

to obey, his servants ye are;" and thus only those can be the servants of Jesus who accept of and obey his word. For this reason he said: "Unto those Jews who believed on him, if ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

They were his disciples if they kept this good seed in their hearts, for "it is the truth," (the good seed) which was to develop and make them free. Now I come to the question of the restoration of this truth, this good seed of the kingdom, the kingdom itself, and ask if any of you have considered how it should be done and what we should have were it done. Would it be indeed a restoration? A return to the old paths? Wherein would we have the same gospel and the same church organization; the same faith and the same power in religion; the same promises and the same spiritual enjoyment; the same catalogue of faith and the same ordinances in the church; the same Father and Son and the same gift of the Holy Spirit; and, in fact, the church of Christ restored as it existed under him and the apostles? So I believe; and that anything short of this will fall short of a restoration, and short of the straight and narrow way that leadeth unto life, of which Jesus was the great teacher and exemplar.

Such a work as this, it is my privilege to ask your consideration of; and it must be made in a proper and true way, do you expect to arrive at an intelligent judgment. I know, my friends, that the feeling of people is against asking for anything good, or seeking for light, in this way, which has so long been evilly spoken of, but it is no more against us than it was the former servants of Christ. The people of Rome said to Paul: "We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for as concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against." Acts 28: 22.

Pilate said to the Jews: "Ye have brought this man (Jesus) unto me, as one that *perverteth* the people."

Did that make Jesus bad because the people accused him of evil things, and a perverter of their law? All of you answer not; my opponent, who engages in a like warfare in this discussion, must answer no.

Against Stephen it is said that they:

"Set up *false witnesses*, which said, [yes, said,—this is like a great many to-day] This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law."

What a charge they had against Stephen! He had been telling them of the destruction of their temple, and that they must listen to present revelation, as well as to read what the "Lord said to Moses," and for this they called him a terrible fellow and stoned him to death.

Has not my opponent taken his stronghold just like these people all of the time? Has not he continued the charge against me that because I was contending for the whole word of God that I was attacking the Bible?

Oh, yes, he says Kelley is attacking the Bible! But have I said anything against the Bible? No; no man ever heard me utter a word against that book. But I have contended, as Stephen did, that it was not sufficient to simply read what God said to Moses and the prophets, or Jesus and the apostles, but that we must have an experimental knowledge for ourselves through the gift and power of the Holy Ghost, the means of inspiration; and my opponent, as the Jews of old, cries out "he is attacking the law." But I am not attacking the law, but abiding in the law, and telling him that if he believed in Moses and the prophets, in Jesus and the apostles, he would believe in the words that I speak, for they all wrote of this day and this work.

Do not then, my friends, be turned from the truth by the tales of evil that have been spun by the evilly disposed against the founding of the church of God in this age, but cast these from you as you would the most deadly poison or the tares of Satan and examine this question as men and women who have judgments of your own and who have been nobly fashioned in the image of God, that you *should* thus act for yourselves.

Now all of these pretended stories and tales of Joseph Smith being a money-digger in the sense these persons tell that tale, hazel-witching, stone-peeping and rambling fortune-seeker are wholly, emphatically and totally without foundation in truth. But tales manufactured by such suborned witnesses as those against Stephen, and those who told that Jesus' "disciples came and stole him away by night while they slept," for the money and promised favor in the

community extended them. Will you be prejudiced against an investigation upon this then by reason of them? Not if you are wise men and women.

It is a fact that when in his fifteenth year a boy of the State of New York, as with Samuel of old when he was but a mere lad, made the announcement to the world that so far as an acceptance of the various systems of Christianity in the world with our heavenly Father was concerned, none of them met his approval in their doctrines taught as a whole, and in their work. And he went on to tell wherein and the reason they were in this condition. Many thought this a very sacrilegious thing in the boy to state this as he did, in the year 1821, and at once set up a clamor against him although he was thus young, and they have kept it up ever since not even ceasing with the offering made by him of life itself for the truth of his statement. He was murdered for opinions' sake in this free country when only 38 years of age, and still the warfare goes on under the most extravagant and absurd concoctions of slanderous tales, sandwiched with the most unbecoming and impolite epithets and disgusting expressions.

But I wish you to particularly notice and examine the straight forward account of the founding of the church by Divine Providence as related by an actor and proper witness, and then choose whether you will prefer to believe the cunning lies and falsehoods of Satan as touching this, or that which carries the conviction of truth on the face of the narration.

(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S SECOND SPEECH.

MORMON REVELATIONS.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mormons are committed by organic action to receive as revelations—I. The so-called inspired translation of the Scriptures by Joseph Smith, the seer, in which Joe pretends to translate and correct the word of God by inspiration. II. The Book of Mormon which they elevate above the Bible, for they declare it contains "the fullness of the gospel." III. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants. Out of 341 pages, 279 are covered by articles that they publish as revelations. IV. Revelations of Joe Smith published in "Times and Seasons," "Elders' Journal," "Morning and Evening Star," "The Missouri Expositor," "The Wasp," "The Millennial Star," and other publications. V. Revelations of Cowdery, Rigdon and other leading Mormons, published in the same publications. VI. They regard as of authority and of divine origin nearly all that was written and published before the death of Smith. In discussion they may deny this, but in their church practice they act in accordance with it. In communication with inquirers they will sometimes deny having a translation, or rather a corruption of the Bible, that Joe Smith pretended to make by revelation, although they published it to the world as done by inspiration with a pretended revelation as preface; and with an introduction full of infidel attacks on the Bible as a palliation for Smith's corruptions of the Bible. They will deny that they make the Book of Mormon a part of what they regard as divine revelations, when their Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares it contains the fullness of the Gospel. They will deny that they make the Book of Doctrines and Covenants a part of what they use as divine revelations, when every article after the introductory lectures, that cover but about one-sixth of the book, is headed "A Revelation." They will deny that they regard certain articles of Joe Smith, Rigdon and others as divine revelations, when they publish them in their official organs as revelations. In his corruption of the Bible called an inspired translation, Joe Smith interpolates two verses of his stuff at the beginning of the first chapter of Genesis and changes constantly the form of the language. He interpolates five verses of his stuff at the beginning of the third chapter of Genesis. The ideas in the latter interpolation have not one particle of warrant or support in the rest of the Bible. All other translators have been content to compare manuscripts and translate the best reading. This ignoramus that could not write a decent sentence of English, pretends to translate Hebrew and Greek, and to tell us that his stuff was what the writers of the

books of the Bible wrote, that has been lost since they wrote. It is about as worthy of the faith of mankind as his pretended revelations in regard to lost property, obtained by looking through his stolen peep-stone into his hat. It is not as reliable, for from the way things stuck to his fingers he could tell exactly where the money or stolen article could be found. We will spend no more time in analyzing this monstrous piece of colossal impudence and ignorance.

The Book of Mormon we have already examined. We will now examine briefly the stuff that is blasphemously attributed to the Almighty, as revelations from him in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. On page 65 we are told: "Behold, I am God and have spoken it. These commandments are of me, and were given unto my servants after the manner of their language." (That is not true, for they did not talk the brogue of King James' translators.) "That after having received the record of the Nephites, yea, even my servant Joseph Smith, Junior," (How exact the Lord is, to guard the people against thinking it was old Joe, the father.) "might have power to translate through the mercy of God, by the power of God, the Book of Mormon, and also (that) those to whom these commandments were given (he meant might be given) might have power to lay the foundation of this Church, and to bring it forth out of obscurity, and out of darkness, the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth, with which I, the Lord, am well pleased." There you have the sincere milk of Mormonism. It is the only church on the whole earth, with which the Lord is well pleased.

Page 66, Martin Harris' wife disgusted with the fraud, that Joe Smith had cajoled her husband into, took 116 pages of the precious revelation, and laid them in the coals that Martin had covered up, and burned them. The Mormon God did not know what she had done, and when he missed the manuscript, he gives Joe a revelation. He tells Joe that somebody had stolen the manuscript, intending, if Joe replaced the language verbatim, to alter it, and pretend that Joe was not inspired, for he could not restore what he wrote at first, or if he did not restore it, then they would produce what he wrote at first, and show that he was not inspired, for he could not replace it verbatim. But the Mormon God, although he did not know who got the manuscripts, nor that it was destroyed, was altogether too sharp for a trick, nobody ever thought of trying. He knew a trick worth a dozen of a trick nobody thought of. He takes some time to study it out, however. Page 67, we are told the Indians are to be converted. This was

one of the vagaries of Mormonism that they seem to have abandoned. The Indians are not Mormons, and the Saints have abandoned their conversion to the apostates of other churches. That prophecy is not fulfilled. Page 69, Martin Harris catches Aleck, for wanting to see the plates that Joe had not got. Joe has no gift, not even to show the plates, except to translate. Martin is told that he feels too big. He must get down off his high horse. Then the Mormon God coolly tells Martin to lie. He says, "And I the Lord command him, my servant, Martin Harris, that he shall say no more unto these (the people of this generation), concerning these things, (the plates), except he shall say I have seen them." As he had not seen them, the Mormon God told Martin to lie. "And they have been shown unto me by the power of God." As they had not been shown unto him by the power of God or Joe Smith either, the Mormon God told Martin to tell another lie. "And these are the words which he shall say," (that is he shall tell two lies) "but if he deny this," (that is does not tell two lies) "he will break the covenant, which he has before covenanted with me, and behold he is condemned." Because he would not do what he promised Joe Smith he would do, tell two lies for him, and what the Mormon God tells him to do, tell two lies.

Page 72, Oliver Cowdery, who is Joe's scribe, gets the big head. He wants to have revelations of his own as well as Joe. He is not content with merely writing down Joe's stuff. The Mormon God gives him a sugar plum telling him that if he will be a good boy he will some day translate some plates of his own. Page 75 Joe and Oliver get curious over the fool idea that the apostle John is now on earth. They get a revelation telling them that he is now on earth. All devout Mormons believe that balderdash. This revelation as now published is more than half of it a fraud. Pages 76-77 Oliver gets the big head again and is modified with a sugar plum or two to keep him writing for Joe. If he is a good boy and does what Joe wants him to, he will some day translate other records, "his own self."

Page 78-83. At last the Mormon God has ciphered it out how to beat a trick that never was tried. He will give a more particular account from Nephi's plates instead of Lehi's. That will make a march on the fellow who thought he could put up a job on the Mormon God.

Page 83, we have a revelation to Hiram Smith. Page 86, one to John Knight, sr., and David Whitmer. Page 87, to John Whitmer. Page 88, to Peter Whitmer. Joe was just "chock-full" and running over with revelations. He had a revelation for every one he wanted to rope in.

Page 89. The three witnesses having been prepared by special revelations are now told that they shall see plates, the golden breast plate, the golden sword of Laban, the Urim and Thummim of Jared's

brother, and the miraculous director of Lehi. They tell us in their testimony, they saw the plates and mention them alone. Perhaps the Mormon God forgot and did not show them the rest. They were told it took wonderful divine power to enable them to see these things. Not long after this eight men saw them and no divine power was needed. Granny Smith tells us that long before this she had a squint at the golden breast-plate, and without one particle of miraculous power. Life of Joseph Smith, page 114. Will some Mormon tell us what became of these articles, we are told an angel took them back from Joe as fast as he got through with them. Then he could not have shown them to his eight witnesses and his mother. If the angel did not take them back, where are they? Great heavy metallic articles like those would certainly be preserved. Why do not Mormons show them? Why not point out the solid imperishable stone chamber where they were found. It would silence all scepticism.

This revelation is not in the "Evening and Morning Star" or the Book of Commandments; David Whitmer says there never was such a revelation. The revelation and the phrase, Urim and Thummim, and the notion about the Urim and Thummim were fabricated in Kirtland in 1835 to furnish a basis for a yarn Cowdery fabricated and wrote for the *Messenger and Advocate*, and was then dated back.

Page 93, we are told: I. Joe was inspired to translate the Book of Mormon. II. The Book of Mormon contains the "Fullness of the Gospel" to Gentile and Jew. III. That the Book of Mormon was given by inspiration and confirmed unto others by ministering of angels. Page 96, an apostle, we are told, is an elder. The scriptures teach that he was sent as a witness to teach and preach, because he had seen Jesus after his resurrection. We are told he imparts by laying on his hands the baptism of the Holy Ghost and of fire. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was never imparted by the laying on of an apostle's hands. That baptism was imparted by Christ himself and from heaven, and in no other way by any other person. The apostles imparted spiritual gifts but not the baptism. Again there is an egregious blunder in regard to the baptism of fire. The baptism in the Holy Spirit was for those of the righteous to whom Christ should impart it. The baptism in fire was for the wicked. "The wheat"—the righteous—"he will gather into his garner." "The chaff"—the wicked—"he will burn with unquenchable fire"—the baptism in fire. We are told a priest's duties. The New Testament does not know of such an officer or of its duties. All Christians are priests. Page 97, we have papal confirmation by laying on of hands. The New Testament knows nothing of it. We have another ordinance added—the blessing of children. The New Testament knows nothing of this. They have added another officer, patriarchs, or blessers. The New Testa-

ment gives no liturgy; nearly all known creeds do. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants betrays its human origin by giving a liturgy. Page 99, Martin Harris gets a revelation, giving the Universalists fits. Mormons have changed somewhat since Joe was fighting Universalists. Martin the witness, one of the sacred three, is told not to commit adultery, not to murder. He must have been a good one for a chosen witness. He is told he must give his property to have the Book of Mormon printed. Bless the Lord! He must not covet his own property. Glory! He must pay the printer of the Book of Mormon. Glory hallelujah! Martin is told he must not argify. He does not know enough. Sinners get the advantage of him. He must content himself with preaching alone. He is told again to give up his property, even his land, to pay the printer of the Book of Mormon, and if he don't he will catch it. Page 102, the Mormon God fixes up Joe's titles. He is to be called—I. Seer. II. Translator. III. Prophet. IV. Apostle. V. Elder. Joe had saved all the big places for himself. Page 105, we have this sublime piece of argifying done by the Mormon God: "Behold I am the Lord God Almighty, and endless is my name, for I am without beginning of days or end of years. And is not this endless?" So there now! Moses has a wonderful vision all to tell him about Joe Smith. Joe was inclined to magnify his own name, not the Lord's. Page 109, the church is told they will be cursed if they don't support Joe. Page 110, Emma Smith is to quit work, write for Joe instead of Oliver Cowdery, do as Joe tells her, and she shall be supported by the church, and receive wonderful gifts, get up a hymn-book, etc. How good the Mormon God is to Joe to act as errand boy for him, and fix up all these little matters for him. Page 113, Oliver wants to be as big as Joe. He has revelations. He gets a backset for it. He must not try to boss Joe or rival him. He must quit talking about revelations. To keep him out of mischief he is sent off to the Indians. Hiram Page's peep-stone is not the "old original Jacob Townsend." It is from Satan. Joe's peep-stone alone is the Simon-pure.

Now let our readers stop and think of such stuff as this coming down from the infinite God of the Universe. Tricks to cajole men into fraud, to wheedle money out of them, to prevent any one rivaling Joe Smith, to see that he has some one to write for him, and all such low paltry, tricky stuff are called revelations. Page 116, Joe spreads himself and prophecies of a howling old time, if folks don't accept his revelations. Page 117-18, Universalism a lick. Also Calvinism. He explains the first death in accordance with Rigdon's theology. He hits original sin a lick also. The Lord always reveals that Rigdon's notions are right; everybody else is wrong of course. What a happy thing for the Lord, that he always agrees with Rigdon! Page 119, David, Peter and John Whitmer are

snubbed up. Joe is the counselor and Joe alone. Page 120, T. B. Marsh is snubbed up also. Page 121, Peter Whitmer, Oliver Cowdery, P. P. Pratt and Ziba Peterson are all punched up a little. Next Ezra T. Mayre, Northrup Sweet, Orson Pratt, and Edward Partridge are stirred up. Page 124 is a long rigmarole about Rigdon, being an Elijah to the new Messiah, Joe. Page 127, is a long rigmarole pretending to be an extract from the Book of Enoch, mentioned by Jude. Page 136, the saints are to possess Kirtland for ever. To obey no power but Mormonism. Pages 137-38-39, James Covell is ordered to go to Ohio. He catches Aleck, because he will not sacrifice his business and go. Page 140, the followers with money are told that Joe must have a house to live in and translate in. It must be built for him. Edward Partridge must let his business, his store go to the dogs, and attend to it. Page 141, preachers are ordered out. To avoid grumbling, Joe and Sydney must go with the rest, but the Mormon God will give them a revelation in a short time to come back, and have an easy time. Partridge catches it because he won't give up his business and run the plans of Joe in the church. Page 147, the Mormon God has to tell some unruly ambitious fellows that Joe is the only prophet. Page 159, the Mormon God kindly acts as Joe's lacky and provides one to do his drudgery instead of Cowdery. Page 161, the Snakers get a dig. Page 164, Partridge gets it again because he won't give up his business. Page 169, the Mormon God sends out Joe and Sydney on a land speculation. Page 171, the Mormon God hunts up another one to do Joe's drudgery. Page 173, Ezra Thayer catches Aleck because he won't give his property to the church to provide means for Joe and others to go out on the land speculation, and go to Missouri, trusting to get his money back, in the land in Missouri. Joe's creditors are told they will be paid in land in Missouri. Page 174, a surveyor, land agent, and editor, provided by the Mormon God. Pages 176-80, Partridge gets a dressing down for not believing all of Joe's big yarns. Martin Harris is approved for giving up his money, but he feels too big. Phelps wants to be too big. Z. Peterson gets a set back. It is amazing how careful the Mormon God was that no one should rival his servant Joseph. Sydney Rigdon is to write a description of the promised land. We are gravely told, "Behold, here is wisdom." Yea, verily; if tall lying was to be done, there was wisdom in selecting Sydney to do it. He could beat Munchausen.

Now comes a farce that is disgusting and ludicrous. Joe had got a crowd of men into Missouri by revelation. There were more than could find work or means of living. Some must return home. There was only money enough to pay the way of three part way back. A revelation is given that it is dangerous for all but Joe and Sydney and Oliver to go by water. The rest must give up their money to them that could go on a steamboat without danger, and foot it

home as they could. No wonder that Ezra Booth's good sense rebelled at such infamous swindling, in the blasphemous guise of a revelation. Page 180-181, a second revelation is given to get the money from the dupes, for Joe, Sydney and Oliver. The Mormon God tells them to do it and trouble him no more. Page 182, nevertheless he trims down those who are not willing to foot it back preaching. He tells them to go to St. Louis he don't care how, and go preaching. Page 183, comes a revelation again telling them that it is dangerous to go on the waters. It is not needful that any should be moving swiftly on the waters except Joe and his two pets. The rest must foot it home and send Joe and his pets on their way in comfort. Page 186, they are told to go out on the preaching mission. Ride if they can get the means, but put out.

How any one could be so besotted in superstition as to publish this stuff with its selfishness, folly, low cunning, and hypocrisy as revelations from God, is unaccountable to all common sense. That men should remain dupes of such a knave after such imposition is still more inexplicable.

Page 188, Oliver Cowdery is hinted at for his adultery with his hired girl. Rigdon's spiritual wifery was making trouble. Page 190, the Mormon God fixes up the business in Kirtland. Sydney had been trying to be as big as Joe, and he gets a lashing. Page 193-5, the rebellious ones who don't mind Joe get a trimming down. Booth cut off. Partridge catches it again. It was wonderful how much trouble the Mormon God had with that Partridge. He was a most cantankerous bird. The Mormon God tells who shall sell and go, and who shall stay, and fixes it all up.

Page 194, we have this revelation, "Behold it is said in my laws or forbidden to go in debt to their enemies; but behold it is not said at any time that the Lord should not take when he pleases, and pay as seemeth him good; wherefore as ye are agents, and ye are on the Lord's errand, and whatsoever 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, and behold I, the Lord, declare unto, and my words are sure and shall not fail, they shall obtain it." Which means in plain English—"Don't go in debt, but take by violence or steal from your enemies." It was this revelation that has been quoted ever since, when Mormons stole or robbed, in Missouri, in Illinois, in Utah, and elsewhere.

Page 195, McLelin is to send his money to Missouri, and go East himself. Page 197, the elders catch it. Let them beat Joe's revelations or dry up. Page 199, we have the unscriptural nonsense about the Melchizedek priesthood. Page 200, children must be baptized at eight years anyhow. Page 201, Joe gets afraid to trust Cowdery with the money to be sent to Missouri. He sends John Whitmer with him to watch him and report. Page 202, the faithful

are scourged for not giving to Joe and his pets. Joe and his pets are to keep all they get, even if more than they want. Page 205, the faithful are punched up to give to have Joe's revelations published. Page 211, we have in a wonderful revelation the popular error that the Lucifer of Isaiah is the devil when he was the king of Babylon. Page 223, there is a positive revelation that a wonderful temple is to be built in Missouri, and a cloud to rest on it in that generation. The Mormons had better be hurrying up or that prophecy will not be fulfilled. Page 224, a fictitious lot of stuff is got off about that unscriptural fabrication the Melchizedek priesthood. Page 247, the farm on which old Joe Smith lives must not be sold, and old Joe must not allow too many to loaf around him. Joe is looking out for the main chance always. Page 253, we have a long revelation about having the faithful come down with their dust to build a house for the President and for printing purposes.

It is positively declared "Behold there is none other place appointed than that which I have appointed in Missouri, neither shall there be any other place for the work of the gathering of my Saints." Page 136, Joe told them the land of Kirtland and vicinity was to be the inheritance of them and their children for ever. Now he says it is Missouri, and there shall be no other place. When at Nauvoo he told them that was to be their inheritance for ever. This needs a little fixing up. Page 265, one of the most brutal insults ever offered to a set of duped wretches. After getting thousands of dupes to go to Missouri, by his lying revelations, and after encouraging them to spoil the Gentiles by his revelations, Smith coolly tells them that what they suffered as a result of obeying his revelations, was a punishment for their sins. Page 277, the Mormons are to curse their enemies and to take vengeance on them even unto the third and fourth generations. This bloody utterance bore its fruit in the Mountain Meadows butchery and hundreds of fiendish murders. Page 278, a crusade against enemies is preached. Page 286, Missourians to catch it. Page 287, another preaching of a crusade. These bloody utterances have stirred Mormon fanatics to many a deed of blood. Page 289, we have a hierarchy more extensive and elaborate than that of Rome built up, and about as much like the simple New Testament Church. Page 301, we have a long revelation to the faithful to shell out, and build for Joe a great tavern at Nauvoo for him to live in and make much gain out of the Gentiles who came to Nauvoo. The Mormon God organizes a stock company and slashes William Law and Dr. Foster and others who have money because they don't shell out. Probably to have the book close with "something religious," on page 315 we have a plagiarized mixture of the Book of Revelations and the Prophets of the Old Testament. Then two letters about the farce of the baptizing the living for the dead, written

while Joe was dodging justice for attempting the assassination of Gov. Boggs, by the hand of that cut-throat Port Rockwell, one of the elect band of Mormons, the Danites. Then come revelations of Joseph III, two sickly little things. The new prophet must take courage: steal some dead man's manuscript, steal from the Bible, get some blatherskite like Rigdon to help him rant and rave and howl bombast and balderdash and he will be a Mormon prophet worth while. As it is now he makes a poor fist of it. He must tear round more than he has yet, or the Mormons will call that younger brother, the "child of prophecy," out of the madhouse.

We have now examined the Book of Mormon and the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. We will devote a few lines to that impudent fraud, the most brazen product of Mormon ignorance and blasphemy called the Inspired Translation. During the years 1831-2-3 Rigdon and Smith pretended to translate the Bible by inspiration. They deliberately changed words in the thousands of instances. They deliberately interpolated words, sentences and whole paragraphs. They assign no reason for this, except that inspiration told them to do this, in order to restore the Bible to its original condition as it came from the hands of the writers. They pretended to restore the Book of Enoch mentioned in Jude to restore writings of Moses now lost, to restore a book written by Abraham. Joe overdid the matter in the case of the Book of Abraham. He pretended to translate a papyrus found with a mummy. Scholarship shows that his translation, his Book of Abraham is an ignorant fraud. So are all other pretended revelations from him. That blasphemous fraud, the inspired translation interpolates into the beginning of the book of Genesis: "And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto Moses saying, Behold, I reveal unto you concerning this heaven and this earth. Write the words which I speak, I am the beginning and the end, the Almighty God. By mine only begotten I created these things."

It blasphemously interpolates into Genesis iii, at the beginning of the chapter five verses of such stuff as this:

"And I the Lord spake unto Moses saying, that Satan whom thou hast commanded in the name of mine only begotten is the same which was from the beginning. And he came before me saying, 'Behold I (what grammar) send me (why did he not say send I), I will be thy Son and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost and surely I will do it, wherefore give me thine honor.' But behold, my beloved Son, which was my beloved and chosen from the beginning, said unto me, 'Father, thy will be done and the glory be thine forever.' Wherefore that Satan rebelled against me and sought to destroy the agency which the Lord had given him and also that I should give unto him mine own power by the power of mine only begotten, I caused that he should be cast down and become Satan yea even the Devil, the father of all lies, to deceive and to blind men and to lead them captive at his will."

But the most blasphemous interpolation is in Genesis L. Into that chapter is interpolated a long lot of blasphemous frauds from the second chapter of the second Book of Nephi in the Book of Mormon. Listen:

"And Joseph said unto his brethren, 'I die and go

unto my fathers, and I go down to my grave with joy. The God of my father Jacob be with you to deliver you out of affliction in the days of your bondage for the Lord hath visited me and I have obtained a promise of the Lord. For out of the fruit of my loins the Lord God will raise up a righteous branch out of my loins (Joe Smith) and unto thee, whom my father Jacob hath named Israel, a prophet (not the Messiah who is called Shilo), and this prophet shall deliver my people out of Egypt in the days of thy bondage. And it shall come to pass that they shall be scattered again, and a branch shall be broken off, and carried into a far country (Sidney's Nephites). Nevertheless they shall be remembered in the covenants of the Lord, when the Messiah cometh. For he shall be made manifest unto them in the latter days in the Spirit of power. And he shall bring them out of darkness into light out of hidden darkness and captivity into freedom. A seer (Joe Smith) shall the Lord my God raise up, who shall be a choice seer (verily Joe was a choice seer) unto the fruit of my loins. Thus saith the Lord God of my fathers unto me. A choice seer (the choice Joe Smith) will I raise up of the fruit of thy loins. And he shall be esteemed highly among the fruit of thy loins, his brethren (verily the people who knew Joe esteemed him highly). And unto him I will give commandments that he shall do a work for the fruit of thy loins. And he shall bring them to a knowledge of the covenants which I have made with thy father. And he shall do whatsoever work I shall command him. And I will make him great in mine eyes (Joe always looked out for his own glory) for he shall do my work, and he shall be like unto him whom I said I would raise up unto you to deliver my people, O house of Israel, out of the land of Egypt, and he shall be called Moses. And by this name he shall know that he is of the house, for he shall be saved by the king's daughter and he shall be called her son. (How much more definite Sidney's prophets are than the prophets of the Old Testament). And again a seer (Joe Smith) will I raise up out of the fruit of thy loins (and don't you forget it) and unto him (Joe Smith) will I give power to bring forth my word (Book of Mormon) unto the seed of thy loins. And not to the bringing forth of my word only saith the Lord, but to the convincing them of my word (the Bible) which shall have gone forth amongst them in the last days. Wherefore the fruit of thy loins shall write (the Book of Mormon), and the fruit of the loins of Judah shall write (the Bible). And that which shall be written by the fruit of thy loins (the Book of Mormon) and also that which shall be written by the fruit of the loins of Judah (the Bible) shall grow together unto the confounding of false doctrines, and the laying down of contentions and the establishing of peace among the fruit of thy loins and bringing them to a knowledge of their fathers in the latter days and also to a knowledge of my covenants saith the Lord. And out of weakness shall he (Joe Smith) be made strong in that day when my work (Mormonism) shall go forth among all people which shall restore them who are of the House of Israel in the last days. And that seer (Joe Smith) will I bless, and they that seek to destroy him (Joe Smith) shall be confounded, for this promise I give unto you for I will remember you from generation to generation. And his name shall be called Joseph, and shall be after the name of his father (old Joe), and he shall be like unto you, for the thing (Book of Mormon) which the Lord shall bring forth by his hand shall bring my people unto salvation."

Then follow two paragraphs about Moses with all of Rigdon's definiteness.

Now then, do you doubt that the Book of Mormon is divine? Sidney has fixed it up so that the Patriarch Joseph prophesied all about it and Joe Smith. There is one thing I don't understand, Joe Smith was to be a lineal and literal descendant of Joseph the patriarch. Now as all the Nephites were slain and as only the Lamanites, the Indians, were left, and these were cursed with a skin of blackness, the query arises, was Joseph a descendant of the Nephites who had been exterminated 1,400 years? Or is he a Lamanite? Of what tribe is he, "Big Injun?" Will Bishop Kelley inform us? That is enough of that blasphemous slaughter of the word of God, the Inspired Translation.

MR. KELLEY'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—When my time was called last evening, I was entering upon the narrative of young Mr. Smith, with reference to the manner of the Commitment of the Gospel, and the beginning of the work that culminated in the organization of the church in this century. I shall this evening first finish this narrative and then proceed with the argument: *Pearl of Great Price*, pp. 37 to 44.

"I was at this time in my fifteenth year. My father's family was proselyted to the Presbyterian faith, and four of them joined that church, namely, my mother, Lucy, my brothers, Hyrum, Samuel Harrison, and my sister Sophronia.

"During this time of great excitement, my mind was called up to serious reflection and great uneasiness; but though my feelings were deep and often pungent, still I kept myself aloof from all those parties, though I attended their several meetings as often as occasion would permit; but in process of time my mind became somewhat partial to the Methodist sect, and I felt some desire to be united with them, but so great was the confusion and strife among the different denominations, that it was impossible for a person, young as I was, and so unacquainted with men and things, to come to any certain conclusion who was right, and who was wrong. My mind at different times was greatly excited, the cry and tumult was so great and incessant. The Presbyterians were most decided against the Baptists and Methodists, and used all their powers of reason or sophistry to prove their errors, or, at least to make the people think they were in error. On the other hand the Baptists and Methodists, in their turn, were equally zealous to establish their own tenets, and disprove all others.

"In the midst of this war of words and tumult of opinions, I often said to myself, what is to be done? Who of all these parties, are right? or, are they all wrong together? If any one of them be right, which is it, and how shall I know it?

"While I was laboring under the extreme difficulties, caused by the contest of these parties of religionists, I was one day reading the Epistle of James, first chapter and fifth verse, which reads: 'If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth unto all men liberally, and unbridled not, and it shall be given him.' Never did any passage of scripture come with more power to the heart of man, than this did at this time to mine. It seemed to enter with great force into every feeling of my heart. I reflected on it again and again, knowing that if any person needed wisdom from God, I did; for how to act I did not know, and unless I could get more wisdom than I then had, would never know; for the teachers of religion of the different sects understood the same passage so differently, as to destroy all confidence in settling the question by an appeal to the Bible. At length I came to the conclusion that I must either remain in darkness and confusion, or else I must do as James directs, that is, ask of God. I at length came to the determination to ask of God, concluding that if he gave wisdom to them that lacked wisdom, and would give liberally and not upbraid, I might venture. So, in accordance with this my determination to ask of God, I retired to the woods to make the attempt. It was on the morning of a beautiful clear day, early in the spring of eighteen hundred and twenty. It was the first time in my life I had made such an attempt, for amidst all of my anxieties I had never as yet made the attempt to pray vocally.

"After I had retired into the place where I had previously designed to go, having looked around me and finding myself alone, I kneeled down and began to offer up the desires of my heart to God. I had scarcely done so, when immediately I was seized upon by some power which entirely overcame me, and had such astonishing influence over me as to bind my tongue so that I could not speak. Thick darkness gathered around me, and it seemed to me for a time, as if I were doomed to sudden destruction. But exerting all my powers to call upon God to deliver me out of the power of this enemy, which had seized upon me, and

at the very moment when I was ready to sink into despair and abandon myself to destruction, not to an imaginary ruin, but to the power of some actual being from the unseen world, who had such a marvelous power as I had never before felt in any being. Just at this moment of great alarm, I saw a pillar of light exactly over my head, above the brightness of the sun, which descended gradually until it fell upon me. It no sooner appeared than I found myself delivered from the enemy which held me bound. When the light rested upon me, I saw two personages, whose brightness and glory defy all description, standing above me in the air. One of them spake unto me, calling me by name, and said (pointing to the other) 'THIS IS MY BELOVED SON, HEAR HIM.'

"My object in going to enquire of the Lord was to know which of all the sects was right, that I might know which to join. No sooner therefore, did I get possession of myself, so as to be able to speak, than I asked the personages who stood above me in the light, which of all the sects was right (for at this time it had never entered into my heart that all were wrong), and which I should join. I was answered that I must join none of them, for they were all wrong, and the personage who addressed me said, 'That all their creeds were an abomination in his sight; that those professors were all corrupt, they draw near to me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me, they teach for doctrine the commandments of men, having a form of godliness, but they deny the power thereof.'

"He again forbade me to join with any of them; and many other things did he say unto me, which I cannot write at this time. When I came to myself again, I found myself lying on my back, looking up into heaven.

"Some few days after I had this vision, I happened to be in company with one of the Methodist preachers, who was very active in the before mentioned religious excitement, and conversing with him on the subject of religion, I took occasion to give him an account of the vision which I had had. I was greatly surprised at his behavior, he treated my communication not only lightly, but with great contempt, saying it was all of the devil, that there were no such things as visions or revelations in these days; that all such things had ceased with the apostles, and that there never would be any more of them.

"I soon found, however, that my telling the story had excited a great deal of prejudice against me among professors of religion, and was the cause of great persecution which continued to increase; and though I was an obscure boy, only between fourteen and fifteen years of age, and my circumstances in life such as to make a boy of no consequence in the world, yet men of high standing would take notice sufficient to excite the public mind against me, and create a hot persecution, and this was common among all the sects, all united to persecute me.

"It has often caused me serious reflection, both then and since, how very strange it was that an obscure boy, of a little over fourteen years of age, and, one, too, who was doomed to the necessity of obtaining a scanty maintenance by his daily labor, should be thought a character of sufficient importance to attract the attention of the great ones of the most popular sects of the day, so as to create in them a spirit of the hottest persecution and reviling. But strange or not, so it was, and was often cause of great sorrow to myself. However it was, nevertheless, a fact, that I had had a vision. I have thought since, that I felt much like Paul when he made his defence before King Agrippa, and related the account of the vision he had when he "saw a light and heard a voice," and still there were but few who believed him; some said he was dishonest, others said he was mad, and he was ridiculed and reviled; but all this did not destroy the reality of his vision. He had seen a vision; he knew he had, and all the persecution under heaven could not make it otherwise; and though they should persecute him unto death, yet he knew and would know unto his last breath, that he had both seen a light, and heard a voice speaking to him, and all the world could not make him think or believe otherwise.

"So it was with me, I had actually seen a light, and in the midst of that light I saw two personages, and they did in reality speak unto me, or one of them did; and though I was hated and persecuted for saying that I had seen a vision, yet it was true; and while they were persecuting me, reviling me, and speaking all

manner of evil against me, falsely for so saying, I was led to say in my heart, why persecute for telling the truth? I have actually seen a vision, and "who am I that I can withstand God?" or why does the world think to make me deny what I have actually seen? for I had seen a vision; I knew it, and I knew that God knew it, and I could not deny it, neither dare I do it; at least I knew that by so doing I would offend God and come under condemnation.

"During the space of time which intervened between the time I had the vision, and the year eighteen hundred and twenty-three, (having been forbidden to join any of the religious sects of the day, and being of very tender years, and persecuted by those who ought to have been my friends, and to have treated me kindly, and if they supposed me to be deluded to have endeavored, in a proper and affectionate manner, to have reclaimed me,) I was left to all kinds of temptations, and mingling with all kinds of society, I frequently fell into many foolish errors, and displayed the weakness of youth, and the corruption of human nature, which I am sorry to say led me into divers temptations, to the gratification of many appetites offensive in the sight of God. In consequence of these things I often felt condemned for my weakness and imperfections; when on the evening of the above mentioned twenty-first of September, after I had retired to my bed for the night, I betook myself to prayer and supplication to Almighty God, for forgiveness of all my sins and follies, and also for a manifestation to me that I might know of my state and standing before him; for I had full confidence in obtaining a divine manifestation as I had previously had one."

"While I was thus in the act of calling upon God, I discovered a light appearing in the room, which continued to increase until the room was lighter than at noonday, when immediately a personage appeared at my bedside, standing in the air, for his feet did not touch the floor. He had on a loose robe of most exquisite whiteness. It was a whiteness beyond anything earthly I had ever seen; nor do I believe that any earthly thing could be made to appear so exceedingly white and brilliant. His hands were naked, and his arms also, a little above the wrist; so, also, were his feet naked, as were his legs, a little above the ankles. His head and neck were also bare. I could discover that he had no other clothing on but this robe, as it was open, so that I could see into his bosom."

"Not only was his robe exceedingly white, but his whole person was glorious beyond description, and his countenance truly like lightning. The room was exceedingly light, but not so very bright as immediately round his person. When I first looked upon him I was afraid, but the fear soon left me. He called me by name, and said unto me that he was a messenger sent from the presence of God to me, and that his name was Nephi. That God had a work for me to do, and that my name should be had for good and evil among all nations, kindreds and tongues; or that it should be both good and evil spoken of among all people. He said there was a book deposited, written upon gold plates, giving an account of the former inhabitants of this continent, and the source from whence they sprang. He also said that the fullness of the everlasting gospel was contained in it, as delivered by the Savior to the ancient inhabitants. Also, that there were two stones in silver bows (and these stones, fastened to a breastplate, constituted what is called the Urim and Thummim) deposited with the plates, and the possession and use of these stones was what constituted Seers in ancient or former times, and that God had prepared them for the purpose of translating the book."

"After telling me these things, he commenced quoting the prophecies of the old Testament. He first quoted part of the third chapter of Malachi, and he quoted also the fourth or last chapter of the same prophecy, though with a little variation from the way it reads in our Bibles. Instead of quoting the first verse as it reads in our books he quoted it thus: 'For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall burn as stubble, for they that come shall burn them, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.' And again, he quoted the fifth verse thus: 'Behold, I will reveal unto you the Priesthood by the hand of Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.' He also quoted the next verse differently: 'And he shall plant in the hearts of the children the promises made to the fathers, and the hearts of the children shall turn to their fathers; if it were not so, the whole earth would be utterly wasted at His coming.'"

"In addition to these he quoted the eleventh chapter of Isaiah, saying that it was about to be fulfilled. He quoted also the third chapter of Acts, twenty-second

and twenty-third verses, precisely as they stand in our New Testament. He said that the prophet was Christ, but the day had not yet come when 'they who would not hear his voice should be cut off from among the people,' but soon would come."

"He also quoted the second chapter of Joel, from the twenty-eighth to the last verse. He also said that this was not yet fulfilled, but was soon to be. And he further stated, the fullness of the Gentiles was soon to come in. He quoted many other passages of scripture and offered many explanations, which cannot be mentioned here. Again, he told me that when I got those plates of which he had spoken (for the time that they should be obtained was not yet fulfilled) I should not show them to any person, neither the breastplate with the Urim and Thummim, only to those to whom I should be commanded to show them; if I did, I should be destroyed. While he was conversing with me about the plates, the vision was open to my mind that I could see the place where the plates were deposited, and that so clearly and distinctly that I knew the place again when I visited it."

"After this communication, I saw the light in the room begin to gather immediately around the person of him who had been speaking to me, and it continued to do so until the room was again left dark, except just around him, when instantly I saw, as it were, a conduit open right up into heaven, and he ascended up until he entirely disappeared, and the room was left as it had been before this heavenly light had made its appearance."

I lay musing on the singularity of the scene, and marvelling greatly at what had been told me by this extraordinary messenger, when, in the midst of my meditation, I suddenly discovered that my room was again beginning to get lighted, and in an instant, as it were, the heavenly messenger was again by my bedside. He commenced, and related the very same things which he had done at his first visit, without the least variation, which, having done, he informed me of great judgments that were coming upon the earth, with great desolations by famine, sword and pestilence, and that these grievous judgments would come on the earth in this generation. Having related these things, he again ascended as he had done before."

"By this time, so deep was the impression made on my mind, that sleep had fled from my eyes, and I lay overwhelmed with astonishment at what I had both seen and heard; but what was my surprise when I again beheld the same messenger at my bedside, and heard him rehearse or repeat over again to me the same things as before, and added a caution to me, telling me that Satan would try to tempt me (in consequence of the indigent circumstances of my father's family) to get the plates for the purpose of getting rich. This he forbid me, saying, that I must have no other object in view in getting the plates but to glorify God, and must not be influenced by any other motive than of building his kingdom, otherwise I could not get them."

"Convenient to the village of Manchester, Ontario county, New York, stands a hill of considerable size, and the most elevated of any in the neighborhood. On the west side of this hill, not far from the top, under a stone of considerable size, lay the plates deposited in a stone box; this stone was thick and rounding in the middle on the upper side, and thinner towards the edges, so that the middle part of it was visible above the ground, but the edge all round was covered with earth. Having removed the earth and obtained a lever which I got fixed under the edge of the stone, and with a little exertion raised it up; I looked in, and there indeed did I behold the plates, the Urim and Thummim, and the breastplate as stated by the messenger. The box in which they lay was formed by lying stones together in some kind of cement. In the bottom of the box were laid two stones crossways of the box, and on these stones lay the plates and the other things with them."

"As my father's worldly circumstances were very limited, we were under the necessity of laboring with our hands, hiring by day's work and otherwise as we could get opportunity; sometimes we were at home and sometimes abroad and by continued labor were able to get a comfortable maintenance."

"In the year 1824 my father's family met with a great affliction, by the death of my eldest brother Alvin. In the month October, 1825, I hired with an old gentleman, by the name of Josiah Stool, who lived in Chenango county, state of New York. He had heard something of a silver mine having been opened by the Spaniards in Harmony, Susquehanna county, State of Pennsylvania, and had, previous to my hiring with him, been digging, in order, if possible, to discover the mine. After I went to live with him he took me among the rest of his hands to dig for the silver mine,

at which I continued to work for nearly a month without success in our undertaking, and finally I prevailed with the old gentleman to cease digging after it. Hence arose the very prevalent story of my having been a money digger.

"During the time that I was thus employed, I was put to board with a Mr. Isaac Hale, of that place; it was there that I first saw my wife (his daughter) Emma Hale. On the 28th of January, 1827, we were married, while yet I was employed in the service of Mr. Stool.

"At length the time arrived for obtaining the plates, the Urim and Thummin, and the breastplate. On the 22nd day of September, 1827, having gone, as usual, at the end of another year, to the place where they were deposited; the same heavenly messenger delivered them up to me with this charge, that I should be responsible for them; that if I should let them go carelessly or through any neglect of mine, I should be cut off; but that if I would use all my endeavors to preserve them, until he, the messenger, should call for them, they should be protected."

I have thus been particular in reading to you this narrative, because it is so entirely unlike the various manufactured stories told about the visions, work, character, habits and integrity of this boy, that I wished them placed side by side before you.

The detailed circumstances by young Mr. Smith are altogether different to the old woman's tales and neighborhood gossip so universally given out by his enemies.

And is it not strange that these same parties who pretend to tell you how it all was, and just what actually did occur, should also deny that anything at all remarkable occurred. Why do they tell so much for about satan and the peep-stones and water-witching, and the plates and angels, and the frock of sand and tool chests, if there was nothing at all? And how can any honest man come to the conclusion that he will reject Mr. Smith's statement of the matter since he was the one there and knew what happened and believe what his enemies said about it when they admit they were not there and know nothing about it, except what they got from Mr. Smith second or third handed? If the statement comes from him any way, shall we not go directly to him instead of taking it through his enemies? That sounds too much like the old story on the disciples charging they came and stole him away, for me. Satan's hand is discernable. Such in brief is an account of the beginning of the restoration of the gospel through this young boy of Manchester. And now, ladies and gentlemen, I shall proceed to examine with you the work as prefigured by the positions laid down by me the first evening.

I. That the principles and faith of the church are in harmony with the word of God as contained in the Bible. Are indeed the good seed of the kingdom, which when men have sown bring forth fruit in the good ground acceptable with Jesus Christ.

II. That from this faith and these principles there was a falling away and perversion after the first century, as was clearly predicted by Jesus and the apostles, and that the church went into the wilderness and her authority was taken away; and that since the *falling away* was occasioned by reason of the perversion of the truth and a corruption of the gospel principles as taught in the early ages, the restoration

must consist of a reinstatement of these same principles and truths, with the same organization and authority as was had in the early church of the Saints.

III. That the restoration was made and the order of the church reinstated by Christ himself in accordance with the predictions made by the prophets relative to this particular work of the last days or time. It may be objected that this work set out in the prophecies to be instituted and established under the immediate supervision of Christ himself, as predicted by the prophets relates to the restoration of Israel and their return to their own country, rather than to a restoration of the gospel. My answer to this is, that one of the things to be eventually accomplished by the work is the restoration of Israel to their own country; but that is but a part of the work to be accomplished or even of restoration: it is but one of the results to be brought about by the replanting of the gospel standard. The visible beginning of the entire work is the "lifting up of the ensign," Isa. 11. "The lifting up of a standard to the people and the casting up of a highway," Isa. 62. The calling and sending forth of men under the proclamation as foreseen by the prophet: "Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and afterwards I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain and from every hill." "I will cause them to know my hand and my might, and they shall know that my name is Jehovah." Jer. 16. The Lord is to do his own work and manifest, His "hand," show forth his power, communicate with the people, and notwithstanding the claim made by the many of the world, that the day of revelation has ceased and that God was to have nothing more to do in the enlightenment and conversion of the human family. He is to plead with the people "face to face," like as he plead with Israel under Moses, and bring them into the bond of the covenant. The more particularly distinguishing feature of this work which the Lord is to perform among the people is that of the preaching of the gospel.

This is in fact God's ensign; his standard, the way of life and salvation; "Immortality and eternal life is brought to light through the Gospel." It is the means by which the Gentiles are made "partakers of the promises in Christ." "The power of God unto salvation." Hence, the work of restoration when it begins will be by first recommitting this means of preparation, and John says of the beginning of the work: "I saw another angel fly through the midst of heaven having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation and kindred, and tongue and people. Saying with a loud voice, fear God and give glory to him for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven and earth and the sea and the fountains of water." The restoration is not only to consist of the gathering of Israel into the bonds of the Covenant,

but in the language of the apostle Peter, "Of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." All things which have been predicted are to be restored. The time of this work the apostle places exactly with that spoken of by the prophets and Jesus, and the apostles Paul and John: "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things," etc. Acts 3:20-21. Then the times of the restitution is in the time when Jesus too, will come, in the "hour of God's judgment." And in the time when "this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." The same as the Revelator said was to be preached "to every nation, kindred, tongue and people." "This Gospel," says Jesus referring to the one which he was preaching, which consisted not only of words, a record of the dead letter, but of power, as described by the evangelist Mark 1:27; "what thing is this? What new doctrine is this? For with authority commandeth he even the unclean spirits and they do obey him." This is the Gospel that is to be preached as a "witness unto all nations;" and it will be, "a witness," for it will be unlike the preaching which has laid claims to being the Gospel for centuries; hence, an evidence of itself and truly "a witness" that the angel has made his way in the midst of heaven, and the times of the restoration or restitution is at hand. It is not true as is supposed by my opponent, that all there is to the Gospel is the record which any one may take up and read. If that was true, all who read the account of the Gospel would be saved; "for it is the power of God unto salvation." But many read the record and do not believe it. The Gospel then is in the word—God's truth, and in power and the Holy Ghost. Hence the apostle says: "For our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but in power and the Holy Ghost and in much assurance." Here is where we get the idea of true preaching, of Gospel preaching. It is a mistake to suppose that a man can preach the Gospel of Christ without the power of Christ's Spirit—to aid him; there is no instance on record of where this was done. Even Jesus himself could not do it without this Spirit and power. Hence it is written of him by the prophet Isaiah 61:1, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek." And before Jesus sent his disciples into the world to preach, he said unto them, "But tarry ye at Jerusalem until ye are endowed with power from on high." Although they had been three years with the master himself, receiving instructions, and had then received the fullness of the Gospel so far as its presentation in word is concerned, they were not yet to undertake to minister his word, until they should have with them the power, as well as the letter of the Gospel. To undertake to preach otherwise than by this would be

to make confusion and discord in their work instead of bringing unity and arriving at the truth; this is the reason we find the world in the state it is in to-day. Instead of men teaching as directed by that Spirit that was to "guide them into all truth," they have preached as they have been educated in their peculiar systems, and their educations having been in different schools and there being an absence of that spiritual guide that was to bring unity and oneness of thought in the truth, we have a thousand divisions, all widely different, and yet, all professing to be the right one.

The educated Catholic preaches Catholicism.

The educated Disciple preaches Campbellism.

The educated Baptist preaches Calvinism.

The educated Methodist preaches Arminianism; and

The educated Hebrew preaches Judaism.

And so I might go on naming the entire thirty minutes; and notwithstanding the fact that all of these claim to be the children of God, and all expect to reach the highest seat around the Lord's table, it would be as great a miracle as the moving of the Kirtland hills to get them to sit down in peace and unity around the Lord's table here in this world. Don't flatter yourselves, my friends, that by the change, called death, all of these barriers are broken down and you will meet with entire different feelings, and tastes on the other side; for it is written: "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap:" and if you would have the Spirit of unity and love, charity that never faileth when you arrive over on the other side, you must first lay hold upon it here. This comes by reason of the "Comforter, of whom Jesus said, I will send you, if I go away, even the Spirit of Truth."

Why, says my opponent, that was for the apostles; Yes, and for all men who desired the truth. He takes the ground that people now should not have this "Spirit of Truth." This was the gift of the Holy Ghost, the comforter and the reverse spirit to this, the apostle says, "is the spirit of error," 1 John 4:6. Then when I contend that this "Spirit of Truth," should be in the church and it after the pattern, in the manner, that God set it in the church, shall I be continually met with the "dodge" that, this Spirit, the Holy Ghost, the comforter, was to the apostles just after the time of Jesus only? In Jesus' time the true church was known by means of the presence of this life power. "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." There is no denying the position that where the church of God, or kingdom of God is, there is power; the power of the Holy Spirit;—Paul knew this, and he therefore asked at Ephesus if those who claimed to have been baptized by John's baptism, had received the power. "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" He knew just how to tell whether they were in the church, or kingdom of

God, or not; for in that, there was power. Hence, "have ye received the Holy Ghost?" been *baptized* with the Holy Ghost? The difference is only in the imagination of my opponent. What right has he to say that when the Holy Ghost fell on these twelve men at Ephesus, and they spake with tongues and prophecy," that they were not *baptized with the same*, since he admits the baptism of the household of Cornelius, and the record reads as in the case of the baptism at Ephesus? "The Holy Ghost fell on all of them which heard the word, and they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." This dividing up of the Holy Spirit, making a distinction between the reception of the Holy Ghost, the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, is without warrant in the word of God, and for the purpose only of maintaining a theory, as I have before shown you. But it is claimed that people are better off without this Holy Spirit than the early Christians were with it.

Singular as it may seem, persons claiming to be wise, ministers of various orders, will undertake to make this claim.

Can they not see that they take sides with the class of whom Jesus spoke who taught that their way was better than that which he taught them, when he was here, when he told them they could only receive the Holy Spirit represented by the new wine, after divesting themselves of their old religion. "No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new, for he saith, *The old is better*," Luke 5:39. And so it is now claimed, that men are better off and nearer to God, than though they received of this Holy Spirit, the Comforter; the Spirit of Truth; the Spirit of prophecy and testimony of Jesus, as he says: "When he is come he will testify of me." If this Spirit is with anybody then, he will testify of Jesus, and "herein we may know the Spirit of Truth from the spirit of error." Hence John writing to his little children, as he calls the saints, says: "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." How do they know all things? Answer, by that "unction," (Spirit) "from the Holy One;" for Jesus had said, I will send him if I go away, and he shall bring all things to your remembrance," etc.

Here, as given in the account in John's letter, we find these believers enjoying the same spirit after all of the apostles had fallen asleep, except John, that they had had from the first. Again, verse 27: "But the anointing which ye have received of him [Christ] abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teaches you of all things, and is truth [the Spirit of Truth] and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him."

As it hath taught you; not the written word hath taught you; but it, the spirit of truth, the "unction." They had to abide in the word also, for if they did not do this, they could not have this unction or Holy

Spirit to teach them; nor could they abide in the word without it. The spirit was with its other work, to bring the word, "all things Jesus had taught him to their remembrance." Hence, Jesus says: "If a man love me,"—if a man, (not one of you twelve or seventy,)—"If a man loveme he will keep my words." Is that all? oh no; "He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him."

Unto who, the twelve? No, he that loveth him and keepeth his commandments, John 14:21, to 27.

The apostle could then truly say of his anointing, 2 Cor. 1:21 and 22: "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ and hath anointed us in God; who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." And the same anointing is that which Jesus was blessed with. Heb. 1:9. "Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

Now I call your attention to the parable relating to the dispensation of the gospel in the "fullness of times," represented under the head of hours of labor, including all the dispensations, or the calling of men into the ministry from the time God began to warn and instruct the people so far as the record informs us. And in whatever age or dispensation a man labored he received the penny appointed, and so of those who labored in the eleventh hour. In the presentation of this work Jesus also showed that the order of nations in this would be reversed; that there would be brought about the change of the *first* being *last* and the *last* first. In the first century the gospel was presented first to the Jews, and afterwards was to go from them to the Gentiles; but in the "dispensation of the fullness of times," the presentation is to be made first to the Gentiles, and then to the Jews. Hence the language of the apostle—Jerusalem shall be trodden down, "until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in;" then the time of rejoicing of the Jews is to take place; and of Jesus in Math. 20:16: "So the last shall be first, and the first last." The standard, then preached by him to the Jews, was in the last time to be lifted up, and to go from the nations termed Gentiles, to the Jews. The prophet Zechariah naming the particular way in which the work should begin that would result in the restoration of Israel, says: "And behold the angel that talked with me went forth and another angel went out to meet him. And said unto him, Run, speak to this young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as towns without walls for the multitude of men and cattle therein; therefore I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her." Zech. 2:3, 5.

Thus we have the full, clear and complete establishment of the work as outlined in prophecy, and as set forth, perfect agreement and harmony in the work itself in the fulfillment.

MR. BRADEN'S THIRD SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—My opponent tried to dodge the quotation from the Book of Mormon. It will avail him nothing. It does represent Christ as answering the astonishment of Jared's brother, when he saw his finger, by reminding him that men are in the likeness of the Father, who has flesh and blood and bones as they have. Smith, and the Church in his day accepted the teachings of the Pratts as standards, and universally taught them. It is amusing to see the dodges of my opponent. It makes no matter who uttered a teaching, nor how universal it may be, if he cannot defend it he repudiates it. It is not a teaching of the Church. It is a very convenient method of discussion. He repudiates what they have published as revelations, in the same way. These revelations are valuable helps. If the revelation suits them, they accept it. If it does not, they reject it. That is as much help as California Hog Scales. Put the hog on one end of a rail laid across a log. Balance him with stones, and guess at the weight of the stones. So Mormons balance revelations with their notions. If they agree, they accept. If not they reject. My opponent balances his revelations with what he can defend. If he thinks he can defend them, they are revelations the teachings of the Church. If not, he rejects them. Such a prophet is as valuable as a fifth wheel to a wagon, it only adds to the load, and they throw it away when they can't haul it.

I did not say that the language I quoted was in Joe's inspired translation, and my opponent knew that I did not. I said he made such comment in the first verse of Genesis in the King Follett sermon, and he knew that was what I said. But anything, even falsification of statements, to dodge. He tells me, Joe did not put certain things in an article in a religious encyclopædia. Jesuits do not either. They conceal part of their sentiments. I quoted Smith's declarations in an article published in one of the church papers—the prophet's special teaching to the faithful. But the present head of the Church has repudiated such teaching. He is to be commended for his good sense; but unregenerate Gentiles have this trouble, which are they to accept? The positive teaching of the founder and great Seer and revelator Joe II., as published in Vol VI. "Millennial Star," or the utterances of the present head, Joe III.? When you decide which is head and which is the tail, we can decide which way the snake is going. The world will hold them to what their standards have published, especially their great prophet, seer, revelator, and founder said, and especially what they have published of his utterances, and have accepted and taught themselves, until

pressed in debate, when they dishonestly try to evade it. He dishonestly says that I teach that God will have nothing to do with men now. He knew that was false when he uttered it. I believe God deals with men now in a perfect revelation, in a higher and more perfect manner than he did in partial revelations. Just what Paul teaches.

I called on him to prove that a single revelation or miracle had ever occurred in Kirtland. His answer is amusing. After assailing my Church, because we have no miracles and revelations, and boasting that his Church is the Church, because it has miracles and revelations, all officers and most of the members having such power; when called on to produce one, just one, in its head centre, he says "the Gospel is based on reason and not on miracles." Just what I have claimed, just what our people claim, and for such teaching he denounced us as apostates. He even asserted that we do not believe in the Holy Spirit, because we say that no one enjoys his miraculous influence; and declared that there was but one influence of the Holy Spirit, and that is miraculous. Christ appealed to his miracles when upbraiding Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida. He said to unbelievers "Believe me for my works." He wrought miracles to convince men and to prove his claims. He healed the sick in Nazareth, and ceased only when they refused to believe, and it was no longer of any avail to give them proof. Will my opponent do what Christ did? Lay his hands on a few sick and heal them? Will he do as Christ did, recite the miracles that Mormons have done in Kirtland? You denounce our people because we have no miracles or revelations. You claim to be the Church, because you have them. We defy you to cite one. Shut up for shame till you do.

He read Joe Smith's yarn about his first vision. That story was first told by Smith in 1843, when he was 38 years old, and 23 years after he says he had the vision. His mother and his father's family knew nothing about it then. His mother in writing his life quotes this very story, as he wrote it 23 years afterwards. It is all a fabrication. No ignorant boy of fifteen, scarcely able to read, had such knowledge of all the profound theological questions of the day. He did not reason like a theologian of forty. Joe fabricated that yarn after sixteen years acquaintance with Rigdon. He got the Campbellism of his pretended vision from Rigdon. It is a lying fabrication. His vision is a lie, for he says he saw the Father in person. No mortal ever saw him. Human ears have heard him but three times. His long quotations have as much relevance as quoting the multiplication table. He supposes that persons are silly enough to think,

because he quotes many passages he is proving his proposition, whether they have any bearing on the question or not. We are agreed that a falling away was prophesied. The sole issue is: What does a restoration include? I claim a return to the Bible, as our sole standard. He says to Joe Smith's pretended revelations, to the pretended miraculous power, visions, miracles, frauds and fallacies, of Mormon knaves and dupes. I claim that the Bible alone is the word of God. He adds Mormon frauds.

I object to his church that it flatly contradicts the Holy Spirit and declares there are two baptisms in the church, when he says there is but one. Will my opponent answer these queries. I. Does not John declare "Immerse you in water, but Christ will immerse you in the Holy Spirit." II. Does not John make these two immersions? III. Is not immersion in water for the remission of sins, in the church? IV. Does not the Holy Spirit say there is one immersion in the church? V. Is not that one immersion—immersion in water, for the remission of sins. VI. If immersion in water for the remission of sins, is in the church, and there is but one immersion in the church, can immersion in the Holy Spirit, which John declares is entirely different from immersion in water for the remission of sins, be in the church? Now answer or stop that gabble that gives the lie direct to the spirit of God. He appeals to Hebrews vi. Can not he see that his perversion of that passage only makes the scriptures contradict themselves, and fails to sustain his perversion. Now it is a fact that, I. The Hebrew letter was written to Hebrew Christians who esteemed the law of Moses above the Gospel. II. The apostle shows that the law of Moses was a preparation for the Gospel, the schoolmaster to lead to Christ. III. He exhorts them to abandon the law of Moses and accept the Gospel alone. IV. He exhorts them to lay to one side repentance from dead works, the works of a dead law, teaching concerning immersions—the immersions, bathings, washings of the law of Moses—the different immersions of Heb. 9-10, "carnal ordinances, meats, drinks, and different immersions imposed till the time of reformation," or until the Gospel came. The immersions of Hebrews, 6:1, and the different immersions of Hebrews, 9:10, on the same.

Again suppose that my opponent finds different immersions in the Bible, it does not prove that there is more than one immersion in the church. The Holy Spirit says there is but one in the church. Can he understand that? The Bible speaks, I. of one immersion in water for remission of sins. My opponent admits that it is in the church. II. Immersion in the Holy Spirit. III. Immersion in fire. IV. Immersions in sufferings endured by Christ. V. Immersion into Moses. VI. Different immersions of the law of Moses. Are all these in the church? They must be if in the Bible; according to my opponent. Why does he not have immersion in suffering—immersions

into Moses—in the different immersions in the law of Moses, in the church, as well as the immersion in the Spirit? 1 Cor. 8:4, "For though there are those that are called Gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there are Lords many and Gods many) to us there is but one God the Father." If my opponent finds a score of immersions in the Bible, to us, to the church, the Holy Spirit says there is but one baptism, as there is but one God. He might as well claim several Gods, as several immersions—several faiths—several Lords—several Holy Spirits—several hopes—several bodies, just as well, as claim several immersions. To us, to the church, there is but one baptism, as there is but one God—one Lord—one Holy Spirit—one faith—one hope—one body—one immersion.

Again, if the one baptism be immersion in the Holy Spirit, then two of the items are the same,—the one Spirit and the one immersion in the Spirit are the same. Or we have the one Spirit and then we receive him again in the immersion in the Spirit. The obtuseness or perverseness of my opponent is to be pitied. He cannot see the difference between immersion *by* one Spirit and immersion *in* the Spirit—the difference between *in* and *by*. The difference between born *of* the Spirit and immersion *in* the Spirit; the difference between *in* and *of*—the difference between immersion *in* the Spirit, and the renewal *of* the Spirit—the difference between *in* and *of*. Until he can see that *by* is not *in*, *in* is not *of*, he had better stop debating, and study a dictionary for several years, for it would take that long for him to understand what any schoolboy knows. Now then let our opponent stop this gabble about two baptisms which gives the lie direct to the Spirit of God.

To his long string of irrelevant prophecies we object: I. His application of them to Joe Smith and the Book of Mormon is a mere inference. If we were to insert the inference it would make the prophecies sound ridiculous. II. The context limits several to the return of the Israelites from captivity. Isaiah xi, 16, "And there shall be a highway for the remnant of the people which shall be from Assyria." What balderdash to apply this to Joe Smith and Mormonism. Isaiah is merely poetic hyperbole, describing the return of the Israelites from Assyrian captivity. One of the egregious blunders of those who run crazy over Hebrew prophecies is that they take what these prophets said of their nation, and they rarely prophesied of anything else, and carry it over into modern history, of which the prophets never dreamed. Men find railroads, telegraphs, telephones, gas lights, electric lights, in Hebrew prophecies. They find that the English people are descendants of Israelites, the Indians are, that the United States is prophesied of, that Louis Napoleon was foretold, Bismarck, the Fox girls, and Joe Smith. I confess that I have such a disgust for such vagaries that I have no patience to notice them.

Jeremiah xvi refers to the Assyrian captivity and return from it. So also Ezekiel. xx. Even if it did not, it could be applied to the Fox girls and Spiritism, as well as to Joe Smith and Mormonism. Such vagaries backed up by irrelevant quotations and misapplication of prophecies are to prove that Mormonism is the church of God.

We will now continue our examination of the pretended revelations of Mormonism. All inspiration should be harmonious and agree with itself. If Joe Smith was inspired when he translated the Book of Mormon, and when he made the Inspired translation, these two products of inspiration should agree. If Joe was inspired when he gave the revelations in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, and when he made the Inspired Translation, these two products of inspiration should agree. In the Book of Mormon there are hundreds of quotations from the New Testament; hundreds from the Old Testament. In his Inspired Translation Joe has changed these passages, in scores of instances. If he was inspired in his translation, King James' version is wrong in all of these instances. Yet strange to say the Book of Mormon follows King James' version, quotes the erroneous language in our version in every instance. How did the Nephites, who quoted by inspiration from old Hebrew writings, happen to quote the errors of King James' version, that was not in existence till hundreds of years after their day? Will Kelley explain this to this tous? Did Sydney Rigdon quote from our version when he wrote the Book of Mormon? Or did the Nephites who quoted by inspiration, quote our version hundreds of years before it was made, instead of from the correct text? Our version is wrong if the Inspired Translation is right.

The Book of Mormon declares that Jesus after his ascension visited the Nephites, and repeated to them nearly all of his sermon on the mount. Jesus says to them: "Behold ye have heard the things which I taught before I ascended to my Father." In his sermon to the Nephites he repeats what he had said before his ascension, just as it is in our version and different from the Inspired Translation in over thirty instances of marked differences between our version and the Inspired Translation. Did Rigdon copy from our version in writing the Book of Mormon? Or did Jesus, in his conversation with the Nephites, quote from our version endorsing its errors, hundreds of years before it was made? Or did Christ use the correct utterance, and the Nephites quote from our version its errors, hundreds of years before it was made, instead of quoting the language Christ did use? Or is our version right and Joe wrong in his Inspired Translation. As an illustration, the Book of Mormon says that Jesus said, "Then I will profess unto them I never knew you, depart from me ye that work iniquity." The Inspired Translation says that he said, "Then I will say unto them ye never knew me, depart from me ye that work iniquity."

Which inspiration is correct? Will Kelley straighten out this contradiction. In like manner in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants revelations agree with our version and contradict Joe's Inspired Translation in many instances.

Again Joe's Inspired Translation contradicts itself. Genesis ii:5-9 and vi:5. Joe interpolates his dogma on pre-existence of souls. He makes God declare that he created the Spirits of men in heaven, before he created their bodies on earth, and before any human body existed. In I Cor. xv:44-49 he translates the language so that it declares that the first man instead of being merely spiritual first, was first of the earth, "that which is natural, is first, that which is spiritual last." The Inspired Translation says, Math. iv: Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary. Luke iii:30 declares Joseph was from the loins of Heli. Hence he had two natural fathers. The original declares that Joseph was the son of Heli, that is by marriage. The inspired Translation contradicts itself in regard to creation. It declares that when man was created there was no flesh on the earth, water or air, and that man was the first flesh on the earth. Gen. ii:6-8. In the first chapter we have fishes, fowls and all animals created before man was created. The words Joe interpolates into the second chapter flatly contradict the first chapter. We have thus proved that Joe's inspiration in the Inspired Translation flatly contradicts his inspiration in the Book of Mormon, in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, and contradicts itself. Had we the Book of Commandments to compare with the revision of its revelations and inspiration in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, we could show that hundreds of corrections have been made, that the Mormon God has revised himself in hundreds of instances.

We will now attack the very corner stone of Mormonism, the ordination of Oliver Cowdery and Joe Smith. It is described by Smith:

"We on a certain day went into the woods to pray, and inquire of the Lord respecting baptism for the remission of sins as we found mention in the translation of the plates. While we were thus employed praying and calling upon the Lord a messenger from heaven descended in a cloud of light, and having laid his hands upon us he ordained us saying, 'Upon you my fellow servants in the name of the Messiah I confer the priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the Gospel of repentance and of baptism of immersion for the remission of sins; and this shall never be taken again from the earth, until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness.' He said that this Aaronic priesthood had not the power of laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us hereafter. And he commanded us to go and be baptized, and gave us directions that I should baptize Oliver Cowdery, and that afterwards he should baptize me. Accordingly we went and were baptized. I baptized him first and afterwards he baptized me. After that I laid my hands on his head and ordained him to the Aaronic priesthood; and afterwards he laid his hands upon me and ordained me to the same priesthood, as we were commanded. The messenger who visited us upon this occasion and conferred this priesthood upon us said that his name was John, the same that is called John the Baptist in the New Testament, and that he acted under the directions of Peter, James and John who held the keys of the priesthood of Melchizedek which priesthood he said should in due time be conferred upon us, and I should be the first Elder and he the second."

Joe and Oliver were divinely inspired men engaged in the translation. They had the miraculous influence of the Spirit, the baptism in the Spirit according to my opponent, yet they had not been baptized for the remission of sins, and were not pardoned. The miraculous influence of the Spirit does not confer pardon. It is not the birth of the Spirit, if Joe's story be true. Will my opponent fix this up? Either Joe lied when he said he had this miraculous influence of the Spirit, or it had not conferred on him remission of sins. It was not the birth of the Spirit. Again, as baptism is immersion the angel talked the nonsense of "immersion by immersion." The angel says the sons of Levi are to make offering unto the Lord. That will repudiate the sacrifice of Christ, set to one side the anti-type and introduce the shadow. That angel needed to be told that Jesus offered himself once for all, and abolished all sacrifices of the sons of Levi. "There remains no more offering for sin." That angel ordains Joe and Oliver to the Aaronic priesthood, and then repudiates his own act and tells them to ordain each other. If his ordination was valid, why tell them to ordain each other? If it was not, why the farce of conferring it? Why not tell them to ordain each other at first? That angel needed to be told many things.

I. The Aaronic priesthood never was in the church of Christ. It belonged to the dispensation of the law of Moses, which was changed "for the priesthood being changed (from the priesthood of Aaron), there is made of necessity a change also of the law." The Aaronic priesthood was superseded by the Melchizedek priesthood of Christ.

II. Christ was never an Aaronic priest and he has ordained no such priests in his church. "Our Lord sprang from the tribe of Judah of which Moses spake nothing concerning the priesthood."

III. There is not a word about the Aaronic priesthood in the church of Christ. It is a Mormon fiction.

IV. The angel, was John the Baptist, the last who held the keys of the Aaronic priesthood. John died early in our Lord's ministry. He died under the law of Moses. He never ordained a priest in the church. There was no Aaronic priest from John till Joe and Oliver. According to this Christ had not properly organized his church and John had to correct his omission by ordaining Joe and Oliver in 1829.

V. If John had been a priest, death would

have cut off his priesthood. Aaronic priests were not suffered to continue by reason of death. Hebrews vii, 22.

VII. Was John resurrected to ordain Joe? If so, how did resurrection restore to John his priesthood?

VIII. If John was not resurrected death had cut of his priesthood, and his spirit could not confer what it had lost.

IX. John claims to have been sent by Peter, James and John. Why not by Christ. Christ himself shed forth what laid the foundation of the church at Pentecost.

X. John says that Peter, James and John held the keys to the Melchizedek priesthood. An utter untruth, the Melchizedek priesthood belongs to Christ alone; and he has no successor. Heb. vi. 15-17. There arises another Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

XI. Christ did not officiate as priest of any order while on earth. He began his Melchizedek priesthood after his ascension. Hebrews viii.; 4. "If Christ were on earth he would not be a priest." So he did not begin his priesthood on earth. Christ chose and ordained apostles; John xv: 16. But he did not ordain Aaronic priests, for but one of his disciples was a Levite. He could not ordain them Melchizedek priests before the law was changed, and before himself, the first priest of that order.

XII. Christ is a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek. He can have no successor.

XIII. The priesthood under the gospel belongs to all Christians. 1 Peter, ii: 5:6; Also Revelations i: 2.

These objections overturn the corner stone of Mormonism. The lie that Joe fabricated to have a divine commission, for his pretense to hold the keys of the Aaronic and Melchizedek priesthoods. It is as baseless as the fabric of a dream. Mormonism claims that there is but one gift of the Holy Spirit,—the Holy Spirit in miraculous powers. Joe said that the Melchizedek priesthood alone can confer that. So the angel told them. The Melchizedek priesthood was not in existence, and of course the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, which that Priesthood alone can confer, was not in existence. Joe and Oliver had not received the priesthood nor the power it alone can confer. Yet Joe had received an inspiration to translate; so had Oliver. And they prophesied on this occasion, before the priesthood which could confer such power was in existence.

(Time called).

MR. KELLEY'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The Book of Abraham has become a terror to my opponent all at once. Well, is that the question under discussion? Is it in any respect connected with it? No. What has the question of whether Joseph Smith translated the Book of Abraham or not, to do in deciding as to whether the Latter Day Saints have, and abide in the gospel of Christ?

If, as a people, we are sowing the good seed or doctrine of the kingdom, and have the gospel preached by Jesus and the apostles restored, it will make no difference whether Joseph Smith did something else correct or not.

Did he do this work of restoring the gospel and church correctly? that is the question. And it is easy to see that he may have done this and yet failed in some other work if he was not called to do that; and again it is just possible and very probable, he did both right.

So far as the translation of the Book of Abraham, so called, is concerned, I have examined the purported translation of T. Deveria as published and it shows upon its face and the way that it is gotten up, that it is a humbug, whatever be that made by Joseph Smith. M. Deveria was not a great *savant*, as has been claimed for him, but a young Frenchman who had made no stir in the world on account of ability of any kind and none since. He only had a copy of this papyrus and how genuine, neither he nor the parties who delivered him the copy, knew, and taking his purported translation (I say this, for he did not claim to be able to translate it in full) and compare with that of Mr. Smith and any intelligent man can soon see that even Deveria's work confirms the fact that Smith knew something about the papyri. The work of Joseph Smith will stand the test of all such jobs as men of that class can put up on him. But the Book of Abraham forms no part of our faith and never did, and I therefore leave it with the "young *savant* (?)".

My opponent thinks I misapply the prophecy in Isaiah 11: 12 and 13. If he really thinks so why does he not take a stand here and show how it is misapplied. He overturns more than simply my argument if he can show this has been fulfilled. When the angel visited Joseph Smith when he was a boy as I read to you, it is said he quoted this language of Isaiah and stated it had not had a fulfillment but soon would. If Braden can overturn that statement, he has made a point. Let him do his worst now. The events spoken of I claim have never taken place at any time. It must yet be accomplished. Judah has never been gathered since the dispersion and when this is fulfilled it is to be by bringing them

from "the four corners of the earth"—the extremities of the earth. Then shall the adversaries of Judah be cut off and Ephraim and Judah dwell together in peace. Two things which have never been since long before the Ephraimites were, with the other tribes, taken captive *first*, by the King of Assyria. I showed you fully from the Bible upon the first question that Ephraim had not existed as a nation nor been known since they were cast out with the tribes, nor would not be until one should stand up as of old with the Urim and Thummim to make his seed known among the people. Hence, this prophecy could not have taken place. But the following verses are sufficient upon this:

"And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it in the seven streams, and make men go over dry shod."

"And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria: like it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of land of Egypt."

This has never been accomplished in any sense neither in a miraculous, as predicted, manner, nor in any way so far as the crossing of the sea or destruction of the nation who shall abide there, nor in the general return of Judah and Israel.

He thinks he has found a contradiction in what is termed the Inspired Translation of the Scriptures, because in Genesis it says man was created spiritual first, whereas in 1 Cor. 15: 47, it says the *first* man was of the earth, earthly.

In Genesis, the Lord is represented as giving an account of the creation of man. His organization; and shows it was first spiritual, then natural. In Corinthians Paul is contrasting the position of Adam with that of Christ. Try again, Mr. Braden, you may strike something yet before the close of the debate.

Again the objection comes up that the Book of Mormon follows the errors in King James' translation, while the quotations in it and the Inspired ought to agree. I bursted his bauble in my 18th and 19th speeches on the first proposition as to the errors and idioms in King James' translation being copied in the Book of Mormon. Now it does not follow that the translation of the Bible should agree in the wording in order for both to be correct. They are translated from different writings and writers, who penned the words at different times, and it ought not to be claimed that they should have got the exact word every time. You just as well claim that where Mark and Luke or Matthew and John differ in their wording of what Jesus said on an occasion, one of them is wrong. It will not follow that either is wrong, and to be discarded unless it can be shown that it contains some false sentiment or doctrine. It would be a

fact that it would look a little suspicious did the Inspired Translation and Book of Mormon agree every time in wording, although translated from originals written by different persons, as they were. Try again for a valid objection.

Again, he takes up 1 Cor. 12:13, but soon to drop it, and says now that I can't distinguish between being baptized in the Spirit, or in the language of the Spirit, or by the Spirit. He said "by the command of the Spirit," before when commenting upon this. But my comment has induced him to change the form again. Suppose we let it read just as it is in the Bible. It so suits me, and should all. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

Comment is useless. My opponent may try to figure around this all day, and at night his work will be knocked all into pi by simply reading aloud the text.

There is a baptism of the water and of the Spirit. Those on Pentecost were baptized by the Spirit, and they had before been baptized in water. Paul was baptized in water, and received also the baptism of the Spirit. This I have shown and much more on this point, however. Paul in this language in 1 Cor. 12:13, gives the Saints to whom he is writing to understand that not only he, but all were baptized by this Spirit. So I believe. The reference in Eph. 4:5 I showed could not mean there was no baptism of the Spirit, for that would contradict Jesus, Peter, Paul, John the Apostle and John the Baptist. It refers to the complete birth in the kingdom of God, the church of Christ, the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" — "the baptism into Christ and putting on Christ," or the burial in the liquid wave and the clothing upon with the Holy Ghost. Paul says in the Hebrew letter, "baptisms" in the plural, speaking of it also as one of the first or foundation principles of the doctrine of Christ.

There has as yet been no claim made that the doctrine and faith of the church differs in any regard to that taught in the New Testament, aside from baptisms, which we use as Paul did in the plural. My opponent has been content so far in rehearsing the various tales about some of the men who first were called to this work, and with making objections to the form of the church organization as not being identified with the New Testament church.

Strange, too, that a person who is in an organization that does not pretend, under any circumstances, to have more than two officers, as contained in the New Testament church, and even these two are entirely different in their work and spiritual endowments to those of the early church, should attempt to criticise another body of people on the ground that he thinks one or two of their officers are not just according to those mentioned in the Scriptures.

But I shall patiently compare the organi-

zation of the church with the New Testament and ascertain what, if any, differences there are. In the New Testament the order is set forth as follows: "Apostles," "Prophets," "Evangelists or Seventy" (Luke 10 and Eph. 4:11), "Pastors" [shepherds or priests], "Teachers," "Helps" [helpers or assistants], "Governments" [directors], "Miracles" [powers], "Gifts of Healing" [gifts of cures], "Diversities of Tongues" [different languages]. See Matthew 10:1, 5; Luke 6:13 to 16, and 10:1. Rom. 12:4 to 9. 1 Cor. 12:28 and 29, and Eph. 4:11. Are these all the officers that were in the New Testament church? No, there were a number of others. Turn to Phil. 1:1, and we read:

"Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons. If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach. Not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, nor covetous; one that ruleth well in his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity (for if a man know not how to rule his own house how shall he take care of the church of God?)" 1 Tim. 3:1 to 5, and 12 and 13.

These fully set forth the fact that there were the offices of bishop and deacon in the church, besides those before named. And upon this I have quoted fully to show the character of the office of bishop. That it was one in which he has to deal with the temporal interests of the church as well as the spiritual. He therefore is not to be a *covetous or greedy* man. In his department as to the *temporal interests*, as chief bishop, he has also supervisory control over the church, hence the expression, "How shall he take care of the church of God?"

The writing is also clear that provision was not only made for one, but assisting bishops to him; hence, "helps," assistants, are provided for in the business and order of the Temporal department in the church as well as in the Spiritual. Also in the Acts of the Apostles, 6:5, it is said: — "They choose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parnenas, and Nicolas a proselyte of Antioch:

"Whom they set before the apostles; and when they had prayed, they laid their hands on them."

Here is the history of the setting apart of seven men to act in a certain position which it seems had not been supplied up to this time. What the particular office was we are not told in the narrative any more than we are told in the 13th of Acts, what particular office Barnabas and Saul were set apart to fill as laborers in God's work. Philip is referred to afterwards as an evangelist, but just what the duties of that office were, is not fully set out. The best authority upon this, is that it was a special work to which certain ones were called who held a high office in the church. Doctor Smith, in his Theological Dictionary, refers to the office to which these seven wise men were set apart, as being evidently a high and responsible one in the church, but which does not seem to be named anywhere.

It was not that of deacon, he concludes. And it is fair to presume that these men were bishops, or high priests instructed to act in that position, and especially are we warranted in taking this view since some of the special work pointed out for these men to do, is the same as that connected with the bishop's duties in 1 Tim. 3rd chapter.

Again, it is thought to be the order in the setting apart of evangelists under the New Testament, to select them from among the High Priests, on account of the very station of these officers, who should have attained the eminent position as had, it is clear, these seven men mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, by reason of being men:—"Of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost, and wisdom."

The Priesthood "was in the church at that time it is certain, and the office of High Priest is connected in this line of authority. Christ it is said was made "an High Priest," Heb. 5:10; and he certainly would not have been called to any office not in the church. Remember it does not say *the* High Priest, as though there were to be but one, and this one the last, but: "an High Priest." He is also called, "the Apostle and High Priest," Heb. 3:1. But he was not the last and only apostle, but held that office in the church, which evidently was the highest office in the church. Paul makes it precede that of High Priest in the language quoted: "And God hath set some [gifts] in the church first Apostles." It is a fixed fact; and those who wish to make Jesus the last High Priest, because they think that was the highest office in the church, and he having held it, therefore he will continue to act in that, and no one else can, make a mistake. He held and acted in the office of High Priest as he did also in that of other offices, because it was an office in the church, as the office of an Apostle was also in the church, and he acted in that, and was not only an Apostle and Priest and an Elder here, but after his ascension still an Apostle and Priest and Elder, and must continue such forever. But this does not cut off the offices, or take them out of the church, for Peter and James acted as Apostles here, while the Apostle (Jesus) was in the heavens. But these are not the only officers as Peter says:—

"The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of that glory to be revealed.

"Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind. Neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.

"And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Peter, 5:1 to 4.

What officers have we now set forth in the New Testament as existing in the church under the apostles?

I will enumerate:—Apostles, Prophets, Seventy, (Evangelists,) High Priests, Bishops, Elders, Teachers and Deacons. These lesser officers evidently are also among the

"helps, governments," &c., and as such, they are qualified to act by the authority of the lesser or helping priesthood. The authority of the priest, teacher and deacon then, is just as much a fact, as that of any other officer, and Paul so instructs:—"Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth on teaching."

How does this list compare with the organization of the Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints?

In that church, the organization is as follows:—Apostles, Prophets, Seventy, (Evangelists) High Priests, Bishops, (Presiding Bishop and assistants,) Elders, Priests, Teachers and Deacons, Helps, Governments and Diversities of tongues [Languages].

Can you not observe a similarity with the New Testament order? Now think back when my opponent began to compare the organization of his church with the New Testament Church, and see what a plight he was caught in. He had elders and deacons in his church, and *these* they made themselves. God don't have anything to do, he claims, in the calling of the minister by the manifestation of his will in these days; revelation is all confined to the first century, and "only a few fanatics" believe in it any longer. But "*our church*," he claims, is "identical,—(just examine the definition of that word, will you?) with the New Testament Church in organization," etc. Who, so little informed as to be deceived longer by such an assumption?

The other evening Mr. Braden claimed there were priests in his church—they are all kings and priests. He is a high, or Melchizedek priest.

Mr. Braden: I did not say I was a Melchizedek priest.

Mr. Kelley: O, you are an Aaronic priest, then, are you? That gives me my Aaronic or lesser priesthood without much trouble. There are only two lines of priesthood, and a man must either be a priest after one line or the other. If he is not a Melchizedek priest he is an Aaronic, or no priest at all of God.

My opponent renews still his objections to the Latter Day Saints idea of God. But the trouble with him is, he seems to be much better acquainted with the Brighamite views and theories than with that of the Saints. But most any kind of notion about God is better than the Campbellite view, for did he not confess in the discussion of the previous question that they did not pretend to know anything about God? He finds fault because some one had expressed his belief that there are more gods than one. This was a charge brought against Christ by the Jews. But Jesus answered "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken; Say ye of him whom the Father

sanctifieth and sent into the world, thou blasphemest?" John 10:34. Moses was made as God to Aaron. The Latter Day Saints believe with Paul: "Though there be them that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many and lords many), but to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." "Howbeit," he says, "there is not in every man this knowledge." Just so; and our Campbellite friends, Braden says, have not got it. 1 Cor. 8: 5, 6, 7.

As to the personality of God, the Latter Day Saints believe he is something. That he is composed of substance, or essence called spirit, as I have before set forth, hence, it is written, "God is a Spirit." Man was made in the image of God. Gen. 1: 27, 1 Cor. 11: 7. Jesus Christ was made in the express image of his Father's "person." Hebrew 1: 3. "The image of the invisible God." Col. 1: 15. Here it is shown that Jesus Christ is the express image of his Father—of his "person," and Jesus looked so much like mankind in general that he was called the "Carpenter's son." He ate and drank, walked about and conversed with man; was crucified and laid in Joseph's new tomb; was raised from the dead and appeared unto the disciples with the wounds in his hands and side. He ate and drank with his disciples after he arose from the dead. Mr. Braden thinks it would be just "awful" if the Latter Day Saints should think that he digested also. How did he get rid of the fish he ate, Mr. Braden? Or was it a slight of hand performance? Remember it is Braden who raises this question and presumes it is wicked to think he digests, etc. Besides, he has left a promise that he will drink wine with his disciples when he comes again. Yet, Braden says, the faith of the Saints is a "bestly system," because they believe that God has a body and parts. Braden forgets, perhaps, that every whole is made up of parts, and that if God exists at all he exists somewhere and somehow, and is something. We have shown that man was made in his image. Stephen says: "I see the heavens opened and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God." Acts, 7: 56. Stephen saw the Father and Son, or there is no truth in the Bible. Then God is a being, and it is not Paganism to believe that he exists, and that the Son was in the express image of his person. But my opponent says again that the Latter Day Saints believe in the eternity of matter. This is a simple question. Which is the most reasonable, to believe that God made the universe out of nothing, or are the elements out of which the material universe was made, self-existent, and God formed the universe out of this self-existent matter. Some of the Latter Day Saints believe the latter the most reasonable. It is simply a philosophical speculation, and not a cardinal feature of the faith. As for myself, it appears far more reasonable, that

God created all things out of existent elements, than that he created them out of nothing. I would have thought, however, that after my opponent had had his idea of God creating all things out of nothing so effectually exploded by A. Wilford Hall, in his *Microcosm* for Jan., 1884, he would have dismissed the unreasonable and unphilosophical notion from his mind.

The Latter Day Saints believe as the Former Day Saints did in the personality of the Father and the Son. That they are distinct personages; that they are omnipresent by the agency of the Holy Spirit. That the Holy Spirit is a substance, and is intelligent and is the medium by which Christ is present with his church on earth; hence he says, "If I go away I will send the comforter." Like the light of the Son, the Holy Spirit may pervade the whole universe. God is also made known through other agencies by the sending of his angels; but these move and are directed by the Spirit of God in their administrations. Christ sent his angel to John on Patmos to reveal to him the message recorded by him in the Book of Revelations. Concerning procreation in heaven by which Spirits are begotten as charged by my opponent as being a part of the faith of the Saints, this is like much he has had to say during the discussion—an assertion of his. The Latter Day Saints hold to no such a faith. The Scriptures say God is the "Father of Spirits." Heb. 12:9. That he "forms the Spirit of man within him." Zech. 12:1. The other part and about the queens in heaven my opponent learned in his Salt Lake school in which he seems to have attained great proficiency.

He challenges me to furnish one well attested miracle that has been wrought among the Latter Day Saints. The Latter Saints do not rest their cause on miracles, but to gratify my opponent I will adduce one or two by giving Campbellite witnesses:

Hayden's History of the Disciples, Pages 250 and 251.

"Ezra Booth, of Mantua, a Methodist preacher of much more than ordinary culture, and with strong natural abilities, in company with his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Johnson, and some other citizens of this place, visited Smith at his home in Kirtland, in 1831. Mrs. Johnson had been afflicted for some time with a lame arm, and was not at the time of the visit able to lift her hand to her head. The party visited Smith partly out of curiosity, and partly to see for themselves what there might be in the new doctrine. During the interview, the conversation turned on the subject of supernatural gifts; such as were conferred in the days of the apostles. Someone said, 'Here is Mrs. Johnson with a lame arm; has God given any power to men now on the earth to cure her?'"

"A few moments later, when the conversation had turned in another direction, Smith rose, and walking across the room, taking Mrs. Johnson by the hand said in the most solemn and impressive manner: '*Woman, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, I command thee to be whole.*' and immediately left the room."

"The company were awe-stricken at the infinite presumption of the man, and the calm assurance with which he spoke. The sudden mental and moral shock—I know not how better to explain the well attested fact—electrified the rheumatic arm—Mrs. Johnson at once lifted it up with ease, and on her return home the next day she was able to do her washing without difficulty or pain."

Here is your miracle, Mr. Braden, from your own history, performed in a company

of citizens, none of whom were Latter Day Saints, told by the same company, the leader being "a Methodist preacher of much more than ordinary culture," and Joseph Smith at this time was but a boy,—not 26 years of age. Yet your own history says it was a "*well attested fact*," and also that this young man, "*spoke with a calm assurance*," and commanded the woman, "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be whole," and then your book says she was. Will you accept it or will you try to mystify it away, like the writer of your history does. When Peter said to the man at the gate of the Temple in the name of Jesus Christ to be whole, and he arose, you seem to think it was all right.

But here is another and a far more fully attested fact, and you begin to talk about "moral and electric shocks." Either these moralizers are wrong, or the Bible is. Jesus taught: "No man can do a good work in my name and be against me."

This was wrought in the name of Jesus Christ. What will my opponent do with it? Go back on Jesus' words and say it was but a shock—mesmerism?

But this Disciple historian continues: Speaking of the experience of Elder Ryder, one of their ministers.

"In the month of June, he read in a newspaper an account of the destruction of Pekin, in China, and he remembered that six weeks before, a young Mormon girl had predicted the destruction of that city."

Thus I have produced from their own history two as remarkable examples, one of healing, the other of prophecy and its fulfillment, as he can point to, with few exceptions, in the Bible—and I wonder if he will do as those of old, say it was by some other power than that of God.

He says that Latter Day Saints believe that all who reject the Book of Mormon will be damned. The Latter Day Saints believe that the Book of Mormon is a true history of the ancient inhabitants of the American continent. That it confirms the Bible teachings concerning the existence of God, and that Jesus Christ is the Savior of men. If it is a true message, and God has revealed it, then it stands to reason that men are under moral obligation to give it consideration, and if they neglect its teachings they must suffer loss, the same as if rejecting any other Divine message. But whoever abides by the faith of the Bible necessarily lives the faith revealed in the Book of Mormon. The great question is, is the Book of Mormon divinely inspired? If so, and which I have proved to be correct, then those who have an opportunity to become informed and benefited by the teachings, but refuse to do so, must take the consequence of their action, just as people did in olden times who rejected the message of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Jesus, Paul, etc. Dogged persistency and the utter refusing of a people to hear a message, has nothing to do with the obligation and justice demanding of them recognition; neither will it stay the purpose of the Almighty to

answer upon them the proper rule of compensation. But he says further, "The Latter Day Saints is the only true and living church upon the face of the whole earth with which I, the Lord, am well pleased." What of it? If the true and living church had been on earth, the prophets would not have talked about a restoration. No use of restoring something which is not lost, or is already here. The Disciples should not object to this, for if the true and living church was here when Mr. Campbell commenced his great restoration, then he was a transgressor. Neither Mr. Luther, nor Mr. Calvin, nor Mr. Wesley thought the true church was here in their day, so they each built one to suit themselves; Just as Mr. Campbell did. While we recognize that there are good people in all denominations trying to do the best they know, and all have more or less good among them, which one, Mr. Braden, among all the sects is the true and living church of God, or Christ, or that has the Holy Ghost in it according to their own showing? Will you answer? As complete a form of Godliness without the power as was ever presented to men on earth. The immediate presence of God and Christ and the Holy Ghost is not claimed by them. They only claim God in the word, etc.

The Latter Day Saints claim what others have asserted. That there was an apostacy from the true church established by Christ, that God on account of the desire of men for evil withdrew his Spirit, and a day of darkness ensued. All true reformers unite in this belief and hence have worked to try to get back to the original faith and practices. But which one has succeeded. Mr. Campbell's was among the last established, but I have proven that it is wanting when measured by the New Testament pattern. The Latter Day Saints make the claim that God has re-instated the ancient order of things in its authority and power, as prophets have declared that he would. This they undertake to maintain, but they have been met by false and unfounded assertions, stories and slander. Is it unreasonable and wicked to hold that God has done just what he said he would do and has done? If he has set up his church, then it is the one true and living church upon the whole earth. John made a similar claim. Was it wicked? Said he, "We know we are of God and the whole world lieth in sin." I wonder how many said, John, you are uncharitable and a bigot. Certainty in religion is an all essential feature. This cannot be, save God is in it by the revelation of his will, yet this is the main feature objected to in the faith of the Saints. Among all the denominations of Christendom some one has more truth and light than either of the others, and each claims that it is his; why should it be thought then sacrilegious or astounding that the Latter Day Saints claim that it is theirs?

He says that Oliver Cowdery was living in concubinage here in Kirtland. This is another of his false assertions, neither can

he maintain it by any reliable testimony. It is akin to the false and slanderous assertions made against the character of Martin Harris which the citizens of Kirtland know to be false and slanderous. Even Tucker who wrote against the Latter Day Saints confessed to Harris' honesty. Tucker's History page 61, he says: "Harris was proverbially a peaceful and honest man."

"Honesty had always been conceded to to him;" *ibid.*, page 71. Tucker was personally acquainted with Harris and wrote his book while residing in Harris' old neighborhood; and although he wrote wickedly against the Saints, he universally accords to Harris' honesty.
(Time called).

MR. BRADEN'S FOURTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We reject the prophets who are the foundation of Mormonism, for their false prophecies (Nephi I.) that Laban's brass plates shall go forth to all nations of his (Lehi's) seed. This prophecy is an utter failure. God said through Joe (Doctrines and Covenants, page 69), that he will show the plates to three and to none else. Eight others say they saw them; Whitmer's mother says she saw them; Emma Smith says she saw and handled them, covered with a thin cloth. The three witnesses were to testify to having seen Laban's sword, a breast plate, the Urim and Thummim, and the brass compass of Lehi. They never testified to seeing one of them. God promised Oliver Cowdery that he should translate other records. He never did. Page 75 we have a translation of a parchment written by the apostle John and "hid up," in which he tells us that he is to remain on earth until our Savior comes again. As John says in his gospel that Jesus did not say that he should remain until he came again, here is a flat contradiction of the Bible. Why did not John tell Joe in person, as he was one of the three to ordain Joe? Or why did he not hand them the letter then? Why not write it in English and save Joe the trouble of translating? Why not write on paper instead parchment? What became of the parchment? Why not kept like the papyrus of the Book of Abraham? Could not the apostle John have written English as well as for John the Baptist to talk English? If John talked English, could he not write it? How did Joe get that parchment? Did an angel give it to him? Did he have three witnesses to it? Over 52 years ago Joe prophesied that a wonderful city and wonderful temple should be built in Missouri in that generation. Not a stone of either have been laid, and will not be in a hundred years. Never will be. The Book of Mormon predicts that the Lord will bring forth the words of the Book of Plates, of which the prediction forms a part. One hundred and eighteen pages were destroyed

and never brought to light. Another failure. Joe's inspired version in scores of cases follows our version, and in another place changes the same names, words and sentences. In Genesis iii, 32, 33, Joe, like the ignoramus that he was, put into the translation of the language addressed to Moses, two verses of language that God addressed unto him, Joe Smith. In the inspired translation Adam is said to have been baptized, and baptism is said to have been preached under the law of Moses by the Nephites for hundreds of years. The Inspired Translation never mentions baptism under the law of Moses in Palestine. If baptism was a requirement of the law of Moses in America, why not in Asia? If a perverted translation omits it, why did not Joe's Inspired Translation mention it? The Book of Covenants, says page 225, that John the Baptist was baptized in his childhood and ordained by the angel of God at the time he was eight days old. The Book of Mormon denounces infant baptism as solemn mockery, a blasphemous sin.

In May, 1833, two months before the Inspired Translation was finished, the Mormon god prophesied that a certain lot in Kirtland should have a building erected on it for the publication of the translation. The translation was published 33 years afterwards in Plano, Illinois. In May, 1833, Joe is told that after finishing his translation, he is then to study languages. If, as he declared, he understood by inspiration all the languages, why should he study? If he had to study, why tell him to study after he had finished translating? In March, 1833, Joe is told that he need not translate the Apocrypha and correct its errors, for Mormons who have the Spirit can discern between the truth and the error in it. Could not they have done the same with the Bible? What need of his translation? After Joe had translated the Scriptures, by inspiration in his preaching, he quoted our version a score of times, when according to his inspired version it is grossly incorrect. He translates Hebrews xi, 40: "That without

suffering they should not be made perfect." In defending baptism for the dead nine years afterwards, he quotes our grossly incorrect version: "That they without us should not be made perfect," and makes his argument turn on the erroneous word and the error.

Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 241, feet washing is pronounced an ordinance and restricted to the priesthood. Paul says, "If she have washed the Saint's feet." When Joe comes to that to avoid conflict with his revelation given about six months before, he changed it into, "If she has washed the Saint's clothes." Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 226. Breaking the covenant of priesthood is an unpardonable sin. If Peter was a priest as Mormonism declares, he broke his covenant and lied, and swore, yet he was pardoned. If John is on earth, as the Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares, where is he? Is he preaching and doing some good? If he is skulking around in idleness, why is he here? On pages 294, 328, Book of Doctrines and Covenants, we are told that Michael the archangel and Adam are the same person. The Bible utterly forbids the idea that men's spirits become angels. Man was made lower than the angels. Men become equal to the angels. Christ took not on him the nature of angels but human nature. The assembly of the first born and angels are different. Page 234, Book of Doctrines and Covenants. Inspiration tells us that "the spirit and body is the soul of man." When Abinadi prayed, "O God receive my soul," Did he mean his body and spirit? When Elisha prays, "Let this child's soul come into him," it meant, "Let this child's body and spirit come into him." Again the Book of Mormon says, soul and body shall be re-united in resurrection.

Joe's inspired translation renders Matt. xvii, 18, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." In arguing on Baptism for the dead, inspired Joe renders it, "Whatsoever ye record on earth, it shall be recorded in heaven." Which inspiration is right? In the Book of Mormon we have a metal called "zif," and we have "cureloms" and "cummons" as animals." If Joe was inspired, why did not he translate those words? Uninspired translators might plead ignorance, but inspired Joe cannot. When Joe lost his gift to translate what did he lose? Did he lose his interpreters? It says he lost "the writings and his gift too." If the gift was in Joe, what need of the interpreters? If in the interpreters how could he lose it without losing the interpreters too? Page 69, Book of Doctrines and Covenants, Joe is to have no other gift than to translate, no other until the translation is finished. Joe tells us that two months before the translation was finished he exercised the gift of prophecy. The Mormon God was mistaken again. Joe, says Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 112, that it was Elias who visited Zechariah the father of John. Luke says it was Gabriel. Luke was mistaken. Joe

says that Elijah and Elias visited him at the dedication of the temple. The ignorant did not know that the Elijah of the Old Testament, and the Elias of the New, are one and the same person.

The witnesses are to see the plates by faith. They are to believe that they saw them. Harris declared he never saw them with his natural sight. He saw them by faith. He believed he saw them, imagined it. In the Book of Mormon Christ repeats to the Nephites part of Malachi's prophecy. Joe's Inspired Translation agrees with our version, and contradicts Christ in several places, and disagrees with our version in several places where Christ agrees with our version. I would like to know which is right, inspired Joe or Christ? Book of Doctrines and Covenants: "He that kills has no forgiveness in this world, nor in the world to come." The Nephite Church was founded by the murderer and unpardoned sinner Nephi. The Book of Mormon declares that Nephites, Jacobites, Josephites, and Zoramites became one people, called Nephites, and were exterminated 400 after Christ. Doctrines and Covenants, page 109, declares that a knowledge of the Saviour shall come to Nephites, Zoramites, Jacobites, and Josephites through the Book of Mormon. Page 248, Joe declares that Missouri Zion shall not be moved out of her place. In less than nine months it was moved and has never got back. Page 266, Joe declares there is no other place than Zion, in Missouri, appointed for a gathering. Page 306, Joe says that if the sons of men prove too strong for the Lord, he will excuse his people, and that he accepts offerings to build up Nauvoo, built before his law allowed them to build it.

Joe, in Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 98, gives a baptismal formula in violation of Christ's words to the Nephites, who gave the exact words Nephites were to use. If Joe was a Nephite why did he violate Christ's law? Page 93, Joe does not know that our Christian era begins four to six years before the birth of Christ. Doctrines and Covenants, page 155, Joe promises that he will give additional information when he translates the New Testament in regard to the parable of the Ten Virgins. The Mormon God forgot all about that when he translated that parable. The Book of Mormon declares that Mulek and Lehi, sons of Zedekiah, led the second emigration to America. The Bible, even Joe's own inspired version, declares that the King of Babylon slew the sons of Zedekiah and all the princes of Judah—all the nobles of Judah. A flat contradiction. Again Zedekiah's eldest son could not have been more than ten or twelve years old, for Zedekiah was only thirty-two when he was dethroned. What leaders they must have made. Slaughtered children ten years old. The Book of Mormon, after telling us that Nephites and Lamanites talked with each other without interpreters, that Nephites preached to Lamanites and their leaders talked to each other in scores of instances

without any interpreters, tells in Mosiah xi: 3, that the language of the Nephites began to be taught among the Lamanites. The Mormon God forgot again.

The Book of Mormon teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins. Yet Alma (Mosiah XI. 22.) was pardoned and born of the Spirit by the fall-down power before he was baptized. Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 100. It is denied that torment has no end. The Book of Mormon (Mosiah III. 1. Mosiah I. 10. I. Nephi III. 44.) It is positively declared to be endless. Book of Mormon (Mormon III. 2.) Mormon says he hid the plates in the hill of Comorah. Moroni says (Ether VI. 3) Mormon hid them in the hill Ramah. Which shall we believe? The Book of Mormon keeps poor Moroni dodging Lamanites, 36 years before he hides those few plates for Joe. Could he not have done it a little sooner? The Book of Mormon (Alma XIX. 2.) declares that all the righteous who died before Christ's resurrection rose at or after his resurrection, before his ascension. The Inspired Translation places the resurrection of some Saint at the crucifixion. Book of Mormon (Mormon II.) declares that miracles had ceased when Mormon was 15 years old. It declared 95 years afterwards (Mormon VII. 13-4) that miracles have not ceased. In quoting Isaiah lxiii, in his visit to the Nephites our Savior changes the language in several places. In his Inspired Translation Joe follows our version. Which is correct, Christ or inspired Joe? But we have found contradictions enough in our investigation. We could multiply them indefinitely.

As we are examining Mormon revelations, the basis or Mormonism let us see how the stories of Mormonism hang together.

Book of Mormon (Mormon III. 2.) we are told that Mormon hid in the hill Comorah all the records of the Nephites, Zarahemlites, and Jaredites, that had been in the possession of the Nephites, except an abridgement he engraved on a few plates, leaving a few plates of "these few plates" for Moroni, who is to complete the record, for Joe Smith. Moroni (Mormon IV. 1.) tells us that his plates are full, when he has done this, and he has no ore or plates. Yet he writes 57 pages of the Book of Mormon on nothing. As Mormon had buried the plates of Ether, how did Moroni get them to abridge them. Moroni says (Ether I. 1.) that he wrote an abridgement of only part of Ether's plates, and that whoever gets them, will get the full account. But God said to Jared's brother: "Write them in a language that they cannot read." How can the finder understand them. He says that the two stone interpreters are to be sealed up with them, so that the finder can read them. But Joe found these identical interpreters of Jared's brother. How will the fellow who finds Ether's plates understand them, when the interpreters are gone? Ether's plates were not what Joe found, nor with what he found. As the interpreters were sealed up with Ether's

plates, which Joe did not find, and not with Mormon's plates which Joe did find, how did Joe get those interpreters? How did they get into that stone vault with Moroni's plates, when they were buried in another place, with Ether's plates? Mormon, as we have seen, hid all the records, yet, Moroni says (Ether I. 7.) that he hides Ether's plates again in the earth. The plates are Ether's, not Moroni's, for Moroni writes on Mormon's plates 27 pages after hiding up the plates he hid. He sealed the plates he hid, and he could not write on sealed plates. He hid the interpreters with the plates he hid, Ether's plates, and Joe found them with Mormon's plates. Moroni says in the next chapter that he had sealed up the plates of Ether, and the interpreters with them, and he wrote from memory on the plates of Mormon, really on nothing as we have seen, and yet Joe finds the Jaredite interpreters with Moroni's plates. Those interpreters and plates were like the thimble in thimble rigging. Now you see it. Now you don't.

Mosiah's interpreters were dreadful things. If one who was not commanded looked through them he would perish. Whitmer looked through Joe's interpreters and was not hurt. If one looked through them he became a seer. Whitmer did not. The gift was in the person and the interpreters were useless. Mosiah's interpreters were handed down from the time Lehi left Jerusalem. Ether's plates are found and no interpreters with them. Mosiah translated them with his interpreters, although the Lord had said no one could interpret them unless he had the Jaredite interpreters. If Moroni interpreted Ether's plates which he never had, for Mormon hid them—and which he had—for he buried them himself—how could he do it, for the interpreters of Jared's brother were not found with them. After Moroni hid the plates of Ether, which he never had, and which he had, and with them the Jaredite interpreters, which he never had and which he had, how did Joe find them with the plates of Mormon with which they were hid.

Jared's brother's plates are not to go forth till the Gentiles are converted. Book of Mormon page 507. Ether engraves plates and Limbi's people find them. not Jared's brother's plates, for Ether did not have them, unless the Lord was mistaken when he had them buried. Mosiah finds Limbi's people who give him Ether's plates. This is the first time a Nephite saw them. But on page 507 we are told that King Benjamin who had been dead years, who was Mosiah's predecessor, had Jared's brother's plates. His people did not know of any Jaredite plates, till years after his death. Will my opponent tell us how Benjamin had Jared's brother's plates when the Limbites found Ether's plates and not Jared's brother's. Will he tell us how Benjamin had any Jaredite plates, when his people knew nothing of Jaredite plates or the people that had them until years after his death? In Nephi i: 7. Amos began to keep records A. D. 294,

Id. i:2, Amos died A. D. 305; or he kept records one hundred and eleven years. As his father was one hundred when he gave him the records, Amos was an old man when he got them, and must have been over 160. So Amaron the brother of Amos must have been over 160. Nephi xiii:3 Christ puts the limit of man's age at 72. Yet Amos and Amaron were engravers on metal long after they were twice that age. II Nephi ii:2 Amaron hides plates, A. D. 320, when Mormon is ten. Mormon is to dig them up when he is twenty-four, or A. D. 334. He dug them up A. D. 345, or 11 years after Amaron had said he would do it. Rigdon added 24 to 320 instead of 14, forgetting that Mormon was ten.

Lehi declares (2, Nephi I.) "That the seed of his son Joseph shall not be utterly destroyed." The Nephites, including the seed of his son Joseph, were utterly exterminated, according to Mormon and Moroni. If Moroni tells the truth Lehi was a false prophet. The Book of Mormon declares that Joe Smith the Seer is of the seed of Joseph the patriarch. Joe Smith was a Gentile. That prophecy is false. If Joe Smith was a Josephite or Israelite, then the prophecy (Nephi XII 1.) that the finder and translator of the records shall be a Gentile is false. If Joe is of the seed of Nephi, Lehi's son, then the Nephites were not exterminated, and the book is false. If they were exterminated then Joe is not a descendant of the Nephites. If Joe is a descendant of Lehi he must be a Lamanite Indian, for the Nephites were all exterminated. I. Nephi IX, 15. The Book of Mormon is called a revelation from the beginning of the world till its end. Ether 1. It extends no further back than the Tower of Babel, thousands of years after the beginning. Alma XXI, 2. Alma prophesies that the people shall dwindle in unbelief 400 years after Christ shall manifest himself to them. He manifested himself in A. D. 34. The Nephites were destroyed A. D. 384 or 350 years from Christ's

manifestation, or 50 years too soon, and they dwindled in unbelief many years before this, or more than 50 years too soon. Rigdon counted from Christ's birth instead of from his manifestation, and then got it 40 or 50 years too soon, for that. Rigdon was not good in figures. The Book of Mormon says, "Saints arose at the resurrection of Christ." The Inspired Translation says, "at his crucifixion." Which is correct? A Mormon revelation in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants, page 319, says that "John the Baptist was raised at the resurrection of Christ." The Inspired Translation says that "the Saints arose at his crucifixion." If Saints arose immortal at the crucifixion how could Christ be the first born from the dead? But why follow these contradictory jumbles any further. This is revelation. Mormonism is divine doubtless, when there is scarcely a page of its revelations that is not contradicted by some other page. I will give my opponent an additional contradiction of the Bible to the scores already given. The Book of Mormon, page 445, Christ declares that after his apostles have baptized persons in water he will baptize them with fire and the Holy Ghost. Matthew, III, 10, "And now the axe is laid to the root of the trees, therefore every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire, whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat in his garner, but he will burn the chaff with unquenchable fire." Evil trees are burned with fire, the chaff is burned with unquenchable fire, baptize in fire. The baptism in fire is for the wicked. The wheat is gathered in the garner; good trees are cherished; the good are baptized in the Holy Spirit. The Book of Mormon teaches that God gives the baptism of fire, the doom of the wicked to his children.

MR. KELLEY'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—As my opponent has left the field entirely, so far as undertaking to make and stand by an argument, and devotes his time wholly to hunting up *supposed* objections to some things in some of our published works and rehearsing these, together with the stories told, I shall take the time to examine these as I proceed. I am aware that a more intelligent judgment of the merits of our faith might be arrived at, if my opponent would but select a few of what he deems the most prominent errors, and try to maintain that they are such, so we could get down upon a basis of genuine argument and thereby test the matter; but it must be quite evident to all by this time that he is not the man to meet the issue in this way. I shall therefore take a look at his running objections.

Again he says: "The Latter Day Saints believed in baptizing children at 8 years of age." Yes, if they have been properly instructed in the faith, and understand the object of baptism, and desire so to be. Can he produce something better, or show where this disagrees with the word of God? He misrepresents the faith of the Saints, by saying, "they believe they will reign over the Gentiles in the Millenium." The Saints believe in the prayer taught them by the Savior, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as in heaven." That he will come and reign with his saints on the earth. "And we shall reign on the earth," Rev. 5:10. "The meek shall inherit the earth," Math. 6. The kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints. Dan. 7:22.

Again, he objects, that the doctrine of baptizing for the dead was once taught among the Latter Day Saints, as though it was a very wicked thing. What does *this* mean Mr. Braden? "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?" I Cor. 15:29. It seems to have been a common practice and well understood by the ancient Saints; so much so, that Paul based an argument upon it; will he scandalize Paul also? This is in the New Testament; he doubtless knows little or nothing about it, but Paul had an understanding of it. Paul says further, "No man knows the things of God but the Spirit of God," and the Disciples deny the possibility of God's Spirit as being able to reveal anything in this age, and it is no wonder that they know no more about this than many other things. Is it wicked to believe in the New Testament? Again, "For, for this cause was the Gospel preached to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit." I Peter 4:6. Shall the Latter Day Saints deny this

part of the New Testament also, because the Campbellites don't know anything about it?

He misrepresents the Saints again, when he says that they claim they will be greater than Christ in the next world. They claim that they will be equal heirs with him to the inheritance of the saints. Hence, Paul says, "And if children, then heirs; heirs of God and *joint heirs with Christ*; if it so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8:17. "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our Spirit that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16. "Sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1:13, 14, and 4:30. "And because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore, thou art no more a servant, but a Son; and if a Son, then an heir of God through Christ." Gal. 4:6, 7. This was the faith of Ancient Saints; and of course must be of the Latter Day Saints.

My opponent attacked the inspired translation of the Bible with but little effect. Did not Joseph Smith have as good a right to translate the Bible as Mr. Campbell and Mr. McKnight, or the Baptists, or the Adventists, or those who recently translated what is known as the New Revision? Mr. Smith's translation stands upon its merits just like all the rest. If it reveals the Scriptures in the true light, then it is good. If not, then let him show it. But he says, Smith stole from the Book of Mormon and put in the Inspired Translation. But first, according to Braden, he stole from the Bible and made the Book of Mormon; now, he has him steal from the Book of Mormon to make the Inspired Translation. What a thief! It is like a man stealing himself rich from his own pocket-book, with but a dollar to start with.

He says, Latter Day Saints accept all that Smith says in the "Times and Seasons," "Elder's Journal," or anywhere else as inspiration. This is not correct. I read from a publication, showing the contrary as follows: "At a conference held at Beloit, Wis., on the 12th and 13th of June, 1852, the following was passed: Resolved, that the whole law of the church of Jesus Christ, is contained in the Bible, Book of Mormon, and Book of Doctrine and Covenants." Word of Consolation, page 2.

The Latter Day Saints hold the Bible in equal veneration, with any people on the earth; they also believe in the truth of the Book of Mormon, and other revelations, that they are assured come from God. They believe that God is just as capable of giving a true revelation of himself now, as at any time since the world began.

My opponent's attack on the Book of Doctrine and Covenants was so ridiculous, that it was sufficient within itself to carry its own refutation along with it. He says, the saints have gone back on the idea of converting the Indians, etc. This is not correct. The Saints believe that many of the Indian nations will finally accept the faith; some individuals have already done so.

Again, Martin Harris was not required to tell any lies as asserted by my opponent last night. He was promised a view of the plates if faithful. He had been telling some things about the plates and in the revelation referred to and he was charged that he should say no more concerning them, except he should bear the testimony that God should give him, at the time he should sufficiently humble himself that he might obtain a view of them. Page 70, Book of Covenants. Any one who wishes, can read and satisfy themselves. From Braden's first reference, up to page 191, in his jumbling of things, there remains nothing that needs even an explanation. All are explained by the book itself; easy to be understood and deserve a better consideration than a tirade of gush and ridicule. There is nothing in the charge that the book permits stealing. Certain ones were assigned to a certain work and its says: "Ye are on the Lord's errand; and whatever you do according to the will of the Lord, is the Lord's business." Whatever they did according to the will of the Lord, was the Lord's business.

This book expressly and emphatically forbids any such thing. Pages 142 and 177. Is it according to the will of the Lord to steal? If it is, then stealing is taught in the revelation, otherwise it is not. He charges on the Revelation, the teaching of the shedding of blood, which he *impiously* says led to the Mountain Meadow massacre. Here is the passage:

"For Satan puts it into their hearts (the enemies of the Saints) to anger against you and to the shedding of blood, wherefore the land of Zion shall be obtained but by purchase or by blood, otherwise there is none inheritance for you. And if by purchase, behold, ye are blessed; and if by blood, as you are forbidden to shed blood, lo, your enemies are upon you, and ye shall be scourged from city to city, and from synagogue to synagogue, and but few shall stand to receive an inheritance." Page 189.

The Revelation positively forbids blood shedding. It says, there is but two ways to get possession of the land, by purchase or war; and they were advised to purchase and forbidden to shed blood, and reminded that if they did their efforts would fail and their enemies be upon them, and they would be scourged and but a few of them would ever live long enough to receive an inheritance. Who will say it was not a true statement? But he says it led to the Mountain Meadow slaughter. He might just as well have said the advice of Christ, "If they smite you on the right cheek, turn the left also," led to the battle of Bunker Hill. The whole of the references to pages included between 65 and 301, are of a piece, misrepresentation and ridicule, and he has made no material or worthy criticism against them,

and it would be but to waste my time on frivolous matters to consider them by item, but I have replied to that which has a semblance of needing an explanation. There is neither truth nor point in his vulgar tirade or jargon read off last evening, claiming to be a criticism of the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. Just let him select one single item that he is willing to take a stand upon and maintain that it is false and he will have done something, until then, his tirade is unworthy of notice. Again he says that men never become angels. But Moses and Elias appeared in the capacity of angels on the Mount with Christ. Luke 9:30-31. Angels were frequently called men. Gen. 18:2. Josh. 5:13. Luke 24:4. Acts 1:10. Heb. 13:2.

Men are called angels. Rev. 2:1. "Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus." Also verses 8-18 and chapter 3:1, 7, 14.

"And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me See thou do it not, I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus." Rev. 19:10. Here one of the old prophets was sent to John on Patmos as an angel and he tells him, "I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren." Saints are called angels. Deut. 33:2. Psalms 68:17. Jude 14. Zach. 14:5. Matth. 25:31. He passes by my Scriptural texts with a wave of the hand; has not "patience to notice them." Yet, he declines to undertake to show wherein either one of these texts are misapplied. I asked him to try Isaiah 11, but he don't make a stand.

He asks me to state why the Book of Mormon and Inspired Translation do not contain the same wording, when both were translated by inspiration, and cites Matt. 7:23 as follows: "And then will I say ye never knew me." Inspired Translation: "And then will I profess unto them I never knew you." Book of Mormon, page 351. This I have answered before. The Inspired Translation and Book of Mormon are both distinct translations. One from the record of the Jews, the other from the record of the Nephites. Neither claims to give the language verbatim as it was delivered by the Savior, but as it was written on the record by the respective parties making the records. There is nothing surprising in the thought that two writers should differ in the presentation of their ideas at times and agree perfectly at other times. The sense is the same here in either case. To know God or to be known of God means just the same; hence, "I never knew you," or "you never knew me," is the same sentiment, but by different ways of expression. One writer uses one method and the other writer the opposite, and so they were translated.

My opponent further says, the baptism of fire is the burning of the wicked when Christ comes, "burning up the chaff," etc. But had he read a little more closely, he could have avoided this blunder. In Math. 3, it is shown that the identical parties who were baptized with water were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire.

The wicked has no promise in either baptism. "Indeed baptize you with water," says John; "He shall baptize you [the same ones] with the Holy Ghost and fire." They were thus baptized. "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." Acts, 2:3, 4.

The element or property of fire—warmth—is associated with the substance known as the Holy Spirit which dwells with heavenly beings. Said the disciples, "Did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?" Luke 24:32. "But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones." Jeremiah 20:9. Says David, "My heart was hot within me, while I was musing the fire burned; then spake I with my tongue." Ps. 39:3. "His eyes were as a flame of fire." Rev. 1:14; Dan. 10:6. "And the sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire." Ex. 14:17. This Fire of Glory—the Holy Ghost—shown so resplendent from Moses' face, that he had to veil himself before he went into the camp of Israel. The *literal fire* that is to consume the wicked—burn up the chaff—is one thing, and the fire and the Holy Ghost with which the disciples of Jesus were to be baptized, is quite a different thing.

I have not claimed that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was for the remission of sins, but to bless and confirm the believers. They went everywhere preaching, the Lord working with them, confirming the word with signs following.

He made a great ado about Jared's interpretations, etc. I answered that in the discussion of the previous question. There is no contradiction or inconsistency in the narrative. The last of the Jaredite kings was contemporary with, and associated with, the Mulekites, and they in turn met with the Nephites and Jared's interpreters could in a very natural and ordinary way have been placed in the hands of Mosiah.

Page 507 of the Book of Mormon referred to last night, I also answered on a previous evening definitely. The things the brother of Jared saw were not to be revealed until after the Gentiles should repent, after Moroni hid them up. They have not as yet been translated. They were translated by the Nephites, however, after the crucifixion, and that translation, as engraved by the Nephites, was hid up with the Book of Mormon by Moroni.

The plates of brass spoken of by Lehi, page 11, did go forth among his posterity; are now in existence, as has been testified of, and in due time will be manifest again to his posterity. They were removed from there for a season, because they sought to destroy them. It was what was on the plates that was the main thing that was to go forth. The plates themselves are now in the care of one of Lehi's descendants, the angel Moroni.

I now come to the mystery of mysteries,

that has never been matched by anything, save it were hazel-witching.

My opponent read last evening from Mrs. Eaton's graphic pen, the old story about Joseph Smith, Sen., digging a well, once upon a time, and from the bottom thereof, he exhumed a baby's foot. Joe was on hand as usual, and snatched it from his father, and ran off peeping for money. Whether his father ever chastised him for this impiety is not stated. But my opponent was particular to elaborate upon another yarn, wherein it was claimed that the said Joe stole this baby's foot from one of Chase's children, and went off hazel-witching and seeking for money. So says Mr. Chase, per my opponent. But we are informed also by him that Miss Chase had a baby's foot too, and could see equally well with Joe, and often pointed out where money was, and could really find lost property. She was a Seeress when she died just a few years ago. Thus we have been shown that this wonderful baby had at least three feet, and either, when looked upon, would reveal hidden mysteries. What Joe would have seen and revealed had he succeeded in stealing that entire baby, no mortal will likely ever know. Anyway, Joe got the baby's foot from his father, and stole it from the chase family, and yet Miss Chase was in possession of the baby's foot, and was divining on all occasions when called upon, till just a few years ago. This nonsense and tomfoolery Mr. Braden drinks all in, and then licks out his tongue for more like it. Hence he goes on, and notwithstanding he has labored long and hard to make out Sidney Rigdon the real author of the Book of Mormon, and to prove that he used "ignorant Joe" as a cat's paw, while he strode along on Ahasuerus' horse, yet last night he had the consummate audacity to charge the whole fraud of prophet-making on poor old Mother Smith, while they yet lived in Vermont, and Joe was only seven years old. Was the old lady Smith and Sydney Rigdon in cahoot while she lived in Vermont in the prophet-making business? She to raise the prophet, he to write the book? But my opponent swallows all of this down, and it looks as reasonable to him, and so he yearns for more like it. There is nothing about the Latter Day Saints faith that looks reasonable to him. So he goes on; Joe was always to be found at corn huskings where there was plenty of whisky, and something to gratify his wild, reckless and voluptuous nature. He was proverbial for his lazy, thieving, lying, shirking, drinking, outlandish habits; yet his mother had him drilled, and tutored, and inspired so completely with the prophet notion, that he appeared as calm and serene as a minister, and both he and his mother had the astounding bad habit of looking people *square in the eyes*, all the time wearing the air of a sober deacon, and never stooping to trifling things, lest the people might not believe that he was Divinely Inspired; Seldom known to laugh. Have you got any

more like this, Mr. Braden? It is so wonderfully consistent! Almost thou persuadest me. But he asks, why did Joseph and Oliver have to ordain each other after the priesthood was conferred by the angel? He might as well ask why acorns do not grow on briar bushes; or why Moses laid his hands on Joshua after the Lord had called him; or why the laying on of hands is to precede and for the receiving of the Holy Ghost; or why Aaron was clad with a robe and bonnet, and had bells on his robe and wore a breastplate; or why the Lord did not write on metal plates instead of stone, so that when Moses got mad he could not have broken them by tossing them upon the ground. It is God's order of things, that is all.

He says that the Book of Covenants states that, "Zion shall not be moved out of its place." Is it moved, Mr. Braden? It was to remain, "though her children were scattered." The children are scattered, but they will return in due time and re-inhabit and build the City and Temple in this generation.

The Nephites were not exterminated as claimed. Many of them joined the Lamanites' Standard. Page 493, Book of Mormon.

Concerning the objection that no one is to be forgiven who is a murderer, John says, "No murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." In the Book of Covenants and New Testament both, reference is evidently had to a heartless, malicious and wilful murderer. He objects to the use of the names Elias and Elijah. Elias is the Greek for Elijah, (Hebrew), and Gabriel is the name assigned to Elijah as an angel; like it was when God covenanted with Abraham. He changed his name from Abram to Abraham. Jacob's to Isreal; and to the apostles, Jesus assigned new names. There is no contradiction in the Book of Covenants in the use of the names Elias, and Elijah. Concerning the objection of the body and Spirit being called the soul, I will say a word. The same idea is held in the Bible: "Eight souls were saved by water." "Breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." This is sufficient upon the soul criticism.

Again, Emma Smith never saw the plates, only when covered with a cloth. In this way she says she did, and handled them. The Book does not say that there should be but three persons who should see them, but that there should only be three who should have them shown them by the power of God and the hand of an angel.

My opponent could make some strong points doubtless, if he was permitted to represent the record in his own way; but even that would be but temporary. The very first time a person got hold of the Book of Mormon and began to compare it with Braden's pretended statements, he would be detected, and the honest investigator would turn away in disgust.

Men who pretend to make criticisms upon the works of others, should, above all

things else, be,—1. Honest; and 2. Fair. In this way only, can the hearer be profited, and a discussion, whether religious, or political, result in good to the people.

But I must proceed with noticing his running list of objections. I call them *running*, because the moment he undertakes to make one, he drops it, seemingly afraid of the answer I shall make, and jumps at something else.

It has been asserted, that I discard all revelations which I cannot defend. But did he tell you of any I could not defend? Oh, no. When they come to a contest, he says they (our elders) discard them. There is not a word of truth in it. I affirm and defend here all that the church believes or has ever believed and taught. But he asks what do I do with the revelations printed in the Star, Times, and Seasons, Elders' Journals, etc.? They are the same as contained in the Book of Covenants; and all in there with the exception of one or two of a private nature, (relating to individuals and not to the body generally) and these I am ready to defend. Here is the trouble with Braden. He wants to carry the idea that whatever is contained in the church publications it is the same as revelation to us. This is a false assumption. The writings and arguments are taken for what they are worth when compared and criticized by the accepted standard works of the church, and are no creed for us; we do not believe in men-made creeds. When the Lord speaks we are bound to hear and obey, but we are not bound to hear and obey before we know whether it is the Lord talking or not. No more than were the early Saints or the Saints of the first century. As Paul says, "If anything is given by the Spirit to one, let the others judge." Never take away a man's judgment if you expect to do him good, even in so particular a matter as of judging upon revelations, or influences of the Spirit. He next makes his one baptism argument under the form of six questions; the 6th one being, "If there is but one immersion is not that one by water?" The trouble is with his *if*; upon this little word the authority of Campbell, Scott and Stone was found to be resting, and the little word could not bear up the load.

"If there is but one immersion," says Braden: But *if*, there is a baptism of the water and of the Spirit, then that settles effectually his, "if there is but one." I have shown you that John the Baptist, Jesus, in John 3:5; and Acts 1:5. Peter in Acts 2:38; Paul in I Cor. 12:13; Heb. 6:2; and Titus 2:5, all taught baptism of the water and the Holy Ghost or, of the Spirit, and does he wish me to now take his "if there is but one?"

The other five questions are of the same kind, and I have answered every one of them in my argument before this.

Again, he says: "No man hath seen God at any time." I suppose that by this, he is trying to find some contradictions in the Bible. If this chaffy stuff is to be termed objections, I can find him five hundred

contradictions in the Bible. Gen. 32:30, Jacob says, "I have seen God face to face." Exodus 24:9, 10 and 11, "Then went Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet, as it were a frame-work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness."

But, Braden says, no man hath seen God at any time; while that sacrilegious boy, Smith, said he saw him. The trouble is Braden is not posted. But he objects to the Book of Covenants, because it makes the Lord to take notice of *little* things; give directions for building a house; told them what to do when they needed funds; where to locate; who is to take certain positions and offices in the church, etc. What an objection this is, indeed, for a Bible man to make! All through the Scriptures, both in the Old and New Testaments, there are many instances of seeming far less importance, in which the wisdom of God is brought to bear, and which may be more effectually ridiculed, if that manner is to be taken for argument, than the instances of direct Providence in the Book of Doctrine and Covenants.

"The direction to build the ark and to pitch it without and within; to make it three stories high, and put one window in it," Gen. 6; is a good example. Take the receipt which the Lord gives to Moses by revelation, for making ointment for the anointing of the tabernacle, the priests, etc. Nobody is permitted to make this kind of oil, but Moses, and if any one did, he should be put to death. "Whosoever compoundeth any like it, or whosoever putteth any of it upon a stranger, shall even be cut off from his people," Exodus 30:23 to 33. Moses at once could monopolize the hair oil trade, under this Revelation.

Take another:—"So they brought the people down unto the water, and the Lord said unto Gideon. Every one that lappeth of the water with his tongue, as a dog lappeth, him shalt thou set by himself; likewise every one who boweth down on his knees to drink," Judges 7:5. This was to test the bravery of the men, and of the whole number who went down to drink, but three hundred lapped like dogs, and the Lord chose these for his army, and with these he routed the Midianites' army, so the history reads. In the Savior's ministry, he and his disciples ran short of funds, and the Lord directed Peter to go and catch a fish and get a coin that he would find in the fish's mouth, and pay the tax. And after his resurrection he directs them where to cast their nets in order to gather the fish. And the Bible critics, come to me, and say, are not these big things for the Son of God to be looking after? He who possesses all power in heaven and in earth, to be troubling his mind with? I have to meet all such silly attacks against the Bible, and these are the petty criticisms brought here by one who professes to believe the Bible, with which to try to over-

throw the truth of the Book of Mormon. Now, ladies and gentlemen, the truth is, as to all such matters, that life here is made up of littles. God confirms men in the faith of himself and his work by the impress of his hand at times in these things which seem to be of little account or importance. And the man or the woman who will not look for God's hand to be manifest in these things which seem to be (to strangers to the transaction) of minor worth, may expect to pass through life without observing the hand of Deity in anything. Not because God is not great in his attributes and his work, but because man is a frail creature and weak in his ways. We must learn to walk before we can run; and to know our letters before we can expect to take a lesson in geometry; and so in the dealing of God with us; he lends aid and comfort where such is required and the man is humble enough in his heart to receive it. And in the establishment of his church and the superintending of his work, he will deal with it as its strength and the circumstances demand; so it has been wherever he has had a church.

He again tries to make it appear that Smith was always boasting along his people with false promises of gain, power, etc., in this world. The statement is absolutely the reverse of the facts; he always told them of the trials in the way to an acceptable life with God and in many instances foretold the evils the church would fall into and the consequences of the same.

He predicts in Book of Covenants, page 199 and 285, evil to come upon the entire body because of wickedness, and this came two years afterwards; and on page 147, he foretells his own death; and on page 304 he predicts the overthrow, or rejection, of the entire church. And yet, these enemies of his have said he kept his people together, through flattery, deceit and false promises. In September, 1831, in a revelation, is foretold his death, and the manner of it to wit: "Shall fall by the shaft of death, like a tree that is smitten by the vivid shaft of lightning." Twelve years afterwards at Carthage, Ill., as the vivid shaft of lightning smites the giant tree, so death overtook him through the missile of the assassin's bullet, and though as Lincoln and Garfield he was struck down by the hands of the wretch and coward, he died as the ancient martyrs, because of his hope in Christ, and his devotion to the good of the human race.

It is truth, God's word, that will either exalt or condemn us at the last day, and let no one imagine that his ignorance is to cause a remission of his sins and land him within the pearly gates. "If ye continue in my words ye shall be my disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Not on account of their ignorance, but knowledge; the light of the Spirit. "If we walk in the light as God is in the light, we shall have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." We absolutely have no promise offered us for

redemption from our sins on account of ignorance, but we must walk in the light. Yet, every objection brought against the divine work of the boy of Manchester, has been from the standpoint that he claimed

to be informed upon the question of religion. And if he was a teacher sent from God and knew whereof he affirmed, he could not have been otherwise, than in the light.
(Time called.)

MR. BRADEN'S FIFTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—Mr. Kelley has denied that there ever was such a man as Thomas P. Baldwin. That there ever was such an officer as Judge of Wayne County Court; that Thomas P. Baldwin was Judge of Wayne County Court in 1833. We read the affidavit of S. B. McIntyre, a lawyer of over thirty years practice in Palmyra, and a resident of Palmyra for fifty-six years, stating—I. There was such a man, a lawyer in Palmyra, stating also his wife's name, and the name of his step-children and his own child. II. That he was Judge from 1830 to 1835, Judge of Wayne County Court. III. That he has examined his commission as Judge of Wayne County Court. IV. That he has seen documents in the Clerk's office that he signed as Judge of Wayne County. We offered an affidavit of his step-son stating there was such a man; that he married his mother, giving his daughter's name, date of his death, stating that he was Judge of Wayne County Court from 1830 to 1835; that he has seen his commission as such. We read a certificate of the very man who answered Kelley's letter explaining how he made the mistake, stating that the records show that T. P. Baldwin was Judge of Wayne County Court; that his commission as such is before him as he writes; stating the date of the first trial on which he officiated as Judge of Wayne County Court; and the date of the last trial on which he officiated as such. Had my opponent possessed common sense, he would have given up. But with a stupidity that is miraculous, he arose and stolidly denied that there was such a man; such an office, and that there was such a judge of Wayne County Court. I could pity my opponent if his lack of honesty in his acts were not so flagrant.

His letter from Whitmer is a dodge. Whitmer does not say a word about punctuation in it. That is dropped. His statement about capital letters is a dodge. Gilbert stated that proper names began with capitals generally. He stated that sentences did not. Whitmer says that the capital letters are part of the original writing. He does not say what capital letters. Will Whitmer lay the manuscript before

an impartial committee, in the presence of J. H. Gilbert, and attempt to show that the manuscript, as it came from the hands of Smith and Cowdery, was punctuated, or that its sentences, as it came from their hands, were commenced with capitals? As to Kelley's attacks on Maj. Gilbert's character, they are beneath contempt. Maj. Gilbert concluded probably that persons who would falsify his language are not worthy of reply.

He attempts to bolster up Cowdery's testimony to the Book of Mormon by denying that he ever recanted his testimony. In a song published in Mormon works in 1838-40 occurs this doggerel:

"Or prove that Christ was not the Lord
"Because that Peter cursed and swore,
"Or Book of Mormon not his word
"Because denied by Oliver" (Olivore!!)

If Cowdery never repudiated his testimony, why did Mormons in their songs declare that he did? As to Whitmer's testimony, we have shown its ridiculous character, its fabrications, contradictions, and falsehoods. We read Smith's denunciation of him. Smith's statement that he was excluded from the Church for crime. That he plotted robbery, and carried on the plot by lying. The act of exclusion is signed by Rigdon and 83 other Mormons, denouncing him for lying, counterfeiting, stealing, and being connected with a gang of criminals of the blackest dye. In the Elders' Journal, No. 3 of the date of July, 1838, page 46, is an official document, adopted by the Mormon Church in the Far West excluding David Whitmer and Oliver Cowdery for embezzling money put in their hands to purchase land for the Church. They had the land bought for the Church, with the money of the Church, deeded to themselves, and tried to compel the Church to pay them several times the price they had paid for it—even when bought with the money of the Church and for the Church. Such is the character of Cowdery and Whitmer according to the official declaration of the Mormon Church, as published in their official organ. This is Mormon testimony to Whitmer's character. We read the statement that Whitmer said that he saw no angel but a Mr. Angel. He has been bought up. He wants to be leader

in a new Mormon faction. His family have had good positions given to them. As soon as this was done he could renew his testimony and exaggerate it into nonsense. Kelley last night read that if Joe allowed any one to see what he found he would be destroyed. His mother says she saw the breast-plate and the interpreters, and nobody "kilt." Whitmer says he saw and handled the interpreters, and nobody "hurt." Looked through them. The Book of Mormon says, it is death to any one who looked through the interpreters without a command. Whitmer is living yet. Joe was not to use the scheme to make money. Did not he die worth over one hundred thousand dollars? Was not he rich? Did not he make money out of it?

The angel in Revelations did not restore the Gospel; he preached what had never been lost. The Spirit of Truth is in the Church now; but how? Not in the miraculous power. Zechariah, in vision saw a young man go out to measure Jerusalem, and one angel said to another, "Go speak to this young man." That means Joe Smith, because he was a young man. O, twaddle! Such are his prophecies. I care not how he reads Isaiah ix. It says the remnant of Israel shall come from Assyria, not America. 1 Corinthians xv. says the "natural" was first the "spiritual" afterwards. Joe interpolates into Genesis a statement that the spiritual was first, the natural afterwards. Corinthians does not contradict Genesis, it contradicts what Joe interpolates into Genesis. Joe's inspiration in the Book of Mormon conflicts with inspiration in the Inspired Translation. But the most wonderful thing is Kelley's assertion that Nephite writers used originals, that differed from ours, and quoted from them. We reply, 1. Book of Mormon copied the blunders of King James' version in scores of cases. 2. There never were any Nephites. 3. There never was any original of the Book of Mormon, except Rigdon's revamping of Spaulding's manuscript. In quoting 1 John, ii: 29, my apponent read, "But the anointing which you have received of him abides in you and you need not that any one teach you. But as the same anointing teaches you all things and is truth"—he saw that it contradicted his theory and taught Campbellism, for it taught that truth, the truth, taught them all things. He deliberately changed it, and read "the Spirit of truth is the Spirit of truth and is no lie," making nonsense, for if one is "Spirit of truth" the other ought to be, and is "no Spirit of lie." His own passage proves that it is the truth and not the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit that teaches believers all things. I did not ask why the Book of Abraham had no witnesses, but why the parchment revelation of John had none. It caps the climax of cheek and folly, when Kelley gravely tells us that *he* has examined the two translations of the papyrus, that of the French scholar, and the fraud of Joe Smith, called the "Book of Abraham," pretending to be a translation made by inspiration; and

he, yes *he*, Kelley, that knows as much of Egyptian hieroglyphics as he does of the language spoken in Jupiter—has decided that Joe was right and the French scholar was wrong! What next!

The Holy Ghost does say there is but one immersion to Christians, just as there is one God—one faith. John does say that the baptism in water is one baptism and the baptism in Spirit another baptism. There are two elements and two baptisms. The one baptism in the Church is in water. Holy Spirit baptism is not in the Church or a baptism to Christians. Kelley may give the lie direct to the Holy Spirit as long as he pleases. It stands there. I read Joe Smith's idea of God. If he was Brighamite I read Brighamite ideas of God. I did not read a word from an Utah Mormon. I read what was said in Nauvoo and published in Nauvoo and before Joe's death. I again denounce as a deliberate untruth the statement that I say that nobody can learn anything about God. I say they can learn through his word. When pressed with the demand for a miracle my opponent declares there is no converting power in miracles. This is what I have contended, and he has denounced it as repudiating the power of God. He says the law of the Lord converts. That is what I have contended, and he has denounced it as repudiating the power of God's Spirit, and talked of the dead letter. But the most amusing thing was when he forgot that he had said that the word of God converts, and asserted that the Gospel alone could not be God's power, for if it were, if a man read it he would be converted whether he believed it or not! That caps the climax of Mormon wisdom. It stands alone in its grandeur. But he has found two miracles: I. A Mormon girl predicted the destruction of Pekin six months before Ryder read it in the paper. When we remember that the destruction was months before Ryder read it in the paper, the miracle becomes baseless. Show that Mormon leaders did not know it before the prediction, for months had elapsed between the prediction so called and the event. II. Healing Mrs. Johnson. I can cite scores of cases where physicians have done as much as Smith did. By strong will and mesmeric control they have caused persons to use what were supposed to be helpless limbs; and if it was mere lack of use that ailed them, the disease having left, they continued to use them. An incident happened in Hubbard, Trumbull County, the same year that Smith healed Mrs. Johnson, that beat Smith all hollow. A man who had been bed-ridden from rheumatism, got so that he could hobble with crutches. He went on crutches three years. One day in passing a nest of young pigs, he punched one with the spike in the end of one of his crutches. It squeaked, and the old sow, a monstrous, ferocious brute, started for him, open-mouthed, uttering fearful sounds of rage. He threw to one side his crutches, ran like a quarter-horse to a fence and dashed over it and never

used a crutch again till the day of his death. That old sow beat Joe all hollow. She healed two legs. He healed only one arm. Both were healed in the same way, a shock compelling the use of what only needed an effort to use.

Having examined the revelations of Mormonism we propose now to inquire if the authors and surroundings were befitting the "fullness of the Gospel"—the last and highest dispensation vouchsafed to men. God chose a Noah, an Abraham, a Moses, a Samuel, a John the Baptist, a Paul, and gave Christianity to the world by His Son. After giving Christianity by His Son he would not select a Baalam, a Saul, king of Israel, a Jonah or a Caiaphas to give to the world the "fullness of the Gospel." Mrs. Eaton, wife of Dr. Horace Eaton who was for nearly forty years pastor of the Presbyterian church in Palmyra, a lady of the highest character who knew intimately the acquaintance, schoolmates and associates of the Smiths, declares:

"As far as Mormonism was connected with its reputed author Joseph Smith, always called Joe Smith, it had its origin in the brain and heart of a deceitful, ignorant mother. Joe Smith's mother moved in the lower walks of life, but she had a kind of mental power which her son shared. With both, the imagination was the commanding faculty. It was vain but vivid. To it were subordinated conscience, reason and truth. Both mother and son were noted for a habit of extravagant assertion. They would look a listener full in the eye and without confusion or blanching they would manufacture startling statements, reciting stories, the warp and woof of which was falsehood."

Let any one read that mass of lies, ridiculous yarns and tomfoolery, Mrs. Smith's Life of Joe, and they will conclude that Mrs. Eaton draws it mildly in her statement.

"Was an inconsistency pointed out, nothing daunted a subterfuge was always at hand. One old man who knew them said to me, 'You could not face them down, they would lie and stick to it.' Mrs. Smith used to go to the houses of the village and do family washings. But if the articles were left to dry on the lines, and were not secured by their owners before midnight, the washer was often the winner. In these depredations she was assisted by her boys who favored, in like manner, poultry yards and grain bins. Her son Joe never worked save at 'chopping bees' and raisings and then whiskey was the impetus and reward. The mother of the high priest of Mormonism was superstitious to the last degree."

Any one who reads her ridiculous stuff in her Life of Joe will see that this statement is literally true.

"The very air she breathed was full of familiar spirits that peeped and wizards that muttered. She turned many a penny by tracing in the lines of the open palm the fortune of the inquirer. All ominous signs were heeded. No work was commenced on Friday. The moon over the left shoulder portended a calamity. The breaking of a mirror, death. Even in Vermont, before moving to New York, while Joe was a child, Mrs. Smith's mind was made up that he should be a prophet. The weak father agreed that Joe was the "genus" of the family and would be a prophet."

We have narrated already that Joe's father and mother were foremost among the fanatical followers of a pretender in Vermont who claimed miraculous powers and to be a Messiah. This suggested to Mrs. Smith the idea of making Joe a prophet.

"So it was established that Joe was to be a prophet. To such an extent did the mother impress this idea upon the boy that all the instincts of childhood were repressed. He rarely laughed or smiled, his looks and

thoughts were downward bent. He rarely engaged in demonstrations of fun, since they would not be in keeping with the professed dignity of his exalted avocation. His mother aided and inspired him in every scheme of duplicity and cunning. All acquainted with the facts, agree that the evil spirit of Mormonism first dwelt in Joe Smith's mother. Bad books had much to do with the origin of Mormonism. Joe could read, he could not write. His two standard volumes in childhood were the 'Autobiography of Stephen Burroughs,' the clerical scoundrel, whose career he so closely imitated, and the 'Autobiography of Kidd, the Pirate.' In later boyhood or early manhood, he was a great reader of the Koran, so like in some respects his own fraud, the Book of Mormon. He was a great admirer of Mohammed. He read Paine's 'Age of Reason,' and was a glib talker of its infidel vulgarity. So Mormonism began in a compound of superstition, infidelity, and villainy.

"In 1823 while his father was digging a well for Willard Chase, a stone of cloudy quartz, singularly resembling a child's foot was thrown out. Joe, who was loafing around, stole this stone from Mr. Chase's children. This stone became the acorn of the Mormon oak. It was the famous peep-stone of the Palmyra Seer. The Urim and Thummim of Mormonism, with which Joe did most certainly divine. Instructed by his mother he immediately set up a claim of miraculous power."

Mrs. Smith afterwards tried to get a singular stone from a neighbor's children to use herself.

"In a kneeling position, with a bandage over his eyes—so luminous was the light without it—with the stone in a large white stove pipe hat, and this hat in front of his face, Joe saw things unutterable. He could reveal where stolen property could be found, for who ought to know so well as he, and his family. He could tell where wandering animals were, for the leading habits of the family enabled them to know. Soon he saw caskets of gems, pots of gold, hid by Spaniards, and his favorite hero, Capt. Kidd. (One can see where the idea of buried treasure originated—in reading the tale of Kidd's buried treasures.) Untold wealth was in neighboring woods and fields. Digging became the order of the night, and sleep the order of the day. Father and brothers, vagabonds, neighbors, all who could be hired with cider, strong drink, or deluded with extravagant lying promises, were organized into a digging phalanx. They sallied forth in the darkness, a gang of loafing, worthless men, accompanied with a gang of low, worthless, lewd women. Solemn ceremonies prefaced the work. Not a sod was turned until Joe's mystic wand, the witch hazel rod, guided by the sacred stone, pointed out the spot. Entire silence was one condition of success. When hours of digging had passed away, and the answering thud on the priceless pot or chest, was about to break on the ear, some one always spoke and broke the spell, and the treasures were spirited away, and had to be found by magic rites, and dug for again. Thus matters went on for several years."

The operations of the gang extended from Palmyra to Harmony, in Pennsylvania, and Hartwicke, Otsego county, New York, the extreme points being over one hundred miles apart.

"Nearly every farm in Smith's neighborhood had several holes in it, that the gang dug. Many can be seen to-day. Sensible people paid no attention to them except to comment with disgust. Lovers of the miraculous, however, commented and talked. The excavations were visited. The newspapers took the matter up and ridiculed it. All this added to the notoriety of the Manchester seer, and his stolen peep stone."

Pomeroy Tucker of Palmyra, New York, who knew the Smiths from the time they came to New York, in 1815, until they left in 1830; and who knew Joe intimately, states that Joe Smith, Senior, ran a little beer shop in Palmyra, for a year or two, and then squatted on a piece of land belonging to some minor heirs. The Smiths did but little in the way of clearing, fencing or tilling. They erected a hovel, and then some additional hovels as out houses. Their farming was done in a slovenly, half-way, profitless manner. They eked out a living by ailing cord wood, black ash baskets,

birch brooms, maple sugar, and cakes and root beer, on public days, like the Indians on the reservation near them. Most of their time was spent in trapping muskrats, fishing, hunting, digging-out woodchucks, and loafing around stores and shops in the village. Joe usually lead in all this, never doing any of the labor himself.

This idleness was noticed by neighbors, who coupled with it loss of property, and became more careful about their cribs and coops. Their neighbors regarded them as an illiterate, whiskey-drinking, shiftless, irreligious people, Joe being the laziest and most worthless of the lot. From twelve to twenty, he was known as a dull-eyed, flaxen haired, prevaricating boy, noted only for his indolent, vagabondish character, and his habits of exaggeration, and untruthfulness. Taciturnity was among his characteristic idiosyncrasies, and he seldom spoke to anyone outside of his intimate associates, except when first addressed by another; and then, in consequence of his extravagancies of statement, his word was received with least confidence by those who knew him best. He could utter the most palpable exaggerations, marvellous absurdities with the most apparent gravity and sincerity. He nevertheless evinced the rapid development of a thinking, evil-brewing, plodding, mental composition, largely given to the invention of low cunning schemes of mischief and deception, and false and mysterious pretensions. In his mental composition, secretiveness and amateness were enormous, and conscientiousness was left out. Tucker describes Joe's reading as Mrs. Eaton describes it. He adds that he used to dilate on the prophecies, when in the presence of his ignorant superstitious associates, and that his explanations were often disgusting and blasphemous. He says, that he contended that all religions were delusions, and the Bible a fable. This agrees with the statement of Dr. John Stafford, a schoolmate, who says he was a great reader and admirer of Paine, and an open talker of his infidelity. Tucker relates the money-digging folly and knavery as Mrs. Eaton describes it. To this we add the statement of fifty-one citizens of Palmyra, and they include the best people of Palmyra:—

"December 4, 1832.

"We the undersigned have been acquainted with the Smith family for a number of years, while they reside near this place, and we have no hesitation in saying that we consider them destitute of that moral character, which ought to entitle them to the confidence of any community. They were particularly famous for visionary projects, spent much time in digging for money which they pretended was hid in the earth, and to this day large excavations may be seen in the earth, not far from their residence, where they used to spend their time digging for hidden treasures. Joseph, senior, and his son Joseph, were in particular considered destitute of moral character, and addicted to vicious habits. In reference to all with whom we are acquainted, who have embraced Mormonism, from this neighborhood, we are compelled to say, that they are visionary, and most of them destitute of moral character, and without influence in the community, and this may account for their being allowed to go on with their imposture unnoticed. It was not supposed that any of them were possessed of sufficient character or influence, to make any one believe in their book, or

sentiments, and we know not of a single individual in this vicinity, who puts the least confidence in their pretended revelations."

Eleven citizens of Manchester, and most of them schoolmates of Joe Smith, signed this statement:

"We the undersigned, being personally acquainted with the family of Joseph Smith, Senior; with whom in the celebrated Golden Bible originated, state that they were not only a lazy, indolent set of men, but they were also intemperate, and their word was not depended on, and that we are truly glad to dispense with their society."

Peter Ingersoll testifies to the old man's lies and manoeuvres to dupe him. He tells us how Joe's father-in-law upbraided him with tears, for stealing his daughter, and with his vicious worthless life, and that Joe confessed that all of his use of the stone was a lying fraud and promised to reform. He tells also how Joe told him after he began to tell that he had found the plates that it was all a hoax, but he had got the d—d fools fixed, and he would carry out the fun.

William Stafford testifies to the lies and the yarns of the Smith's about caves full of gold and precious articles and how they dug for them. He tells of the tomfoolery of old Joe and young Joe in digging. At last they got him to let them have a black wether, a very fat one, to use in their tomfoolery. They cut its throat, and then led it around in a circle, and then dug but failed. The Smiths, however, had mutton without stealing it. Willard Chase testifies to the worthlessness and lies of the Smiths, and their gang; and to the lies and tricks of young Joe, in particular. P. Chase testifies that they were an intemperate, lying, worthless set. That they scarcely ever told two stories alike in regard to the Book of Mormon. David Stafford testifies that Joseph Smith, sen., was a liar, a drunkard and a thief; and that Joe, jun., was like him. He testifies to seeing them return from stealing excursions with stolen mutton. Barton Stafford testifies to Joe's getting drunk, and having his shirt torn off of him, and his wife leading him home, after he had pretended he had found his golden Bible. Henry Harris testifies that Joe's oath was rejected by a jury as unworthy of belief and that the whole set were intemperate and liars and worthless money diggers. Mrs. Abigail Harris testifies to old Mrs. Smith's lies and tricks to get money, and about the Gold Bible. Roswell Nichols testifies to their lies, dishonesty, and the tricks of the Smiths. Joshua Stafford testifies to the same. Joseph Capron tells of their lies, tricks and tomfooleries.

To this might be added the testimony of the people in Susquehanna county, Pa., where Joe lived while pretending to translate, telling of his lies, his profanity, and trying to seduce his hired girl, his declaration that adultery was no crime.

In 1880 William Bryant testified: "I knew Joe Smith personally to some extent. I saw him frequently. I knew well his reputation. He was a lazy, drinking fellow, loose in his habits in every way." Danford

Booth says, "Smith's reputation was bad." Orrin Read, "I knew the Smith's, but did not associate with them; they were too low to associate with. There was no truth in them." Samantha Payne testifies:

"She was a schoolmate of Smith. His reputation was bad; he was regarded as a worthless, shiftless fellow, a braggadocio and a blackguard. The mother of Joseph Smith was regarded as a thief by her neighbors. She was exceedingly superstitious and addicted to lying, as were all of the family. She once came to my mother to get a stone the children had found, of curious shape. She wanted to use it as a peepstone. Mother would not trust her to look around the house for it. The Smith's dug for money on nearly every farm for miles around; their excavations can be seen to-day. Some are on the farm on which I now live. The digging was done at night with most absurd superstitious acts. It was done by a gang of men and women of low reputation. They told many absurd stories about it. After Smith came back from Penn-

sylvania his followers dug a cave in a hillside not far from here. They conducted the work of getting up Mormonism in it. I was in it once. It can be seen to-day. The present owner of the farm, Mr. Miner, dug out the cave, which had fallen in. The cave had a large, heavy plank door and a padlock on it. The neighbors broke it open one night, and found in it a barrel of flour, some mutton, some sheep pelts, and two sides of leather."

Ezra Pierce testifies to the digging for money, their lying and laziness, and the low gang that were engaged in it. Dr. McIntyre, who was their physician, testifies that Joseph Smith, senior, was a drunkard, a liar and a thief, and his house a perfect brothel. That Joe got drunk, stole sugar, got beaten for it, and told the doctor who dressed his bruises that he had a fight with the devil. Yea, verily he had!

MR. KELLEY'S SIXTH SPEECH!

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The consummation of the offense of Joseph Smith in the minds of his opposers was, and is, that he was an unlearned boy. Was not reared in their theological institutions. What right has this man to know anything? they reasoned. It is the old story which the self-wise could not understand in the first age of Christianity. "How knoweth this man letters having never learned?" This is the thought when fully brought out: How did Joseph Smith know so much when he had never been to school? Had not attended our college? Why, they say, he even pretended to translate the Bible; *our* Bible. This perfect book. Oh! what sacrilege. The rascal! Now, my friends, I want your attention for a moment while I expose this hypocritical cant, so commonly indulged in by our opposers. In the first place let me ask you, what made this our Bible to the exclusion of other people? Was it given to us? No; all of you know that there is not even a single Gentile writer or writing included within its pages. It contains God's will as revealed to the Jews, and hence the Jewish Bible, if belonging to any particular class; as the prophet Ezekiel declared, "The stick of Judah." Ezek. 37:19. We received it as handed down after the time when they were scattered as a nation, and have tried by our wise men and scholars to translate it from their languages, the Hebrew and Greek, into ours. But in doing this our scholars do not agree as to many things, absolutely disagree, and have been warring for years; not only upon the translation from the original, but actually as to what in fact *was* or is original. And not only as to words, but sentences; *verses*; *entire books*. And there

has not only been a revision of the translation into our language, but of the Greek text itself. The oldest manuscripts extant are only referred back to the fourth century by scholars, unless we accept the claim made for a few of the New Testament writings, the Sinaitic, discovered less than forty years ago, which it is claimed may be traced back to the beginning of the third century. As to these originals there is a disagreement in many things. St. Jerome, in his commentary on the 40th chapter of Ezekiel says: "When we translate the Hebrew words into Latin we are sometimes guided by *conjecture*;" and he makes frequent mention of the *additions*, *corrections* and *subtractions* made in the version of the Septuagint by Origin. Again he says: "It is *mere superstition to assert*, as some authors do, that the Hebrew text which we have at present is not *corrupted* in any place, and that there is no fault, nor anything left out, and that we must indisputably follow it at all times." Dupin, in his church history, speaking of the differences found to exist in the original manuscripts, says: "There are differences in the punctuation, about the consonants, and whole *words* and *verses*, which show that let them be never so diligent, it is impossible but some faults will slip in, either in the copying or printing of a work." And then it is charged that the boldness of some transcribers of these originals was such that they "ventured to *strike out*, *add*, or *change* some words which *they thought necessary* to be omitted, added or changed."

The original manuscripts were transcribed and handed down by the same persons whom Braden termed "Papists," and refused to receive their plain historical

statements as evidence that the doctrine of the laying on of hands was practiced and preached by the apostles, and handed down by examples of practice to the second and third centuries thereafter. Is it enough for him to answer these plain historical facts by simply charging them with Papacy? It is not a fact in the first place that Papacy, as it is commonly understood, then existed; but if it did, it would likely be as proper to look to it for a correct history of practices in the church as for a correct history of the teachings in the church which must come through the same parties. Yet he gets his perfect law, the constitution, the New Testament, through this papal line as it is termed. And to prove his New Testament is the perfect law he quotes James 1:25, "But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty," etc. Why does he say this perfect law was the New Testament as delivered by the apostles? Does he not know that much of the New Testament was not yet written? This, as I have before shown, was in the year A. D. 60. Long before the gospel of Luke was written; before the letters to Timothy, Titus, the Colossians, the Hebrew churches, the 2nd and 3rd Epistles of Peter, the Epistles of John, of Jude and the Revelation were ever in existence, or even thought of, perhaps, and yet it is held up to this audience to show the law was perfect in the sense, that God would give no more revelations to the human family. Why? The Psalmist, as I have quoted to you, said hundreds of years before this, "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the soul." Did he mean that God would for that reason speak no more unto the human family, neither in the 1st, 2nd or 3rd century? Not at all. But that God is perfect and his law must be perfect, whether we have it all, or a part; whatever we have is perfect, if not changed by designing men after having been revealed. That law is given to man as Isaiah says, 28:10, "Precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little." And this is the view taken in the writings of Paul. "For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to the Jew first, and also to the Greek, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed." Does he mean all revealed, so that Jesus could no more communicate anything that was good or beneficial to the world? No, sir. For, nearly the whole of our New Testament was written after this language of the apostle was sent to the saints at Corinth.

The apostle in the next part of the sentence is the interpreter: "From faith to faith." It "is revealed from faith to faith." As men have faith to advance in the divine life; and this is in harmony with the whole tenor of the New Testament teachings. Now turn back to your argument upon this subject where you held that the apostles were the constitution makers, the framers, and look down the line again. My position was that they were simply the publishers,—the preachers of God's law as

he delivered it to them. This harmonizes with the entire text, "revealed from faith to faith;" "hath committed the word of reconciliation to us;" "Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity." "A minister," etc. "Go teach all nations." "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." *That I have commanded you*; and, notwithstanding this former commanding it was necessary that they be further commanded as they proceeded in the divine work, and instruction was given "from faith to faith."

Now I call you back to the reference of the translation of the Bible by Mr. Smith, as he read some verses from it to show how bad Smith was; but was there any bad things in the verses which he read? Oh, no, simply because it's Smith's translation, and Mr. Smith was not college-bred; he gave God the credit for the work of translation; that is the trouble. I have shown you that the originals of the Old and New Testament were to some extent *changed*, and thereby much light taken from the word of God. If you will compare the Doway version with the King James' version, you can easily determine that, without going back to the Greek or Hebrew; and if this is a truth, and Mr. Smith's translation throws light by restoring this, is it a bad thing, and should we say he was sacrilegious?

I told you from the outset that I was not particular what translation we were to use in this discussion, for I could prove my faith by either well-attested one. All of these translations harmonize in their prominent and essential features when taken as a whole. But at the same time this is true, it is also true that on account of the inaccuracies in the word, many things are rendered dark until the entire line of inspired writings upon them are examined, and few men can so read and examine the Bible. Hence, it is in God's wisdom to give us a translation and correction. Remember, *correction also*, so that it shall enlighten the feet of those who would have otherwise walked in the dark. My opponent claims that Paul's words as to "baptism for the dead" "has always been considered by scholars as a dark passage." And in his affirmative question he admitted his church would not even *presume* to take a position on the God-head, because they were so much in the dark, but not more so, he thought, than others; yet Jesus says, "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." According to this, he has truly admitted salvation out of his Church. It is necessary to know the Father and Son to have life. And says the apostle "If our Gospel be hid it is hid to them that are lost." Ignorance does not do here, they must "walk in the light," as John declares, and to do this one must have the Comforter from on high.

My opponent should have told this audience frankly that many of the correc-

tions made by Mr. Smith's translation have since been endorsed by the first scholars of the world. They did not know they were confirming him, however. Such a thought would have amazed those high-toned churchmen. Open to First Cor., 10: 24, "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." Here according to the King James' translation we have to seek other men's wealth. But it is corrected by Mr. Smith forty years ago, to read "Seek another's good;" and although Mr. Smith has been accused of trying to find law to permit him to prey upon the property of others, and persons have gone so far as to pervert the plain teachings of the Book of Covenants in order to try to prove the false claim. But in 1881, the scholars of the world, in their Revised Version of the New Testament, correct the sentiment here to read as Mr. Smith had corrected it forty years before. The next point I will notice is the idea which is carried in these books which have perverted our teachings so much, that we were "to suck the milk of the Gentiles and take the whole country." Nothing is farther from the truth than this. We are more clearly upon the record on this point than any other church in America. Our faith is as set forth in the Book of Covenants, page 177: "Let no man break the laws of the land; be subject to the powers that be: (the government in which we live); until He reigns, whose right it is to reign, and subdues all enemies under His feet." Who is this? Answer: Jesus Christ. How long are we to conform to law and be subjects? Answer: till Jesus Christ shall come. We are not to take possession of the kingdom then as some have foolishly supposed; but if we are Christ's children, his saints, we will be given the kingdom when he comes. The prophet Daniel speaking of this says: "For the kingdom was given to the saints of the most high." Is this the hope which our enemies have so shamefully misrepresented? Do not all the followers of Jesus expect to share in this final hope?

Now all of this talk about all religious parties being destroyed except the Latter Day Saints, and that *they* are to take the earth, is had to stir up prejudice against us; there is no true foundation for it, nor never was.

There has doubtless been found persons among the Latter Day Saints who have at times said foolish things and been, perhaps, fanatical; but is that any ground for these grave charges against the body? Is that the way to decide upon the views, faith or character of any other people, simply from what some excited or evilly disposed member may have said? This is the way in which my opponent has sought to carry on his side of the discussion from the first; to pick up all that he could find that has ever been said by this one or that one, either of those who had been cut off from our society, or those who have ever been bitter and unrelenting enemies, from prejudice, ignorance and superstition or other-

wise, and tell to this audience. To gather up all the foul newspaper stories that have been published and insiduously circulated against the Saints, and read them here for evidence.

I showed fully from the beginning of this discussion that such a course was not in any sense justifiable; that no body of people and no religion could be fairly or in any sense correctly attested by any such course; that that was the way, to abuse, falsify, wrong and slander people, but never to ascertain what they really are, or what their religion is.

I showed fully and effectually too, that if Jesus and the apostles were tried in such a way we would have to confess that they in no sense would bear such test; for they were berated, abused, slandered, while living and since their deaths, although over eighteen hundred years have passed away since the false statements were first circulated. Jesus was no exception to the rule. No upright man of prominence in God's work has escaped, and from the very nature of things. He who originates these lies is the Devil, the evil one, who has ever gotten up such stories and influenced men and women to tell and circulate them, and could it be supposed that he would not act like himself in this age and dispensation of the world? He is, as stated by Jesus, the "father of lies," and of course will be carrying on his own work. But, says one, these are not lies he has told about the Latter Day Saints. That is just what the people thought about the tales told against Jesus and Paul. They thought they were true stories. Where does the fault lie in regard to this? *It is in pursuing a course presumably for evidence, which will not bring true evidence.*

It is impossible to attain truth by seeking to these tales and second and third handed statements made in the absence of the parties against whom they mitigate, and for this reason Courts of Justice as I have shown exclude them as vile and utterly unreliable. Truth cannot be gained in any case in this way.

My opponent has taken a course in this controversy by which he has disregarded all rules of evidence. Broken every established principle for eliciting truth. Has violated with impunity the rules of law and order established by our legislatures and judicial tribunals; upheld and followed a rule which in the past brought opprobrium and disrepute against Jesus and the apostles and their religion; that caused the martyrdom of the faithful in the first and second centuries; that put to the rack, starvation and death, the good under the Reformation, and caused the people to clamor for the life of Joseph Smith, because he differed with them in the matter of religion. It is the matter of his work that I deprecate; it is the system of slander that I consider most revolting and disgraceful. Accept such a system of investigation and no man's reputation and character is safe. I could by following such a course sink into lasting

disgrace the Disciple, or any other church with which I am acquainted. Not only that, but most any public man, whether religious or otherwise; and especially if he has been unfortunate enough to have been called to the work of leading a reformation.

My opponent would be down at a single stroke. Only a week ago there came into my hands a newspaper circulating statements about him that are as grave as these he has charged against Joseph Smith. But he will say they are false. Grant that they are; how does that help the case? The more *false they are* the more they are evidence in my favor that I am right in my positions of investigation in this controversy. I wish to prove to him effectually that his course in this discussion, in rehearsing the statements of others for facts, is unjustifiable and against all proper rules of decency and propriety. Why should I engage to meet a professed minister of the gospel in discussion on agreed and written rules providing for proper and respectful controversy, and then be compelled to sit and listen to the outrageous tales and stories, and the most harsh and unjust epithets against my brethren, when I know them to be nothing more than vile and revengeful tales of slander? I will not just make assertions about these published statements, but prove that I am not trying to deceive you as I pass along. The following upon this point of my argument is from the *Table Rock Argus*, a paper published at Table Rock, Pawnee county, Nebraska.

"FALLS CITY JOURNAL:—This office has received a pamphlet entitled, 'Ingersoll Unmasked,' by Clark Braden. Braden requests us to advertise himself and his pamphlet free, which is characteristic of the dead beat. The Kearney Journal, Oakland Independent, Omaha Watchman, and a few other exchanges, have puffed this fraud, and we hope they will publish our version of Braden Unmasked. We personally know Clark Braden to be an unscrupulous liar. A number of years ago, in Pawnee City, he villainously slandered the character of Joshua K. Giddings, the old anti-slavery hero, for which he was taken to account then and there. Braden is a liar by nature, and a charlatan by profession. He exhausted his resources for knavery in this State, and is no longer recognized by his own church, in the East. No respectable publishing house would take Braden's pamphlet, and he was obliged to print it at his own expense and in his own name."

Upon this statement made in the *Falls City Journal*, the editor of the *Argus* said:

"The editor of the *Argus* received a similar pamphlet, with the same request. From what we can learn of Mr. Braden he is a scoundrel and villain of the blackest dye, and is worthy of no endorsement at the hands of respectable publishers. Christianity evidently needs no such defenders as Clark Braden, formerly of Pawnee county, Nebraska."

These are the published statements of men now living, and doubtless my opponent will say they are false and slanderous. But that is not the point. I have read these to show you that we cannot accept the manner and work of Mr. Braden, during this discussion for argument. If these are false, it proves my position true, without a doubt; if true, all the assertions he has made during this discussion and the purported evidence falls flatter still, and my opponent is still discomfited.

I must say for myself, that his style of debate has been the most conspicuous

failure, that I have ever witnessed, so far as overturning a peoples' faith is concerned. So much, upon the kind of weapons used. My opponent seems to have been considerably chagrined over his effort last evening, about the punctuation and capitals used in the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon, and he endeavors to try to make you believe I have changed my positions upon this since I was at Wilber. There is not a word of truth in it. I hold the same views now, as then, and have properly stated them in both places. Mr. J. H. Gilbert has been fairly, fully and absolutely caught in his attempts to break down the religion of the Latter Day Saints. He stated in my presence, and to other parties, what I read to you. He in fact, knew nothing when examined, against our people, or against the truth of the Book of Mormon. His statement was published, as I stated last evening; when it was learned that he said he had been misrepresented, W. H. Kelley wrote to him asking him to point out wherein; that he had published his language as taken at the time, and if there was a misunderstanding, he wished to know wherein, and that if he had been mis-reported, it was unintentional. This letter, Mr. Gilbert has never answered. He cannot do it. And the examination of the manuscript of the Book of Mormon and answer of Mr. David Whitmer, effectually squelches all affidavits, Gilbert is able to make. The trouble with Gilbert is, he ran with Tucker too long, and has things mixed. It is enough comment on Mr. Gilbert's statement, to say, that he is willing to communicate to Braden's side, and answer questions, but not to mine.

Next, I was somewhat amused at the manner of my opponent in dealing with what he calls Mormon Miracles. He first challenged me to produce a well attested miracle that ever took place in our church. I soon furnished the cases out of his own church's history. He cannot deny the cases of healing and prophecy, so what does he do? He turns skeptical all at once, and works himself up to believe it was done through exciting and natural causes. Well, it was done. He cannot gainsay that, and if he wants to believe it was by the same power by which the old sow of which he related the story, wrought, that is his own business. But it seemed to me, it must appear to himself, that he over reached the mark a little. In order to tell a story to ridicule and beat what actually took place at the appeal of Joseph Smith for the afflicted, through the name and grace of Jesus Christ, he related a tale, which he thinks beats Mr. Smith's miracles all to pieces. It so happens that his tale of the old sow, beats the reported miracles of Peter, Paul, John and Jesus, just as effectually as it does those of Joseph Smith. Shall we conclude then, magnetism and excitement did them all? Nonsense. But the worst of all this is, that he should stand before the audience and claim that the girl had some way of knowing of the great fire

at Pekin, of which the Spirit spoke, when he has not one iota of evidence from his own, or any side to base it upon. No such claim could possibly be justly made, at this time, when Ryder, their preacher, who related it and all connected with it, who saw, heard and were acquainted with the circumstances, are beyond the reach of an interview. No, the ship had come, but Ryder had not heard of it. That is Braden's solution. In order to carry out his views he deliberately makes out his own brother ministers to be perfect ninnies, without the faculty of criticising a simple thing, like the time of the arrival of a vessel, when they are depending upon a statement relating to the same on a matter of the highest importance. Let my opponent drop these silly objections, and argue the question under discussion.

Is the church I am representing here, in name, principles, faith, doctrine, practices, ordinances, organization and worship, a complete shadow of the type that is reflected in the New Testament? If it is, it is God's church and accepted with him. Let the word of God settle it; by this word are we to be finally judged; not the stories told, and let us be honest, whatever the result. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son."

But I will not allow my opponent's attempt to limit the spiritual gifts and the spirit of revelation to the Apostolic age of Christianity pass without noticing it again. Jesus, instead of thus limiting the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to the first century of the Christian era, teaches on the contrary, that the comforter is to be given to all who keep his commandments: "If ye love me, *keep my commandments*. And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another comforter, *that he may abide with you forever*." John, 14:15, 16. "Even the spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, *he shall testify of me*." John 15:26.

"For he (the comforter) shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear *that shall he speak*; and he will show you things to come." John 16:16. Please observe: this comforter that "*speaks*" and shows "things to come," is not limited to the Apostles, but promised to *all who love the Lord* and who *keep his commandments*. So likewise Jesus, after his resurrection, makes the promise that "these signs shall follow them that believe" the gospel, not only in the first age of Christianity, but *co-extensive* with the preaching of, belief in and obedience to the gospel, in "*all the world*." Notice the salvation here promised on condition of obedience to the gospel; the condemnation pronounced on condition of not obeying the gospel, and the signs promised to follow the believer, are all *equally unlimited*, so far as time is concerned. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," whether in the first or the nineteenth century, "and he that believeth not shall be condemned," whether in the first or in the nineteenth century, "and these signs shall follow them that believe," whether in the

first or the nineteenth century, so far as the promise of Christ is concerned, in Mark the 16th chapter.

So Peter, on Pentecost day, realizing the fulfillment of the statement of Christ in his own experience and that of his brethren, as found in Luke 24:49, "Behold I send *the promise* of my Father upon you" under the inspirational influence of that Holy Spirit received as promised, gives the extent and limit of that *same* promised Holy Spirit to the believer in Christ.

Hence, to the 3,000 who on that day enquired the conditions of salvation, Peter said, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to *you*." Not to us the Apostles *only*,—and to the next generation *after you*,—"and to your children." But Peter, as if foreseeing the objections to the receiving of the Holy Ghost, would be urged in later ages, does not limit the "promise" to *that* generation, and the next one, their children; but proceeds to extend it to "*all*, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." All then that will believe and obey the Gospel, even all that are afar off, are called to the enjoyment of the "gift of the Holy Ghost" here promised. See Acts 2: 38, 39. So far as the terms "Holy Ghost" and gift of the Holy Ghost is concerned, Luke, another of the *inspired* writers uses these two phrases interchangeably in Acts. 10: 44, 45. The Spirit given to the disciples of Christ on Pentecost, Peter urges, is the Spirit referred to by Joel, a Jewish prophet, quoting him as authority, when reasoning with those accepting the Old Testament Scriptures as valid authority. And he shows to them that the Spirit there manifested, is the same Spirit Joel referred to, but does not say it was a full and complete fulfillment of Joel's prophecy. The "gift" manifested there, was "the gift of tongues," a gift not mentioned in Joel's prophecy. Joel says, the old men are to dream dreams. How many of the old men fell asleep on the day of Pentecost and dreamed dreams? Joel says, "the young men shall see visions." How many of the young men had visions on the day of Pentecost? Joel says, "the servants and the handmaidens shall prophesy when the Spirit is poured out." How many servants and handmaidens prophesied at Pentecost? Joel says that *after* the children of Israel are gathered back to the land of their Fathers, "afterward I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." But the ultimate and complete fulfillment of Joel's prediction will be realized after Israel is gathered preparatory to the coming of the Lord in glory, connected with which will be the great and dreadful day of the Lord, the turning of the sun into darkness, and the moon into blood, even the day of the deliverance of the righteous by the advent of Christ in glory. Joel 2: 28, 32. Matthew 24th chapter: "Of this Spirit then the believers in the Gospel are entitled to in every age when the Gospel is preached, believed and obeyed, to the end

of the world, according to these teachings of Jesus and Peter."

Then shall we so interpret the language of the apostle Paul in the 13th chapter of First Corinthians as to *contradict* Jesus, the Master, and the apostle Peter in relation to the perpetuity of the spiritual gifts and have him teach their limitation to the first age of Christianity? No, Paul teaches that they are essential to the edifying of the church and the perfecting of the saints—not the perfecting of the law—till "that which *is* perfect is come." Paul is not contrasting an *imperfect* LAW with a perfect one. The contrast here is between the saints with the gifts having an *imperfect* knowledge and understanding of the things of the great hereafter—this *mortal* state—as compared to the *perfect condition* and understanding of things divine, when *we* reach the *immortal* and perfect state. An imperfect congregation—church *militant*—is contrasted with the church triumphant and *immortal*. Hence the language, "For *we* know in *part*, and *we* prophesy in *part*. But when that which *is* perfect, [perfect at the time when Paul wrote the Corinthian letter—not that which *will be* perfect] is come, *then* that which *is* in *part* shall be done away."

Therefore Paul does consistently with these great facts, teach the Ephesians that not only the nine gifts mentioned in the letter to the Corinthians were given to build up the church till the day of perfection arrives, but that five other gifts, namely, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, thus aggregating fourteen gifts of the Spirit in all, were given "for the perfecting of the saints [not the law, *that was already perfect*, see Ps. 19; James 1:25] for the works of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till *we* all come to a *perfect man*—[not perfect law]—to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." (Not till we get a book made).

Christ, when Paul wrote this language, was an immortal, resurrected being, and these gifts being given "till" *we* all come to the measure of the stature of the *fullness of Christ*, who was then full in the wisdom of God, these spiritual endowments are essential to well being and edifying of his church, till we reach the immortal state, even the resurrection of the dead.

If the Ancient Church, with *more* scripture than we possess to-day, with all its inspired apostles, prophets and other officers, together with all the spiritual gifts, only "saw through a glass darkly," when

trying to view the great future with its rewards and hopes, what degree of perfection are we attaining to-day, with less scripture, a less perfect law than they had, and devoid of *all Spiritual light* by the gifts?

Then, how consistently can the great Apostle to the Gentiles, after showing to the Corinthians "a more excellent way" than to think *all* could be apostles, or all could be prophets, or all were teachers, or *all* be endowed with any one office or gift, by showing them how God had *distributed* the gifts among the different members of the one body, as in the language: "God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it pleased Him," (God): Change and teach another thing? He could not do so. He then proceeds to instruct the saints that the gifts without charity would avail nothing, but that charity and gifts together would insure their reward, if faithful to all the commands.

He then informs us that we are under obligation to God, to seek to attain these gifts, a *Divine command* twice repeated. Thus—"Covet earnestly the best gifts."—"Follow after charity," and "*desire* spiritual gifts." Yes, *desire* spiritual gifts, just as long as we follow after charity.

"Even so ye, forasmuch as ye are zealous of Spiritual gifts, *seek that ye may excel* to the edifying of the Church."

"If a man think himself to be a prophet or Spiritual, *let him acknowledge* that the things which *I* write unto you, *are the* commandments of God. 1 Cor. 12: 31, 14: 1: 12 and 37.

So writes this divinely inspired teacher, Paul, in concluding this subject of Spiritual gifts, in this letter, addressed to "*All, that in every place* call on the name of Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours." Chapter 1: verse 2.

Since we are thus *commanded* to seek the Spiritual gifts in righteousness, to the edifying of the church, let us remember that the Savior says: "He that hath my commandments and *keepeth* them, he it is that loveth me, and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and *will manifest* myself to him." John 14: 21. Let us then secure the love of the Father and the Son by observing the command to seek the gifts, along with all the other commands, and also secure the "manifestation" of Christ to us, as promised.

(Time expired).

MR. BRADEN'S SIXTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:--Mormons try to deny that Smith began his course as seer by witching for water with a witch hazel rod, and peeping for stolen and lost articles and buried treasures. Mrs. Smith in her life of Joe, admits that he did such work. The editor, apostle Blair, admits that he did. Scores of associates testify to the fact. They try to deny that he dug for money, and superintended a gang of knaves and dupes in such work. His mother admits that he did. So does apostle Blair, the editor. Scores testify to his spending years in such work. That great excavations were made all over the neighborhood and for miles around, extending from Palmyra, N. Y., to Harmony, Pa., and Hartwicke, N. Y. Many of these excavations can be seen to-day. When the gang came to Kirtland they renewed the work of digging for treasure and living witnesses can be cited who can point out where they dug in Kirtland. Mormonism began in peeping with a stolen peep-stone, and witching for water with a witch hazel rod, and digging for years for buried money. It began in superstition, lying and fraud attended with thieving, drunkenness and lewdness. The witching for water was a lying fraud; so was finding the plates and translating. Peeping for lost property and buried treasure with the stolen peep-stone was a fraud. So was the pretense of finding plates and translating them. Digging for buried treasures, seen with the stolen peep-stone, was a lying fraud. So was the tale of digging up plates and translating them with a stolen peep-stone. We, on a former occasion, exposed Joe's lies and contradictory stories about his plates, and the lies and contradictory stories of all connected with the fraud. We could read Joe's own statement of his casting the devil out of Newell Knight in New York. Mrs. Smith's yarns of visions, miracles, etc., that attended their first meetings and their removal to Ohio. One of Joe's unmarried sisters proving to be eniente it was declared to be an immaculate conception, and a new Messiah would be given to the world. Old citizens of Palmyra and Manchester testify to hearing such stuff from Martin Harris, David Whitmer and other Mormons. The whole affair was a strange compound of ignorance, superstition, lying, fraud, trickery, and low cunning, managed by Joe, who was an infidel, and was imitating his favorite characters, the clerical impostor Stephen Burroughs, and Mahammed. It would require volumes to record the absurdities, the tricks and lies of all connected with the fraud. The low absurd character of the pretended supernatural events connected with the origin of Mormonism, shows its low vile origin, and the low, ignorant character of

its originators. The most low and absurd superstitions of Southern negroes were eclipsed.

The real originator of Mormonism was Sydney Rigdon, who only intended to use Smith as his tool, to get the fraud before the world, as a miracle and revelation, through his stolen peep-stone. But Smith proved to be a deeper schemer than even Rigdon. When Rigdon allowed Joe to go before the world first, to usher in, and conduct the movements for months, as its prophet, and came in only as a convert, he gave away his chances to be leader. He often tried in Kirtland, in Missouri, in Nauvoo, to get the coveted place of leader and make Smith subordinate; but he had put the citadel in Smith's hands and entered only as a recruit, and Smith was too cunning for him to succeed in ousting him. Smith always held Rigdon in the position he assumed when he embraced Mormonism openly, that of a mere convert, and never allowed him to assume his real position, the author of the whole fraud; and the one who intended to be leader, and only intended to allow Smith to act as author and leader for a short time, in order to start the fraud. Rigdon intended to use Smith as a cat's paw to rake the roasted chestnuts off of the stove of public censure and criticism; but the cat proved to be a shrewder imp than even the one trying to use him. He kept the chestnuts and threw to the originator of the scheme, only the shells. Rigdon's whole career in Mormonism was an apish chattering and quarrelling to regain what he had given away.

Since the discussion began I have come in possession of the following facts: James Jeffery, of Churchville, Harford Co. Maryland, in a statement dictated to Rev. Calvin D. Wilson, in the presence of his wife, declares: "Forty years ago I was in business in St. Louis. The Mormons then had their temple in Nauvoo, Ill, I had business transactions with them. I knew Sydney Rigdon. He acted as general manager of the business of the Mormons (with me). Rigdon told me several times in his conversations with me, that there was in the printing office with which he was connected in Ohio, a manuscript of the Rev. Spaulding's tracing the origin of the Indian race from the lost tribes of Israel. This manuscript was in the office several years. He was familiar with it. Spaulding wanted it published, but had not the means to pay for the printing. He (Rigdon) and Joe Smith used to look over the manuscript and read it on Sundays; Rigdon said Smith took the manuscript and said, 'I'll print it,' and he went off to Palmyra, N. Y."

On the 14th of September, 1844, Sydney Rigdon, who was trying to assume Joe

Smith's place as President and Prophet, was called on by a committee of the twelve apostles. In the conversation with them, he told them that they dare not reject him. If they did, he would reveal their secrets. On the 15th and 16th Brigham Young and others denounced him for such threats. They rejected him and expelled him September 16th.

In an article in the "*Times and Seasons*," of May 1st, 1845, reprinted from the *Kalamazoo Gazette*, and signed E. M. Webb, Rigdon is bitterly denounced for his exposures of Mormonism.

In a conversation with Dr. Silas Sheppard, some time after his return to Pennsylvania from Nauvoo, in response to Dr. Sheppard's request that he would now, since he had, as he declared to Dr. Sheppard, renounced all connection with Mormonism forever, tell him, Dr. Sheppard, the truth, in regard to the Book of Mormon. Rigdon replied, "Dr. Sheppard, my mouth is forever sealed on that subject."

Rigdon lived for long years after this, in ease. His family flourished in business. He wrote much, would talk on all subjects but Mormonism, and died, and as far as the world knows "gave no sign." Observing neighbors think that he was a pensioner of Mormonism, and that his family have profited largely by selling his papers to the Mormons, or in bribes to keep them a secret.

Now let us collate the facts. I. Rigdon becomes intimate with Mr. Jeffery, while acting for the Mormons in business transactions. II. Rigdon threatens the Mormons in the Fall of 1844, that he would divulge their secrets, if they reject him in his attempt to be President. III. They reject him. IV. On his way back East, and while in St. Louis, he fulfills his threats, and tells Mr. Jeffery that Spaulding's manuscript was taken to a printing office. That he got it from the office. That he and Smith examined it together. That he gave it to Smith to publish. V. About the same time Mormon papers are denouncing him bitterly for his exposures. VI. A change comes over the spirit of his dream. He announces that he has renounced Mormonism forever, but that his mouth is forever sealed in regard to matters that he had been freely making public.

The key to the matter is, Rigdon had failed to get a party to follow him. He could make nothing out of Mormonism. He began to tell their secrets as he declared they would. Mormon agents visited him. They could not let him talk any more. They offered him two alternatives. Money and silence, or Danite vengeance. Rigdon had sent Danites on their murderous errands too often not to know what that meant. He took the bribe, and his mouth was forever sealed. He lived in ease, with no visible means of support. His family have been successful, with no tangible means of success. Rigdon lived on Mormon money, paid to keep him silent. His family have made a good thing out of it, in accepting

hush money. Rigdon lived for years, an outspoken atheist and infidel, and died one. Like most Mormons who are not dupes, but knaves, he turned infidel, when the fraud was no longer profitable.

Sidney Rigdon was like Joe Smith a lazy youth noted for his extravagant language, stories and exaggerations and falsehoods. He used to talk scepticism and was noted for his fondness for debate. After he stole the Spaulding manuscript he joined the Baptist church. He told a marvellous experience and afterwards told the Baptist Association when they were trying him that it was all a lie. He manufactured it to get into the church. He began preaching as soon as he joined the church and soon began to plot to oust the old pastor of the church and get his place and came very near ruining the church. Failing in this and having lost the confidence of the Baptists in Pennsylvania, he went to Ohio and joined the church in Warren. After preaching here for two years he returned to Pittsburg. He remained here nearly two years. He was expelled from the Baptist church and preached a short time to his malcontents in the court house. He resumed working at his trade, a tanner, and began to fix up the manuscript he had stolen from the printing office. During this time he resumed his infidelity and talked it openly and freely as old citizens of Pittsburg and Pennsylvania testify. On a visit to a relative near where the author's father had charge of a stone yard, he used to spend hours in sitting near the author's father and talking his doubts and scepticism.

In 1826, while he was living in Bainbridge, Ohio, he was invited to preach the funeral sermon of Warner Goodall in Mentor by the Baptist church who knew him as brother-in-law of Adamson Bentley, a well known Baptist preacher, and that he had been a Baptist preacher. He did so and was invited to preach for the church. He laid to one side his scepticism and preached for them and went with the church into the Disciple movement. As Baptist and Disciple preacher he was noted for his spread-eagle eloquence and ability to get up revival excitements. He had been hurt in youth and it left him with a tendency to epileptic spells. He would often while preaching, especially in revival excitements, have such spells and see visions and swoon, have trances, etc. This tendency caused his preaching to be wild, visionary and extravagant. He was regarded as a cunning, ambitious schemer, noted for his extravagant talk and actions, his exaggerations and untruth, and as destitute of truthfulness and moral principle. His preaching attracted the visionary and fanatical. He carefully indoctrinated them with his ideas while Smith was getting out his book. He made a confidant of P. P. Pratt who let his brother Orson into the secret, and these four, Smith, Rigdon and the Pratts, constituted the brains of Mormonism in the start. Two were known to be infidels before they went into Mormonism the two originators

—Rigdon and Smith. The other two were probably no better.

It will be bootless for my opponent to undertake to deny the statements of the Palmyra and Manchester people. Since entering on this debate the speaker has visited Palmyra and obtained certificates of Col' E. B. Dewy, Danford Booth, Ezra Pierce, Samantha Payne, M. G. Smith, J. H. Gilbert, that the names attached to the Palmyra and Manchester statements were the names of real persons. That the character of all for veracity was good. That among the names were the best citizens of Manchester and Palmyra. That a list of better names could not have been obtained. That the statements were the universal opinion of all who knew Smith, his family and associates. That such has ever been the opinion and such is the opinion to-day. Acquaintances have testified to the high character of Willard Chase, to the veracity of Ingersoll and all others whose names are attached to the affidavits published in Howe's book. We have proved the affidavits to be genuine.

We have the statement of M. G. Smith and survivors that they signed the statements. It will do Mormons no good to jabber "lies, frauds," etc. Since their system is all lies and frauds, they judge other persons by themselves. No fact in history can be more fully sustained by human evidence than the low, dishonest trickery, lying, fraudulent origin of Mormonism. It began in fraud for gain, and was carried on in fraud for gain. In Kirtland, Smith, Rigdon and the leaders borrowed money, bought goods on credit, started a "wild-cat bank" without a charter, and without capital, built houses, a big temple, laid out lots, planned a great city, built mills, factories, tanneries, started a big land speculation, paid more for land in 1834-5-6 than it has ever been worth since, dressed like princes, lived like nabobs, gulled their dupes, swindled the public with their fraudulent paper, and notes, until the swindling bubble burst and left hundreds defrauded and ruined. Rigdon and Smith were arrested for banking without a charter and were fined one thousand dollars each. The printing office and other property were sold to pay the execution. That night the printing office, the Methodist church, and another building were set on fire. As a blind a pretended attempt to fire the temple was shown to the committee who investigated the incendiarism. Rigdon and Smith fled from Kirtland the 10th of January, 1838, in the night, to escape arrest for swindling, and were chased by the officer's posse over one hundred miles. This is one miracle that Mormon leaders wrought in Kirtland. They got large sums of money on credit, and by fraudulent issues of wild-cat; and succeeded in skipping out to Kirtland between two days, and escaped the officers of justice and the penitentiary. That miracle I will admit. There are Mormon admissions that corroborate these charges. P. P. Pratt states that when Smith moved from

New York to Pennsylvania, his goods were searched twice by an officer, Pratt says, to find the plates. As there could not be any warrant obtained to search for the plates, such an idea is absurd; and as a search warrant to look for stolen goods is the only process under which an officer could search his goods, they were searched for stolen property. Mrs. Smith admits that officers searched his father's house about the same time. Smith says that he and Rigdon fled for their lives in the night from Kirtland, and were chased by assassians over one hundred miles. As the people of Northern Ohio do not do such deeds, they were chased by officers to arrest them for swindling. The fraudulent swindling transactions of Mormon leaders in Kirtland are well known. No one dares deny them in Kirtland. An eye witness told the speaker this incident: Rigdon was preaching in the temple one Sunday urging the people to "give the devil his due—to pay him in his own coin." A son of Belial arose and shouted, "will the devil take the Mormon wild cat?" Though out of order the question was pertinent. Mormon wild cat was the currency of the father of lies, and no one knew better than Rigdon what the devil would accept, for no one was better acquainted with him.

In Missouri, Mormonism ran the same course as in Kirtland. They filled all the offices with Mormons, trampled under foot the rights of others and undertook to rule by violence. A revelation of Joe Smith taught them "Behold, it is written in my laws they are forbidden to get in debt to their enemies. But behold, it is not said at any time that the Lord should not take what he pleases and pay as seemeth him good." (They can steal). "Wherefore as ye are agents, and as ye are on the Lord's errand, and whatsoever ye do according to the will of the Lord is the Lord's business, and he hath sent you to provide for his saints." Arvard, Peck and Corrill testified before judge King that they heard Smith justify taking the property of the Gentiles. In the same court Arvard, Hinkle and Rathburn testified to robbery by Mormons, under their teachers, and with Smith's knowledge. The Sunday before the disturbances in Davis County, Smith said that all who would not take up arms should be driven out as enemies. Rigdon said they ought to be set on horses and forced into the fight with bayonets. Rigdon said their property would be taken and given to those who went. Smith told Robinson to whip those who spoke against the presidency. Smith declared that those who spoke against the presidency should leave the country or die. Slade testifies that Rigdon pledged a company to kill any one who should attempt to desert the Mormons. Also that Rigdon declared that a man had been murdered, and that any one who told of it should be killed.

Phelps testifies that Rigdon pledged a company to kill deserters, and throw them into the brush, and give them no burial

except in turkey buzzards' guts. The infidelity and irreligion of these leaders can be seen in their talk. Owen testifies that Smith said that the militia were a d—d set, and God would damn them, and that God would not notice his cursing such a d—d set. Hinkle declares that Smith said they were a d—d mob, and he would play hell with their applecarts. In the last meeting of the council in Nauvoo, which Smith attended as Mayor, and while urging them to destroy the "Expositor," Smith swore like a trooper, as the history of Hancock County shows. He was imitating his early hero, Burroughs, his model Mahomed in playing religious impostor, although an infidel, and when enraged would curse and swear. Rigdon was an infidel impostor also, and could talk as we have cited, and act the ruffian and cut-throat. It will avail Mormons nothing to deny these facts, for I quote from a report of a Committee of the United States Senate, and published as a Government document and authority. Mormons denounce such witnesses as liars, although they were some of their own leaders. The witnesses testify that Rigdon and Smith were behind Arvard in organizing the Danites, and that they knew and approved of their fiendish acts. Their own declarations prove it.

Mormons have denounced as apostates, Rigdon, the author of the fraud, and first vice-president; F. G. William, second vice-president, Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer and Martin Harris the three witnesses; Warren Parish, one of the first seventy; Leonard Rich and Sylvester Smith, two of the seven presidents of the first seventy; J. F. Boynton and Luke Johnson, two of the twelve apostles; Stephen Burnett and Zerah Oral of the seventy; W. A. Cowdery and Cyrus Smaling, presiding high priests. It is safe to say that from the start in Kirtland until they left Nauvoo, one-third of their apostles, priests and councillors have been denounced as apostates. It proves that these leaders were knaves who went into it to get power and gain, and when it was no longer to their interest they renounced the fraud. The worst exposures of Mormonism have been by its leaders, those highest in authority. As we have shown the real author of the system, exposed his work in getting it up, and its fraudulent origin. A system that has been abandoned by its real author, and denounced by him as a fraud, that has been denounced by one third of its leaders as a fraud, and that has been lead by scoundrels, if the declaration of the Church against these apostate leaders be true, is a fraud of the vilest character. We accept what such leaders say of it, and what it says of them. It is pot calling kettle black. Villains have fallen out and honest people learn the truth.

Mormonism was gotten up for gain to its infidel leaders. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants says, "Whoso receiveth you receiveth me, and the same will feed you and clothe you, and give you money, and he who does not these things is not my disciple."

There you have it. You cannot be a disciple unless you give money. You will be damned if you do not. Again: "It must needs be that ye save all the money that ye can and gain all that ye can in righteousness." Again: "It is wisdom in me that my servant Martin Harris should be an example unto the church, in laying his moneys before the bishop of the church. And this is a law unto every man that cometh unto this land, to receive an inheritance. And he shall do it with his money as the law directs." Again: "And let all the moneys that can be spared, it mattereth not unto me whether it be little or much, be sent up into the land of Zion, unto those I have appointed to receive it." Again: "And let all preachers who have no families who receive moneys, send it up unto the bishop in Zion, or to the bishop in Kirtland, to be consecrated for the bringing forth of the revelations, and the printing thereof; and the establishing of Zion." Again: "Behold this is my will, even obtaining moneys, even as I have commanded." Again: "He that sendeth up moneys to the land of Zion shall receive an inheritance in this world. His work shall follow him also, a reward in the world to come." Money, money, money. Again: "I command thee that thou shalt not covet thine own property, but impart it freely to printing of the Book of Mormon which contains the truths of the world of God." Yea verily. Impart a portion of thy property, even a portion of thy lands, and all save the support of thy family." Joe was not to make gain out of the fraud, we are told. Listen: "It is meet that my servant Joseph Smith should have a house built in which to live and translate." And again: "It is meet that my servant Sydney Rigdon should live as it seemeth him good, inasmuch as he keepeth my commandments." Again: "Provide for him (Joe) food and raiment and whatsoever he needeth." Again: "In corporeal labor thou (Joe) shalt not have strength, for this is not thy calling." Joe was born tired. Labor never could call loud enough for him to hear. Read the lying revelation of January 19th, 1841, in which Joe is to have a tavern built for him in which to make money, and it is to be his and his children's forever. Oh, no, Joe was not to make gain out of it. The apostles had one Judas who carried the bag. Mormons have their tithing arrangement, and have their apostle who carries the bag. My opponent is the lineal descendant and successor of that apostle who held the bag. Does he serve Mormonism for naught?

Mormonism began with a back-slidden infidel preacher, Solomon Spaulding. It was taken up, by another back-slidden infidel preacher, Sydney Rigdon. It was given to the world by an admirer of Payne, an infidel, Joe Smith. Its leaders have largely infidels, who used the fraud to dupe the silly for gain. When they abandon it, they go out into infidelity. Rigdon lived a confirmed infidel after he abandoned it, and died an atheist. It is meet that it

should be defended in Kirtland by a rehash of infidel attacks on the Bible, when its fraudulent, anti-scriptural character is exposed. We have had bitter infidel attacks on the origin of the Books of the Bible, on the accuracy of its text, on the character of inspired men, on its statements and teachings. This has been applauded by the infidels in the audience. They know their man, they know the work he is doing, he is doing their work. Mormonism and

infidelity, like Herod and Pilate, make friends to crucify the religion of Christ. My opponent challenged me to debate what he failed to meet in this debate. Will he, as an honest infidel, affirm his attacks on the Bible in debate. I will meet him then under his true colors. It would be out of order to reply to his infidelity, introduced out of order in a debate, in which the Bible is the standard.

MR. KELLEY'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—The audience can readily see the absurdity of my opponent's position in claiming that the Priesthood was not given to the Christian ministry, and that there never were put two High Priests of the order of Melchizedek, viz., Melchizedek and Christ. Moses says, 'the Lord your God shall raise up a prophet like unto me.' This language points out the official character of Christ; that he was to be *like unto Moses*; and it is emphatically stated that Christ was a Melchizedek priest, and for him to be like unto Moses, Moses also must have been a Melchizedek priest. It is definitely declared that he was a Priest. My opponent confesses the truth when he says that Moses was not an Aaronic priest; but he then goes on and makes the ridiculous statement that he was not a Melchizedek priest either; and when I pressed him to the wall, showing there were only two lines, he endeavored to answer by craft and wit, saying that it did not follow because a man was not an American, that he must be a Irishman; that he might be a Dutchman. But in the case of the Priesthood, there is no chance for a third party; there are but two lines of priesthood mentioned in the Bible at all; hence, in this case it is either the American or Irishman there is no show for the Dutchman at all, if he wishes to represent it in that way. My opponent puts himself in the position of saying that Moses was neither an Aaronic or Melchizedek priest, but at the same time he must admit that he was a priest. But the Bible speaks of but two kinds of priests, and Moses must of necessity have belonged to one line or the other, and he was an officiating priest before an Aaronic priest was ever heard of, hence, the logic comes with all the force of certainty that he was a Melchizedek priest, and this effectually knocks his Dutchman out of line.

Christ as a Melchizedek High Priest ordained a ministry set them apart con-

secrated them: that he might send them forth to preach. When he ordained them, he must have conferred on them the Melchizedek priesthood, for Christ held that authority, and the office of an Apostle was not in the Aaronic Priesthood. Men were called in the same way to offices in the Priesthood in the christian dispensation, that they were under the law, viz: by revelation from God; hence, Paul says, "As God hath distributed to every one, as the Lord has called every one, so ordain I in all the churches." Ordaining was the conferring of the office of the Priesthood upon them. Hence, when God spoke through the prophets at Antioch, to separate Barnabas and Saul to the ministry, they did so by the laying on of hands. Peter makes it definite that the Melchizedek Priesthood was in the christian church.

"Ye are a Royal Priesthood." I Peter 2:9.

Melchizedek was king even on earth, and Christ who holds the royal authority is an Apostle, High Priest and King, and presides over his own House, the church. He is to reign as king of kings and Lord of Lords, holding the royal priesthood.

Ye are "an Holy Priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." 1 Peter 2:5. The church of Christ was a holy one, and "Royal Priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices." Yet my opponent has the audacious assumption to assert that neither the Aaronic or Melchizedek Priesthood were ever conferred in the Christian church. It is sheer nonsense and stupidity to talk about a Priesthood and no priests, or priests and no Priesthood. It was the belief in a conferred authority in the Christian church that gave rise to ecclesiastical conflicts all along down from the Apostles to the present day. It was in view of this that scores of Episcopalian ministers in England went to the Catholic church, and were re-baptized and re-ordained, believing in the necessity of authority in the church, and that if it was to be found any where, so far as they

knew, it was among the Catholics. But my opponent and his church, are all kings and priests, anyway; men and women, old and young, with or without an ordination, just as it suits their fancy, and to cap the climax of absurdity, they imagine that they are reigning now. Tertulian says, "It was customary among heretics to confound the offices of the clergy and laity together." St. Jerome observes, "They (the early christians) reckoned that to be no church, which had no priests." Eusebius says, "Origin received the ordination to the Priesthood, at Cesarea," page 243. Braden further says that Christ abideth a priest continually, therefore, no one could receive the Melchizedek Priesthood after him. If this position is true, then Christ was never a Melchizedek High Priest, for Melchizedek, who was before Christ in the earthly career was made a High Priest continually:—"Abideth a priest continually," says Paul. Heb. 7:3. Jesus as I have shown is an Apostle, and so abideth, yet we have many others. But how is the church a Royal Priesthood? By all of the people being priests or kings? No; it is in the sense expressed in Ex. 19:6;—"Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Yet all were not priests, but certain ones were consecrated to the office of the Priesthood, and performed the services of the same, and thus served the people. They were called a kingdom of priests, because they had the Priesthood and priests among them; and it is in this same sense that Peter called the church of God on earth a "Royal Priesthood." Braden is neither a king or a priest, as he has affirmed before this audience; neither is any other person in his church.

All of the sons of Zedekiah, king of Judah, were not slain by the king of Babylon as claimed by my opponent. The Bible does not say all of them were slain. It states that they slew the sons of Zedekiah before his eyes. 2 Kings, 25:7. To have slain all of his sons would have made Ezekiel a false prophet; for he prophesied:—"Thus saith the Lord God; I will take the highest branch of the highest cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon a high mountain and eminent. In the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it. Ezekiel 17:22, 23.

The cedar represents the kingdom of Israel; the highest branch was the reigning king, Zedekiah; the tender young twig, represents one of the kings' sons, who was to be placed "upon a high mountain (in a goodly land) and eminent, and it shall bring forth boughs and bear fruit and be a goodly cedar," etc.

The prophet said on this continent, "Will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were not slain, all except it were Mulek? Yea, and do you not behold that the seed of Zedekiah is with us, and they were driven out of Jerusalem?" Mosiah 11:12, and Heleman 2:27. So Ezekiel's prophecy had its fulfillment by one of Zedekiah's sons coming

to America and aiding in establishing a colony.

The church has been criticised as not being after the apostolic pattern because it has in its organization a chief Presiding Apostle or High Priest or Presiding Elder, over the whole church. But this is in harmony rather than in conflict with the New Testament.

Dr. Wm. Smith says concerning the apostle James, (the less). "From henceforth we always find him equal, or in his own department superior, to the very Chiefest apostles, Peter, John and Paul. For by this time he had been appointed to preside over the infant church in its most important centre, in a position equivalent to that of Bishop, [High Priest or President.] The pre-eminence is evident throughout the after history of the apostles." Smith's Bible Dictionary, page 237.—(Acts 12:17; 15:13, 19; 21:18; and Gal. 2:9.)

While Christ was on earth the apostles disputed as to who would occupy the chief seat after his death or ascension. Eusebius informs us that James occupied the chief seat, or that of President. Hence he presided at the conference in Jerusalem when there was a large representation of the church from abroad present, including Peter, John and Paul, and gave decision upon the most important matters brought before the conference. We have no history of this apostle for ten years after the ascension of the Savior, when we find him presiding at Jerusalem over the whole church, and Peter, John and Paul recognize him in that position.

But again, objects my opponent: "They, have presidents, vice-presidents, counselors presiding elders, etc., in their organization." Not as gifts set in the church. These are but appellative terms defining the right of precedence in business or government of officers of the same rank. For illustration: The especial gifts to qualify one to preside over the church is that of an Apostle and Prophet; but if the party possessing such gifts was not chosen by the voice of the body to preside, he would not be called the President, nor be President. If a person was called by the voice of the body to act in the office of President, when he did not have the gifts belonging to that office, he could not properly discharge the duties of it, any more than an ignorant, and blind, deaf and dumb man could fill properly the office of President of the United States, although he would be called President.

The apostle Paul referring to James, Peter and John, calls them "pillars," but pillars was not the designated title of the especial gifts of these apostles. James presided at the conference at Jerusalem, and was therefore the President, and you can call him President James and the term will convey the true idea of the office he held in the church, that of an Apostle, Prophet, or the Presiding Elder of the entire church there, as he presided over all other elders.

In my argument last evening I showed

that the position was untenable and unscriptural that was held by many, viz., that God held his last intercourse with the human family eighteen centuries ago, and that he would no more speak to his children through inspired men; for that he had himself declared by the prophets that he would set his hand the second time to recover Israel and the dispersed of Judah, which time was after the falling away from the truth as it was established by Jesus and the apostles, and to support this quoted to you some twenty-three passages of Scripture directly in point as proof; but I am met with the accustomed dodge in reply, that they have not the least application whatever to the subject—not the slightest; oh, no! My opponent can go on with a long statement containing naught but confusion, I do not say argument, for it is not, to show you that all inspired men and all communication between God and man was limited to the days of the apostles; and he judges it german to the question, although he has not a single passage from the word of God to support the theory; but if I take up passage after passage, writer after writer, prophecy after prophecy, and read to you that the Lord *will have inspired servants after that time*, and “plead with them face to face”—communicate with them as with Moses—that he will send again his angel with “the everlasting gospel to preach to them that dwell on the earth—to every nation, kindred, tongue and people in the hour of judgment and retribution in the earth, and call upon his servants to make known the same to the people; that as he did in the days of Noah, the time of Lot, and the first century of the Christian era, so shall it be at his second coming, and that in that time his hand shall be revealed, his power manifest and his ensign lifted up for the nations to behold, I am answered with: “They have not the slightest bearing upon the question.” No; very good talk upon the question of the gathering of the Jews, but no application here. Why has it not? Simply because it has not; that is the wise reason offered, and you are expected to swallow it, without knowing or asking the reason why. The question under consideration is, as to whether the church I am representing is in fact the church of God and accepted with him; and it occurs to me to be very applicable whether he has anything to do with it or not. Whether it is established in accordance with the prediction of the prophets or not; whether his hand is revealed in its establishment or not; and whether the gospel of the kingdom, a gospel containing God’s word, the ancient faith and the gifts of his Holy Spirit is preached as a witness or not.

And he turns around and would feign make you believe that some man was smart enough to get all of this up; have perfect arrangement and time with all of the prophecies, and even preach the truth of God in order to deceive the people. By this method of assailing the faith he deliberately throws away the rule laid down in

the Bible: “He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ he hath both the Father and the Son.” “He that is of God heareth God’s words; and “No man knoweth the things of God but the Spirit of God.” Thus he stands convicted of discarding the standard and setting up for opposition to my arguments the methods of ridicule, abuse, slander and vituperation that Satan used against the preaching of Noah; that he met Jesus, Peter and Paul with from the outset of their work, and with which he so enraged the people of London that they exultingly dragged Mr. Wesley through its streets by the hair of the head in order to ease their consciences.

That is one way of meeting men, but it is not, nor never was the manner of him “who spake as never man spake;” neither of his servants in any age. Why? says my opponent Mohammed and the meanest men of earth said some good things. What has that to do with the rule laid down by Jesus and his apostles as to trying his servants? I have asked you time and again if you would abide by the word of God or discard it and abide by your prejudices. If Mohammed filled this rule and did, in his teachings, abide in the doctrine of Christ, then God was with him, and you cannot gainsay the proposition so long as you believe in the teachings of Jesus. But Mohammed did not abide in the doctrine of Christ; did not even claim to; and consequently he was not what he claimed to be when tried by that rule, although he may have taught many good things. Satan taught and quoted from the Bible when he tempted Jesus, and said, “It is written he shall give his angels charge concerning thee;” but here he stopped; he had taken a little Bible, but would not abide in the remainder. Consequently he was not of God, for he “abode not in the truth.”

So Mr. Campbell had a little Bible and he clung to that well: “baptism in water for the remission of sins;” wherever he got it makes no difference, as to this controversy; the trouble with him was he stopped there and failed to abide in the doctrine of Christ; for he did not teach “the baptism of the spirit.” Paul also taught besides this: “By one spirit are we all baptized into one body.” And John confirms it with: “For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one; And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the Water and the Blood; and these three agree in one.”

Now, if the church I represent does not abide in the doctrine of Christ it is not Jesus’ church and not accepted with him, as a church, although there may be good men and women therein who are doing good and accepted with him that far. But if its doctrines and teachings are in harmony with the doctrine of Christ, then we are sowing the good seed of the kingdom, and it is his church and accepted of him; and it makes no difference whether there be

some bad men and those who take advantage of the true faith to work evil or not. The kingdom of heaven—the church—was likened unto “a net cast into the sea that should gather both the good and the bad.” And it ought not to surprise any one to find in it some bad as well as good. Let me give you a further illustration: “Only a short time ago I took up the “Truth Seeker,” published in New York, and read the account of a Disciple preacher down here in Ohio, who had been carrying on a religious meeting with much success, but who, before the close of the revival was taken by the officers as a thief and a burglar. What fairness or argument do you think it would prove for me to hold up this example to you and say: Ah! yes, here is your Christianity and undertake to condemn his entire church by it. So I might enumerate the instances by the dozen in every church or denomination, but what would it prove? Nothing whatever as against the denomination, unless I further showed that this work was done in carrying out the principles and faith of the denomination.

In the first age of Christianity, many, after receiving Jesus’ words and faith, turned away and brought forth in their lives evil fruits; turned to be thieves, and liars, and adulterers, and general adepts of crime and all manner of lasciviousness: as witness the thief on the cross; the traitor of the twelve; the wicked of Corinth, 5 chapter, 1 Cor., who revealed in debauchery and sin; the polygamous followers of Nicolas, one of the seven, chosen for his wisdom, justice and being blessed with the Holy Ghost. Acts 6, and Rev. 2:6 and 15. The detestable things practiced in Thyatira; the bigotry, selfishness and barrenness of the church of the Laodiceans; and of others of the churches of Asia, and it seems that these were the only ones that came near enough to the truth in the Revelator’s time to claim even a notice of instruction from Jesus.

But by reason of this turning from the faith and practicing evil of those who were once in the faith shall I say, or will he say, that therefore Jesus was a bad teacher. Peter’s doctrine’s were not the truth and Paul’s exhortations and preaching were not in harmony with morality and decency? No, sir. Such a conclusion is monstrous, illegitimate, absurd, unless I further go on, and show that in carrying out these things they were also abiding in the principles and doctrines taught by these worthies.

Oh, but I must not make this argument, he says. Why? You are attacking the Bible! Who is attacking the Bible? The one that makes an argument in accordance with the Bible, or the one who when his argument is applied to the Bible is found to be working against it? Throughout the discussion I have appealed to the Bible and that which harmonizes with Bible teachings for my proofs. My opponent has from the outset refused to meet me upon this fair, true and agreed ground of controversy, but instead, has throughout the discussion from

the very first night, resorted for his argument to ridicule, methods of villifying, slander, obscene remarks, old wives’ tales, fables, lying stories, which, although starting from nothing, soon, like the story of the “three black crows,” when traced back are found to be utterly foolish and ridiculous. Take an illustration:—I assisted in running one of these stories down at one time, through a number of the very persons he has mentioned as witnesses: Wm. Bryant, David Booth, Ezra Pierce, Orin Reed, Abel Chase, Orlando Saunders, J. H. Gilbert, the Jackaways, Dr. John Stafford of Rochester, New York, and Thomas Taylor of Manchester. Twelve persons who were cited as the persons who knew about the truth of the stories told on the Smiths. Tucker and Howe in their published works against the Mormons had cited some of these same parties as persons *who knew*. And what indeed, could you expect but that I should be completely astonished, to find that not a single one of these parties knew a single material fact against a single one of the Smith family, or Oliver Cowdery, Martin Harris or David Whitmer, the parties who, together with the Smiths, had been most vilely assaulted and slandered. The story of the digging for money and the cave will illustrate what these witnesses knew. When we first began to talk with Mr. Bryant he said he did not himself know anything about them, but they had a great cave over there in the hill where they lived and reveled all night. He did not know just where himself but Mr. Booth and Pierce could tell us all about it. But it is no use to take the trouble to go and see them said he, for you can just buy Tucker’s work and get it all. However he directed us to Mr. Booth’s. Calling on Booth, he did not know a single thing; but said the cave was there now, and they used to meet there, or that was what was told; he had never seen the cave, but Squire Pierce knew all about it. It was always “they,” that incomprehensible every body and nobody, “they.” Bryant, nor Booth nor none of them could tell who “they” were, whether Smiths, Cowderys, Harris, the Spaniards or who? But “they.” We went to Squire Pierce’s: Oh, yes! he could tell us all about it. He said he lived three miles from them, that he pulled sticks with Joe one time, he knew. He could tell us about the cave, and digging for money, and counterfeiting, all about it. The cave is right over there in the hill: We still pressed him for a particular location; we told him we wanted to go and see it and look at the “sheep bones.” At this the old man collapsed. Said he could not find the place, the cave had fallen in and the sheep bones were all buried. Not even the spot could be found. But, he said, Abel Chase was in there once, and he could give us the facts. We went to this Chase; he said, “No. I never saw the cave, never saw them dig for money.” He sent us to Gilbert and the Jackaways. Gilbert did not pretend to know anything about it. We went to the

Jackaways; the Jackaways said, "Yes, they dug for money. The large holes are over there in the hill now." But, we asked, who dug? "They;"—they did not know who "they" were, but the holes were over there in the hill. What hill? we asked, the hill Mr. Smith lived on? No, not where Mr. Smith lived. How do you know the holes were made while digging for money? They did not know that, but they did know there were some holes over there that looked as though they had been made by some body digging, but the holes may have been from some other cause. But Chase did say his sister, Sally, had a stone through which she claimed to see things, and he thought that she could. Here is the truth of the matter: it was the opponents of Smith who claimed to see through the stone and not Smith. This is the "*black crow story*" duplicated. In this instance we found there was a man by the name of Smith once lived there. That was all. Mr. Smith had the Urim and Thummin and never at any time pretended to use, or that he could use or see things, or divine or locate money, or property or anything else through the stone baby's foot of Sally Chase or anybody else. These are all the scandalous lies and inventions of the people.

Take the jumbled mess called affidavits in Howe's book, the work which I have proved beyond question to be composed of false, garbled, perverted passages and statements from our works, deliberately made to deceive by some one, and what have we? A thing from the very manner in which it is written; the contradictions, and the fact that the originals were burned as soon as these pretended copies were put in Howe's book, that will prevent any man accepting them who is honestly criticising the work of Mr. Smith. Braden only read a small portion of these pretended affidavits. The whole would have floored him without a notice or criticism from me. Peter Ingersoll is made to say entirely too much; he was acquainted with all the hog paths and sheep tracks on the Smith farm; the cows could not be milked without Ingersoll's knowledge; and he finds out that they are hiding their cows in the woods to deceive, and knew about other peoples' cows that were hidden; yet in the same affidavit he says, "I told him (Joseph) I would let him have the money," and he presented Mr. Hale for security. Mr. Hale presented for security, yet he was far away in Pennsylvania and Peter Ingersoll had never saw or heard of him to this time, except through Joseph Smith. But Smith would not take his money, and then Ingersoll is made to say: Smith told him, "I went to Palmyra and met that *darned fool Martin Harris*, and told him that I had a command to ask the first honest man I met for fifty dollars in money, and he gave it to me.

Then he is made to say: That he saw William after they visited Waterloo and William said, "we do better there than here; we were too well known to do much

here." Then take the tale of the frock of sand, the Canada Bible story, the toll gate story, the Sun story, raising chests of money to the top of the ground, the old man's water-witching and contortions while Alvin his son witched, notwithstanding Alvin had been dead then at least two years, all in this pretended affidavit. Is there a man under the Sun foolish enough to believe it?

Take Wm. Stafford's pretended statement with regard to the "black sheep story," it is even worse than that of Peter Ingersoll, if possible. His own son Dr. Thomas Stafford says: "I have heard that story, but it is not true, I was living at home at that time. They never stole a sheep from my father I am sure." Mr. Orlando Saunders who proved to be the best acquainted with the Smith family of any party living anywhere near Manchester or Palmyra, New York, being their near neighbor, says they were honest, industrious and upright, and the only thing that could be said truthfully against them was that they were very poor and worked for a living. And the Presbyterian minister who went around for affidavits did not get a different story from him either.

This Gilbert tried to get his brother, Lorenzo Saunders, who was only 9 years of age in 1830, to swear that he saw Sidney Rigdon at Smiths' in 1827, and he refused to make the statement; and yet, Braden has reported it in this discussion as though it was true and that he had his affidavit to this effect. I have noticed invariably one thing during this discussion and that is that a story never loses in size after it reaches Braden's hands, and although it is but a mere rumor, he tells it with all the *avidity* and *positiveness* that belongs to the statement of facts.

Then there is the long pretended statement of Willard Chase which condemns itself if he would read it all, and so of Parley Chase, David Stafford, Henry Harris, Abigail and Lucy Harris, Joshua Stafford. This Stafford family were whales to testify, they, like Howe, were mad because some of their relations were Latter Day Saints, and they wanted to do something lest the people might think they were leaning that way. That would be *such a disgrace*, you know. Then there is Nichols, Capron, Stoddard, Ford, Th. P. Baldwin, yes, their disinterested judge, mixed in with these slanderers of Mr. Smith's family; when the same man just before the removal of the family from New York went and persuaded the old lady Smith to come to his house and take care of and nurse his wife through a long sickness. Then to cap the climax Braden introduces his 51 witnesses, this Baldwin being one, and makes them all say: "Martin Harris was a man who had a handsome property and in matters of business his word was considered good." Yet he has continually assailed this same man's character throughout this controversy. They did not like Harris' religion, and that was all that could be said against him; but as all of the

others of these wicked, false, corrupt and slanderous statements they are made to say: "*they were considered*," so and so.

The following is the statement set out by Braden's 51 witnesses:

"And in reference to all with whom we were acquainted; that have embraced Mormonism from this neighborhood; we are compelled to say they were very visionary, and most of them destitute of moral character, and without influence in this community; and this may account why they were permitted to go on with their impositions undisturbed."

Did you ever hear such wise conclusions? Because they were *destitute of moral character and influence* they were permitted to go on *undisturbed*; but if they had had a *good moral character and a good influence* that neighborhood would have *disturbed* them. Well, I think myself they would have been, if these 51 men ever signed that statement. This is on the same ground that the Campbellites over about Hiram put their claim for disturbing Smith and Rigdon with tar and feathers, I suppose. Their own history states Rigdon had a *good moral influence*. Next I turn to his new witness, Jeffries, who got acquainted with Rigdon in 1844, when Rigdon did the business for the Mormons in Nauvoo, so he says; but Rigdon did not do the business for them neither in 1844, 1843 or any other time when they were in Nauvoo. He was in poor health when at Nauvoo, and did but little of anything then, except to act as Postmaster, and in 1844 he lived in Pittsburg, and was in charge of the church in Pittsburg in the year 1844. He never told Jeffries any such thing at any time, and never at any time in his life claimed or pretended to claim he ever knew anything about Joseph Smith until after October, 1830. I have read to you his own published letters over his own signature; not what his enemies said about him, and he lived and died firm in the faith, claiming that he was the proper head of the church after the death of the other two Presidents, as he was the second counsellor to the President.

Braden can not, as he states, bring old citizens of Kirtland who will testify to his stuff. I have challenged him from the first to do so, and he has not put a single one on the stand. He called in one of his own men, a Campbellite preacher, Mr. Moss, who lives far away from Kirtland, and that did him no good. I have lived in Kirtland for nearly a year, and I have yet to meet the first old citizen who knows anything against the honesty of Rigdon, Harris, Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery or David Whitmer, and I have made it a point to talk with all I have met on this subject; and only last evening when he had made the statement that he could prove so and so about these men, an old gentleman who was never in any way connected with the Saints, came to me and said, "It is a falsehood. He can't do it. I have lived here for fifty years, and was acquainted with those men, and he slanders them." There

are men here who have heard these stories and who can repeat them, but what evidence is this? I have heard stories too, ever since I was ten years old, about Joseph Smith and others, and usually they have been proven to be false. If Braden is telling the truth about what he can prove here about these men, why does he have to call his audience,—who do not agree with me in religion, "Danites and clackers," because they repudiate these false and slanderous assertions?

We have a Justice of the Peace here in Kirtland, and if you want to make your contest on that kind of evidence, we will set an hour for the bringing of testimony to-morrow, and bring our witnesses and have them sworn. I am ready to present witnesses with you on these points. But the Kirtland bank, that was a failure, he says. Was it the only one in Ohio at that time that failed? No, there were dozens. It was in the time of the "wild cat" banking system in Ohio and other states, and the hard times which came on in 1836 and 1837-8, property sunk in values, and the banks went under everywhere. In the State of Illinois, where my father lived, a man could not get cash for labor at any price, and formerly well to do men could not meet their taxes even. In this time the Kirtland bank went with the others, except, it did not swindle the poor. Besides the hard times being against the Kirtland bank, there was also an organized opposition to it by those opposed to the religion of the Saints, which tended to much more cripple it. The Saints when they came here paid good prices for whatever they bought; mortgaged their farms and lands thus bought to secure the balance of the purchase price on them in many instances, and the hard times coming on, they were forced to sacrifice their places and pay their debts; this they did, and he thinks it was *awful wicked*. Does the subsequent history of these people show that they could not succeed in business as well as other people? Notwithstanding the fact that their properties were taken from them by mobs, and they were driven from their homes, the history shows they were equal to all the emergencies, and in knowledge, wealth, honesty, integrity of heart, and the true worship of God, they were the peers of any other people.

Smith and Rigdon left Kirtland in 1837, because continually harrassed by mobs and conspirators, who were using every means possible to injure them in person and property. These conspirators even went so far as to persuade other men into their work who were honest in their intentions, but who did not realize the object and base purposes of the conspirators until afterwards. Crimes were permitted and charged to the Saints when they were perpetrated by their enemies; and years after, right here in Kirtland, one of these enemies upon a profession of religion in a protracted meeting, confessed to being the person who stole a plow in the interest of their gang and

which was laid to one of the Saints, and they even perjured themselves to convict an innocent man, and made him suffer the penalty because of his religion. A tool chest was stolen from one Hinds and laid to the Saints, but a search warrant found it in the loft of the minister who was working up this mob. All this evidence comes from Braden's side. The Saints had to guard the Temple night and day while they were erecting it, and suffered untold wrongs and outrages by a people who ought to have been their friends. For this, they hold no malice however, knowing that the men who did it, were as a rule deceived and put up to the terrible work by a few unprincipled leaders, who were always far out of danger in the back ground. It was like it was in the time of Jesus and the Apostles. The self-constituted clergy and priests urged the populace to blood and vengeance and hence, Jesus says: "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

Braden charged this terrible work to infidels, last night. How could he so insult

your good sense as to so deliberately misrepresent that tragedy? It was the *chief priests and rulers*, who urged the people on; the only avowed disbeliever in the Bible known to be present was Pilate; and he persisted, "that he found no fault in Jesus," and those *pious priests*(?) cried out: "Away with this man and give us Barrabbas!" But Pilate spoke to them urging again the release of Jesus; and these *pious hypocrites* cried out, "Crucify him!" "Crucify him!" Our infidel friends have enough sins of their own to answer for, without piling upon them the terrible crimes of religious bigots. But my opponent ensnares himself whichever way he turns. He is as a man walking in darkness, although supposed to be learned after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ. He has *no word* of God to be a lamp to his feet and guide to his pathway, because he denies the office work of the oil, the unction,—the Holy Spirit—that throws light upon *this word* and gives the proper understanding.

Time called.

MR. BRADEN'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—In the discussion of this question I have investigated, as duty demanded, the character of Mormonism, and of its originators and authors. I read the testimony of persons of the highest character. Unable to meet it, there was introduced last night the lying abuse of an infidel blackguard. It was read by a similar character. His Danite band of similar characters greeted it with their accustomed Danite yells. It is what infidelity deals in. The Book of Doctrines and Covenants declares that the Saints will be equal with Christ. It is blasphemy. Joe took from the Book of Mormon his fool prophecy in regard to himself, and with transcendent blasphemy, put it in the Bible as the words of the Almighty. I did not quote the passage about "inheritance by blood," nor refer to it in quoting the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. I referred to two passages preaching a crusade against the Missourians. He says Moses and Elias are angels. Where does the Bible say so? Angels assumed the form of men and were called men. The angel in Revelations did not say "I am one of the prophets," but "a fellow servant of the prophets." Mrs. Chase had a peep-stone. That is one of Granny Smith's lies, and she says it was Chase's daughter, not his wife. As he was a minis-

ter, neither is true. Gabriel and Elijah are the same. Chapter and verse for it, if you please.

"Baptize for the dead" is quoted. Baptism is in the likeness of the burial and resurrection of Christ, a type of it. In imitation of it. Paul says, "that the dead rise your baptism shows." It is in imitation of the dead, or death and resurrection of Christ. Its resurrection from the water proves that the dead are resurrected. It is "baptize in in imitation of the dead," or death of Christ. The language in Matthew speaks of three things in each case. Salvation of good trees, salvation of the wheat, and baptism in the Spirit. All these are for the good. Evil trees, burning chaff and baptism in fire. All for the evil. "You" includes both classes, just as when it is said God will reward every man according to his works. If Joe Smith knew enough to translate, he could do so. As he was an ignoramus, the talk about his translating and correcting revelation is blasphemous nonsense. Emma Smith, as her language is reported by Joe III in "Life of Joseph the Seer," does declare she saw the plates and handled them, covered with a cloth. None but the three were to see the plates in the way they did. It does not say so, and is a paltry dodge. Jacob and others saw God's representatives. Hosea says Jacob wrestled with an angel.

Isaiah says it was an angel that led Israel in the wilderness. "No man hath seen God at any time."

He cannot find in the Bible such a trickery, selfish, jealous talk as we cited from the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. My opponent shows his ignorance in assuming that "cut off" means death. In one case a person was cut off for seven days. It means separate from the congregation, excommunication, and some times put to death. He shows his infidel ignorance in saying there was one small window in the ark. Gesenius says the word used means a system of windows. Gilbert said there were no capital letters at beginning of sentences. He said nothing about capitals in any other place. We know all about God that he can know—what God has revealed. We know more, for we do not bury it and obscure it under Joe Smith's materialism and lying revelations. He finds persons who were priests and officiated as priests outside of the Aaronic priesthood, and assumes that they were Melchizedek priests because they were not Aaronic priests. That is like assuming that a man must be an Irishman because he is not an American. He might be a Dutchman. Let him prove they were Melchizedek priests. There was Melchizedek and there was another—Christ. Only Melchizedek and another—Christ.

We have already exposed the violence and intolerance exhibited by Mormonism. It began in abuse of all who would not accept the fraud, and has since been carried on by violence, denunciation and villification of all who oppose it. It began with abuse of all who opposed it in New York. This was carried to violence and plotting assassination in Kirtland. It culminated in the Danite band, and assassination in Missouri, and Nauvoo. Smith was notoriously quarrelsome when intoxicated. Mormon pilgrims to New York can have pointed out to them, by citizens of Manchester, the tree to which he tied his father, when he flogged him. He was taken to Painesville while in Kirtland and tried for assault on his brother-in-law, Calvin Stoddard. He told a dupe of his by the name of M. C. Davis, that it was the will of the Lord that Grandison Newell should be removed. His Danite with a young man who lived in Smith's family, went to obey the revelation. The Danite tool took aim at Newell in the bosom of his family, when his better nature revolted at the horrid crime, this murderous villainous, impostor had sent him to do, and Newell was spared. On another occasion he sent three Thugs under the leadership of one Bump, to waylay Newell, and murder him as he returned from Painesville. They lay in wait with loaded guns for hours. Providentially, Newell took another road, and escaped Joe's fiendish hate again.

The spirit that actuated him in Kirtland can be seen in another fact. Mr. William Smith one morning visited a Mormon neighbor by the name of Cluff. He

observed a pike setting behind the door. On inquiry he found that Mormons had been provided with these murderous weapons, to use on the Gentiles, and that one or more were in nearly every Mormon family in Kirtland, and over 200 in all. When Mr. Cluff left he gave the pike to Mr. Smith. Here it is. It is the pike used by the Irish Catholic rebels in the Protestant massacre of the last century.

We have cited the schemes of swindling fraud and ruin that characterized Mormonism in Kirtland. It closed in bankruptcy, ruin and incendiarism. It left Kirtland a ruin strewn with wrecks. Land has not been worth as much per acre in Kirtland since the Mormon influx into Kirtland, as similar lands in neighboring towns. Mormonism left a stigma on Kirtland. Even now, citizens of Lake county, and towns about Kirtland, would look on a return of Mormons to Kirtland as an incalculable calamity. Mormonism became a stench in the nostrils of all decent people in north-eastern Ohio, and its foul odor has not left its old haunts yet. Like the stench of the spotted animal in the fields, every shower of excitement on Mormonism causes it to manifest its noisome odor.

While acting in his primitive, supernatural capacity as water-witch and money-digger, Smith made the acquaintance of a drunken vagabond by the name of Walters, who had been a physician in Europe. This person had learned in Europe the secret of Mesmerism or animal magnetism. This was entirely unknown in America except to a few in large cities, who had read European papers. Smith learned this art, and like all men with great passions, vitality and physical force he was almost a prodigy in his mesmeric power. All casting out devils and raising the dead were merely a display of his great mesmeric power. He would select those he could throw into a profound mesmeric trance. Persons ignorant of the secret thought they were dead. He would by passes bring them out of the trance, and the ignorant supposed it was a miracle, a resurrection. His supposed cases of healing were merely displays of this power, and are common now, and no wonder. When the Mormons began in Kirtland, they pretended to heal all sick by laying on of hands. Some claimed there was no use in persons being sick, that they should never see death. As two of their leaders, F. G. Williams, who was second vice-president, and one other, were root-doctors; revelation allowed them to use herbs. It was observed, however, that when the present prophet was born, Joe had the best medical aid from the world he could get.

A young man named Dota, about twenty years old, was very active and zealous among them, and divinely commissioned to preach. So firmly did he believe in Smith and Mormonism, and their miraculous power, that he told one of his family not five weeks before his death, that he would live a thousand years. Ten

days before he died he was attacked with inflammation of the bowels. No persuasion of his parents, who were not Mormons, could persuade him to allow a physician to be called. The elders called on him, encouraging him in his delusion, and telling him he was getting better. Smith visited him and protested against his having a physician, and went through his mummeries over him, and told him he would get well. When his parents brought a physician a few hours before his death, the physician told him his delusion had cost him his life. He would live but a few hours. Reason returned to the poor victim of Mormon madness and the scoundrelly hypocrisy of Smith, and the leaders. He exclaimed, "What a mistake I have made!" He said to a Mormon standing by, "This is a lesson. I have learned by experience; you can profit by it. With me it is 'too late,' and died, a victim to Mormon folly and fraud. An attempt was made to raise a child. It was generally believed that they drugged the child, intending it to recover from the drug, and gave it a dose that killed it. Old citizens can narrate scores of cases of delusion and fraud in pretended miracles. Smith and Rigdon once tried to heal Mr. Wakefield of Willoughby, before a crowded house in the temple, and announced that he had been healed of lameness; but he was as much a cripple in five minutes as he ever had been, and died one. Smith tried to heal a decrepit hand of Elder Murdoch, and failed. The failures compelled him to give up that fraud. Smith announced at a conference that some would see the Savior. He laid hands on Elder Wight, mesmerizing him, and Wight arose with a pale countenance, fierce looks, and arms extended, shaking form, leapt on a bench, and shrieked that he saw Jesus. He laid hands on another, who shuffled over the floor, his legs bent, one shoulder elevated with his head resting on it, his arms extended, hands clenched, mouth pinched up like an "o," and his countenance wild and ferocious. Smith shouted, "Speak Bro. Harvy," but he could not. Smith first said that it was the Spirit of the Lord, but when persons cried out that he was possessed of the devil, he changed his mind and said it was the devil; and cast him out by removing the mesmeric spell. Scores of such scenes can be narrated by the old citizens of Kirtland. Ridiculous attempts to confer spiritual gifts, scenes of folly, frenzy and madness. Imposture on the part of leaders, madness, folly, and insanity on the part of the dupes.

Rigdon's conversion was effected by this sublime vision. After much prayer he was wrapped in a vision, and to use his own words: "To my astonishment I saw the different orders of professing Christians passing before me with their hearts exposed to view, and they were as corrupt as corruption itself. The society to which I belonged passed before me, and to my astonishment it was as corrupt as the rest. Last of all the little man (Cowdery), who brought me the Book of Mormon, passed

before my eyes, with his heart open, and it was as pure as an angel." This was a testimony from God that the Book of Mormon was a divine revelation. This was Rigdon's lie, on which he based his pretended conversion to Mormonism. He went to New York to see Smith, and arrange for the carrying out of the scheme that he had been concocting for years. Cowdery and Harris and Whitmer stayed and held meetings. Scenes of the most wild, frantic and disgusting fanaticism ensued. They pretended that the power to work miracles, was about to be given to all who embraced the new faith, and commenced communicating the spirit by laying their hands on the heads of the converts, which produced an instantaneous prostration of body and mind. Many fell on the floor, and would lie for a long time apparently lifeless. Women would fall on the floor, especially young women, and utterly regardless of exposure of person. The sexes lay around promiscuously, and were laid to one side promiscuously. The fit came on during prayer meetings, which were held nearly every evening for weeks. Young men and women were peculiarly subject to this delirium. They would exhibit all apish actions imaginable, making the most ridiculous grimaces, creeping on their hands and feet on the frozen ground. A spectator now present, declares he never saw anything like it, except in the insane ward of a poorhouse. Preaching to the Indians, the Lamanites, converting the Lamanites was the hobby of Mormonism at first. Their converts would go through with all modes of Indian warfare, knocking down, scalping, ripping open, tearing out the bowels, etc. At other times they would run through the fields, get on stumps, and preach to imaginary audiences, rush into the water and go through the pantomime of immersion, etc. Many would have fits of speaking in all Indian dialects. Again, they would in the dead hour of night, run over the hills and fields in pursuit of balls of fire, light, etc.—The Holy Spirit they declared. Others would put the devil to flight and chase him. One of the audience saw three men, one a negro called Black Pete, each mounted on a stump on the hill, north east of the post office, all preaching. A waggish young man made a singular noise, all jumped from their pulpi and dashed down the hill. Black Pete shouting: "Here we go," and when he slipped up, "O God, here we go." Cowdery departed to convert the Lamanites, with his Book of Mormon and miracles. The young men in Kirtland all had a mania for preaching to the nations. They would jump into the air as high as they could, and pretend their commissions to preach were handed down to them out of heaven. These commissions were on parchment, signed and sealed by Christ himself. With such papers in their pockets, they ran over the country, ranting, and calling it preaching. At one time, they pretended that an angel walked out on the water, and

held a light for them to baptize. The boys examined the water, and found a plank just below the surface. They moved it, and the next night the angel got a ducking, and the boys chased him through the stumps in the neighboring field. Mr. Moss, the teacher, was called one day from his school to see a young man in the upper story of his father's shoe shop. He was scaring away the devil, by pointing his finger at him, and shouting "Zit." Mr. Moss tossed a shoe near him, and he dashed headlong down stairs, and chased the devil through a neighboring field. We could continue these disgusting statements for pages, and we have living witnesses here to sustain our statements. What wonder that Mormonism after making Kirtland a bedlam of fanaticism, left covered with infidel wrecks—persons who scouted all religion, because Mormonism was a humbug.

Living witnesses for this scene can be produced. We quote from Dewitt Miller of Willoughby. In a log school in the town of Willoughby, near Kirtland, Smith, after a sermon explanatory of the nature of the possession by devils—the divine nature of the power he should use in casting them out, and the process of casting out devils, proceeded to attempt to cast devils out of a man named Ichabod Crandall, who lay on his belly on the floor, groaning fearfully, surrounded by a circle of Mormons on their knees. Smith said he would give three orders. First mild, second authoritative, and the third, such an order as would fetch the devils sure pop. Smith in a loud gruff voice issued his order. At the third order the devil came out, not out of Crandall, but out of a bag held by a man in the corner, near the old stove, in the shape of a big black cat. The cat tore around the house squalling, the dogs took after it barking, the boys yelling. The cat was chased up a tree. The tree was cut down, the cat killed, and Smith's devil was disposed of. The ridiculous frauds practiced in attempting to work miracles in and around Kirtland are notorious. No wonder my opponent was so shy of Kirtland miracles. He feared that the attempt to walk on the water, and the failure caused by the planks being moved, would be brought out. What wonder that Mormonism left Kirtland a wreck religiously, and that the very name of Mormonism is a stench in North-Eastern Ohio, and that Mormonism made Kirtland a stench in the nostrils of all decency, and sense. The cases of preaching from stumps, chasing the devil, of the child, of Dota, of Mr. Wakefield, of Murdoch, and scores of other frauds and failures are too notorious to be denied.

One of the idiotic tomfooleries of Kirtland was speaking in different tongues. This idiotic farce is still kept up by the Re-organized. It was practiced in the convention last Spring. Mr. Higbee, once a Mormon Elder, tells how David Patton, a Mormon emissary, commanded him to arise and speak in tongues. He faltered. "Speak as

you list," ordered Patton. He then gabbled words that Patton called a tongue. Others gabbled in the same manner. Reynolds Cahoon gave them this rule: "Make some sound, continue to make sounds, the Lord will make a language of it." Persons would frequently sing in this gibberish in a drawl or whine, they called a tune. They said these songs would be sung when the lost tribes appeared in Missouri. One of the women who spoke in the convention in Kirtland last Spring, drawled out, "Ah-Pish-Ke-Ta," "Ah-Pish-Ke-Ta," those four syllables over and over. That is the work of the Spirit of God. Another eye witness tells of this scene. A number of Elders and Priests assembled in a room in Kirtland. Smith exhorted them to exercise faith, and some would see the Lord in person. He declared the time was coming when no one would be allowed to preach unless they had seen the Lord. About as sensible as my opponent's claim that all Mormon preachers are called as Aaron was called, and that they have miraculous power. Soon he said to Rigdon, "Sydney, you have seen the Lord." Sydney mounted Ahasuerus's horse and shouted, "I saw the image of a man pass before my face, whose locks were white and whose countenance was exceeding fair, even surpassing all beauty I ever beheld." Hiram Smith declared that he had seen what Sydney had seen. R. Copeland declared that he had seen the temple of Zion filled with Saints, the top covered with the glory of the Lord, in the form of a cloud. Smith went around the room laying his hands on the head of each one, gabbling, "Ah man. Oh Son. Ah man. Ah ne. commune, en halle goste, en haben, en glai, hosanna, en holle goste, en esac, melkin, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nephi, Lehi, St. John." After the supper several gabbled in tongues, and one sung a gibberish to the tune of Bruce's address. Who doubts that the Holy Spirit was given to gabble such stuff, and that Mormon idiocy is the "Fullness of the Gospel." A mischievous youth, now a man of advanced years, William, present in the audience, used to speak in tongues in Mormon meetings, as a practical joke on the brethren. It was announced that he excelled all others. The most wonderful display of tongues in the Mormon dispensation was the gibberish of this young man. Rigdon declared that he spake in three tongues, and interpreted his waggish gibberish in strains of spread eagle, in which Ahasuerus' horse cleft the clouds like Pegasus. Think of a waggish Corinthian youth uttering gibberish as a practical joke, and the inspired Paul announcing that he spake in three tongues, and interpreted in a rhapsody of high-fallutin. The Saints used to have love feasts, in which wine was passed around in buckets, each one helping himself to all he wanted, with gourd or dipper. The old bleaser, old Joe Smith, often got so blessed drunk that he could not get out of his chair. In an endowment meeting held in the temple in 1836, wine was drank so

freely that several of the church officials got beastly drunk. S. H. Smith, brother of the prophet, staggered into the pulpit and gave a revelation, Mormons claimed it was a wonderful miracle that a man so drunk could utter such a revelation!! Smith soon got sick and spewed into a spittoon, and W. E. McLellan emptied it several times out of the window. It was on this occasion that one of the brethren, lying flat on his back so full of the spirit (of drunkenness) that he could not sit up, hiccupped out: "Now is the time to see visions." Yea, verily it was. He spake as spirits gave him utterance, but not as the Spirit of God, who declares that no drunkard shall inherit the Kingdom of God. But for the sake of our common humanity we forbear. Such was the character of Mormonism under Joe Smith in Kirtland. What wonder that decent people dread a renewal of it, as they would a pestilence of pollution. What wonder that Kirtland has been a wreck religiously. That it is full of men and women who are at sea, believing nothing, doubting all things. It is said scratch a Russian and you will find a Tartar under his hide. In like manner scratch an infidel in Kirtland, and you will find a soured Mormon under his hide, or the soured son of a Mormon. Judging from the defense of Mormonism made in this debate, and the applause of infidels given to the infidel attacks made on the Bible, Infidelity and Mormonism are the same.

We propose now to cap the climax of Mormon lying which reaches the sublime in its colossal magnitude, with an extract of Joe Smith's autobiography, telling what happened in Kirtland at the dedication of the Temple. "Brother G. A. Smith arose and began to prophesy, when a noise was heard like a mighty rushing wind, which filled the temple and all the congregation arose simultaneously, being moved upon by an irresistible power. Many began to speak in tongues and to prophecy. Others saw glorious visions, (as they had two barrels of whiskey with the heads knocked out, perhaps some were in the condition of the Saint who said, "Now is the time to see visions.") And I beheld the Temple was filled with angels which fact I declared unto the congregation. The people of the neighborhood hearing an unusual sound, and seeing a bright light, like a pillar of fire, resting on the Temple, were astonished at what was transpiring and came running together." There is not a person who was at Kirtland that day, or who was at the dedication, that does not know that that statement is a tissue of lies, made up out of whole cloth. Yet we are asked to accept the colossal liar that published to the world that monstrous lie concerning the dedication of the Temple, as a prophet, and his lies as revelations. The organization that was gotten up by such a liar, and that publishes such lies, that is based on and made up in all that is peculiar to itself of such lies, is the true church of God and accepted of him.

My opponent argues in his last speech that Moses was like Christ and as Christ

was a Melchizedek priest, Moses was one. Unfortunately, the Bible says Moses was like Christ as a prophet. "A prophet like unto me." Not as a priest. It does not say, A priest like unto me. He wants to know to what priesthood my people belong. We are Christian kings, not Melchizedek kings or Aaronic kings; Christian priests, not Melchizedek or Aaronic priests, royal priests unto God. He asserts that Christ was a priest on earth. The Scriptures declare, "If he (Christ) were on earth he would not be a priest." Christ was not a priest on earth. He began his priestly office when he entered the holy of holies, heaven. I shall spend no time over ecclesiastical history. I can establish every papal mummery by it, as he does his mummeries. He undertakes to off-set my exposure of Joe Smith by citing an instance where a Disciple preacher stole. Wicked men may steal the livery of heaven to serve the devil in. We see that done frequently. We can believe that. But when you ask us to believe that God, who cannot look on sin with the least allowance, deliberately chose a water witching, peeping, money hunting, lying, drinking, stealing, swearing scoundrel, and by miracle clothed him with the livery of inspiration, to give a revelation and dispensation of religion to the world, that stood related to the dispensation of his own Son as the fullness of the gospel, you insult decency and reason.

My opponent takes up the testimony of the men and women of Palmyra and Manchester, and criticizes it. He impudently plays witness and pettifogger. He manufactures evidence to suit his wants. He tells us that he talked with persons in Manchester and Palmyra. We read on the first proposition the affidavits of Danford Booth, Orrin Reed, Amanda Reed and J. H. Gilbert, that the statements he read were deliberate falsehoods. There were pretended answers to questions never asked. In other cases the pretended answer was exactly the reverse of what they said. We have impeached Kelley the witness with his fabricated testimony. It is merely the manufactured yarns of Kelley the pettifogger that he impudently wants to foist in as evidence. Samantha Payne testifies she was in the cave. Had he driven over to Mr. Miner's, Mr. Miner could have led him to the cave. His yarn about Mrs. Chase having a peep-stone is a fabrication of old Granny Smith. His attacks on the affidavits are ridiculous. Peter Ingersoll would let Joe have money and move him if he would give his father-in-law as security. That is incredible, for Joe's father-in-law was over one hundred and twenty miles away. True, and they were going right to his house. Ingersoll tells what Alvin did. Alvin had been dead two years when he testified. Yes, but he was living when what Ingersoll narrated happened. Is not my opponent ashamed of such stuff. Dr. John Stafford never told him that his own father's affidavit in regard to the black wether was false. I will furnish Dr. Stafford's

affidavit that it is true. I will furnish the statements of Abel Chase and Lorenzo Saunders. I will not manufacture evidence and tell what a dozen witnesses told me. Think of the infinite impudence of E. L. Kelley's attacking men who have been judges of State Courts, Congressmen, leading business men, the best citizens of Palmyra and Manchester, men whose shoes he is not fit to clean. It is as impudent as the conduct of himself and brother. On Sunday morning two Danites made a raid on several old people in Manchester. They refused to give their names, tell who or what they were, or their business. They asked questions, sneered at the answers, laughed over them, disputed them, insulted the ones on whom they had forced their impudent presence, and bulldozed generally; and then went off and manufactured a report, that the persons interviewed declare under solemn oath to be a tissue of deliberate falsehoods. Such

is the character of the course of Kelley the witness and Kelley the pettifogger for Mormonism. It is in keeping with his client's character.

In regard to Jeffery's evidence, we have this to say. Mormon history shows that Rigdon lived in Nauvoo and not in Pittsburgh in 1843, until late in the year. That he did lead in Mormon business. That in Sept. 1844, he was in Nauvoo, trying to take Smith's place. That he told the apostles, September 14th, 1844, that if they did not place him in Smith's place, he would tell the secrets of Mormonism. They rejected him. In the Mormon official organ appeared bitter denunciations of Rigdon for exposing Mormonism. It was precisely at this time that Jeffery declares he told him what he narrates in his testimony. Every fact in Mormon history in regard to the matter corroborates Jeffery's statement. Kelley's statement in his attempt to set it to one side are flat contradictions of Mormon publications.

MR. KELLEY'S CLOSING SPEECH!

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—I appear before you this time to conclude my work of the debate. I have been gratified throughout the discussion with the courtesy manifested by you during the various sessions and the interest taken in the arguments, and I shall have been amply repaid for the time I have given to it, if the investigation leads you to a more thorough and fuller acquaintance with God's word and to a closer observance of his law and the obligations we all owe to each other.

After noticing one or two statements just made, I shall at once proceed with my argument and

SUMMARY.

Reference has been made to the article which I read last evening and a personal attack made against me, (it is so unreasonable, however, that no injury can result from it, if intended) because I used that article as a forcible illustration that my positions have been correct all of the time while his have been false and deceptive; I had in vain cited him to the fact that his course would, if correct, destroy the divine claim of Moses and the prophets; of not only these, but the religion of Jesus and the apostles. Had cited the fact that the Reformers would be necessarily rejected by such a rule and that the great Wesley would be dishonored by its application; that the ministers of his own denomination would fall equally with others, but it seems my

opponent never appreciated the enormity of his course until I had brought the matter home to him. Now he says I am an infidel because I read it. But did he not force the reading because of his blindness to tamer illustrations?

With regard to the evidence I read taken at Palmyra it was not my own publication, but another party. So much for his comment about my being a witness for myself. But Dr. Thomas Stafford will not say what Braden has said he would, nor has he ever to my knowledge even hinted that he was not correctly reported.

The ridiculous tale he tells about Joseph Smith's speaking in tongues, which he took out of Howe's book or from some one else who got it there, is beneath the consideration of any sensible man. Joseph Smith did not profess even to have the gift of tongues. That was not a part of the conferred favors upon him. He was a prophet. Can't you see the difference, Mr. Braden?

Again, wherever the Saints have been, he says, they have left in their track, barrenness and desolation. Yes, as with the Master of the house so with the household. The Jews cast Jesus out of Jerusalem, and ruin, desolation and death followed, and so had he predicted. His children were cast out of Kirtland and like results followed, and it had been also predicted that it would. It was also afterwards told them that they should find favor in the eyes of the people if they kept the law of God, and right here

in Kirtland I am now met with such warm friends that it has surprised my opponent, and instead of carrying the people against me, as he expected, as of old, he has turned against this intelligent audience calling them "Kelley's clackers," etc. Nauvoo has been referred to. Yes, the Saints were driven from Nauvoo, and desolation followed for the city. Is the lesson in our favor or against us? Let every candid man and woman answer for him or herself. But I must not refer to the fact that Jerusalem in its desolation is a mark of the habitation of the favored of God under the prophets, or my opponent will think I am attacking the Bible.

Again, during the last night on the first question, when he knew I had not the time to reply to him, he dodged in and foamed considerably, charging polygamy upon Joseph Smith, the Seer, in the hope that he might help his weak efforts in the minds of those who could be easily prejudiced. And sure enough one or two bit at it. What a pile of evidence he brought forward. In vain I had showed him that if Mr. Smith did do something bad it would not hurt our faith any more than the act of Peter when "he cursed and swore," or that of Paul and Barnabas when they fell out and would not even travel the same road, injured the pure principles of the gospel then. That our faith was not in men but in Christ and his doctrine. But no, he could never see the argument; but takes the stand and said I compared Smith with Caiaphas and some of the old Hebrew idolators. I had never used one of the names he mentioned, however; I had compared with Moses the type of Christ, with Abraham the father of the faithful, with David the inspired Psalmist, and Solomon the wise king, and many of the early Christians. Then he puts on a solemn look again and says I attack the Bible. If I undertake to stand by it and compare our faith with it in this controversy, I attack it in his estimation; yet it is the agreed standard in this debate, and have I not the right to compare with the standard? And when I compare and say that my people by his own stories are as good as those held out by the standard that we accepted, he hollows out, "foul," "it's not fair." The point is, if the argument he uses to destroy the Book of Mormon will also destroy the Bible if applied to that book—the argument is bad; not the Bible bad, but the argument. Can you now see the point?

Was Joseph Smith a polygamist? He said he was. Where is his proof? He cites the case of Mrs. Foster, an old trumped up affair got up by a gang who tried to blackmail Joseph Smith. Why did you not read the full statement? It would have exposed your scheme. I will read it from a work published against our people. Smucker's history of the Mormons, page 174:

"It is utterly incredible that Joseph Smith, who, great impostor that he was, never missed an opportunity to denounce seducers and adulterers as unfit to enter into his church, should have been concerned directly or indirectly in proceedings like these, though

it is scarcely surprising that when such stories have been circulated by men whom the "Prophet" had thwarted or reprimanded, there should have been found some persons willing to credit them."

These are the suggestions of Mr. Smucker after sketching through the purported tales connected with Martha Brotherton, Mrs. Foster, et al. The so-called affidavits referred to in this same Mrs. Foster affair, after being brought before a court, having no sympathies with Joseph Smith, were after an examination, promptly dismissed by the judge as being unworthy of notice, and being "evidently gotten up to deceive the people and slander Smith."

Mr. Smucker says again, page 379:

"As the Mormon authorities positively deny that Joseph Smith was guilty of the charge often alleged in justifying his murder, it is a motive of caution in the receipt of evidence. We must remember, too, that Smith universally, in all his letters, revelations and speeches denounced adultery and fornication. Subject as all founders of religious systems are to calumny, we cannot resist the doubt that there may have been misrepresentation and exaggeration, both as to the character of Joseph Smith and the cause of his untimely end. At any rate, and under any circumstances, it is impossible to justify the acts of his enemies, either in the persecution of his followers, or in the circumstances of his death. The fanaticism that destroyed him is to be condemned quite as strongly as his own."

This is the open criticism of a man who has carefully gone through all the published stories with reference to these charges by the Bennett's, Law's, Parish's, and in Ford's History of Illinois, etc. And if an able critic and enemy of Mr. Smith and his religion, after an examination of these things stands in doubt and feels that to condemn would be unjustifiable, who shall say it is in the least assumptious or fanatical for his friends to maintain that he was innocent? Who will not say that we shall not have even done our duty as men, setting aside the fact of being brethren, if we shall fail to demand the proof and sift it thoroughly, ere accepting this charge as true against one of our fellow men, who cannot be heard in his own behalf?

But Braden drinks in all these lying statements and refuses to accept of the reasonable side. No; Smith was a polygamist, he says; but not one of the Smith family ever went to Utah or into Polygamy. His father died a monogamist at Nauvoo; his brothers Don Carlos, Samuel Harrison and Hyrum, died monogamists in Nauvoo; his only remaining brother, William B., lives in Iowa where he has resided for years; his sisters all remained in the state of Ill., after his death, and the only survivor is Mrs. Salisbury, a lady of the highest character, having an intelligent family, and her husband one of the first men in Hancock County, Ill. His only children, Joseph, Alexander H. and David H. are all monogamists; two of them for the last eighteen years being actively engaged in the ministry, and only two days ago the oldest, and the one now President of the Church, was called to Washington, Iowa, to address the State Temperance Society, of which he is the Vice-President. Joseph Smith's only wife, Emma (Hale) Smith, refused to go to Utah, or with any faction of the church, and as a true heroine, raised her children

in Nauvoo, Ill., and has ever maintained that her husband has been lied about; that he never had any wife but herself; and that he was never married in any way to any other woman than herself; and that it is not true as hawked about by his enemies, that she ever burned a revelation of her husbands, or any paper purporting to be such; that, at her husband's death no one mourned as his wife or widow but her; no claim has ever been made by any woman to her face that she was also a wife; no claim was ever made for any children but her own, that they were his children; and that of a truth her husband has been maligned by those who had in view a sinister motive to advance, by so misrepresenting him.

Taking up the writings of Mr. Smith, there is not a leaf, scrap, line or sentiment of his own writing, in the world that in the least favors polygamy. On the contrary, every sentiment referring to the marriage relation, in the Book of Mormon, Book of Doctrine and Covenants and the Inspired Translation of the Bible, the works emanating from his own hands, teaches monogamy. And in all his letters, notices, press articles and publications, sanctioned by him, monogamy is enjoined wherever marriage is referred to in such a sense as to call forth an expression of his views.

Mrs. C. V. Wait, in her history of Brigham Young and his Harem, page 195, says: "Lucy Decker, married to Brigham Young, was the *first wife in plurality*, and the first child in polygamy was Brigham Heber, born to Brigham Young in 1847." This marriage took place about two years after Joseph Smith's death. But he says, "there are women in Utah who claim to have been married to Joseph Smith." But how, and when? When he was living? No; you cannot point to a woman who made the claim while he was living. Years after he was dead you could find them tenuous. How were they married to him? I will read the work of John Hyde, a Utah Elder at one time, and who left them and made an expose of their religion. He united with that church in 1848, four years after Smith's death. His book is the one where Braden has sought for testimony. He says, as to polygamy, page 87:

"Not only is it deemed proper to take the widows of some good brother, but also to take fresh wives for your dead brother. There was a lady named 'P', in Salt Lake, in 1854, who had heard of and loved Smith. He had been dead for ten years; but that is nothing to the wings of Mormon faith. She was desirous to be sealed to him, although, I believe, she had a husband still living in the States. *Brigham consented to act as proxy or agent for Joseph Smith, and accordingly the interesting ceremony was performed.* Mrs. P—, good soul, gave up all her property to the church, faithfully believing she had joined the numerous army of the Smiths in general, under the special banner of the Prophet Joseph."

This is sufficient without comment. There can be little doubt in the mind of the close thinker, that after the death of Joseph Smith, there was a studied effort made on the part of Young, Kimball and a few

others to connect the Prophet with polygamy, if possible, in order to weigh in their own behalf, in carrying out their schemes; and this scheme of marrying women to the dead, was gotten up by them in order to more perfectly carry forward the design.

After this piece of silly nonsense, of marrying a woman to Brigham, (but ostensibly to the dead, who could utter no protest,) had taken place, then Brigham would tell them they were wives of Joseph Smith, and they would so claim to the "brethren," and so, the perversion of history was well-nigh made complete, by this cunning. Thus many good honest men and women were deceived, and led to believe Joseph Smith had more wives than one, because they had not the courage, after passing through *Brigham Young's Endowment House*, to look these hypocrites in the face, and ask them:—When were you married to him? Who officiated? Did you live in his house or some dark corner? Where are your children you had by Joseph Smith? You seem to have plenty by Brigham Young? Were you classed with the *mourning widow and children* at Nauvoo, at the time of his death? If not, why not? Where is your marriage certificate? Why did you not think it was necessary to have one?

My friends, the stories of these people are too absurd for honest men. No prominent man's reputation is safe, if we accept such as evidence.

But, he says he will prove it from our own paper, the *Saints' Herald*. Now, is it not singular, that this evidence should be in our paper, and we not know it? If as a people, we claim all the time that Joseph Smith was not in polygamy, or if he was, we have never had evidence of it, are we to be termed fanciful upon this, when the strongest evidence he says he can find, is in our own church paper? It ought to strike any sensible man that if such a thing as he terms evidence, is in our church paper, and at the same time as a people, we do not believe the charge of polygamy, made against Joseph Smith to be true, that we must have some good reason for it. He would hardly charge the body with either ignorance, or a lack of sufficient courage to admit that Mr. Smith was guilty, if we had the proofs. Whether guilty or not, does not injure our faith; we say the charge is false because we are convinced of it. And my opponent after his unsuccessful effort to destroy my faith with his own choice of weapons, from whatever source he could gather them, will hardly be able to effectively turn my own against me. Such a thing as attempting it, to say the least, smacks highly of egotism, and is utterly ridiculous.

I read in full what is said upon this question in our paper at Wilber, and Mr. Braden knows it don't prove what he asserts, if he can understand the English language at all, in a matter wherein his prejudices govern.

I will read what he claims as proving

that Joseph Smith was in polygamy and received the purported polygamous Revelation in Elder Mark's letter. Vol. I, page 26, *Saints' Herald*.

"He said, it [polygamy] eventually would prove the overthrow of the church, and we should soon be obliged to leave the United States, unless it could be speedily put down. He was satisfied that it was a cursed doctrine, and that there must be every exertion made to put it down. He said he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it, and I must go into the High Council, and he would prefer charges against those in transgression, and I must sever them from the church, unless they made ample satisfaction. There was much more said, but this was the substance."

This is Braden's strong hold, and my friends be candid and examine it, and show no favor to Joseph Smith in doing it, and what have you?

1. That somebody was doing something in the church not right—Going into polygamy.

2. "That it must be speedily put down." Well, does that sound as though he was going to dilly-dally about the matter?

3. "That it was a cursed doctrine." Does that sound as though he had received a revelation endorsing it? He would have struck at the revelation instead of the doctrine. He referred to it as being the doctrine practiced by David and Solomon. And learned fifteen years before in the Book of Mormon, page 116, that it was a cursed doctrine.

4. "That he would go before the congregation and proclaim against it." Does that sound like it was his revelation then, or that he was guilty?

5: "That (Marks) must go into the High Council, and he (Smith) would prefer charges against those in transgression, and (Marks) must sever them from the church."

Does this sound like a man that was guilty himself with the others? He to prefer charges and have all the transgressors cut off from the church. And yet, Braden would have you believe that this statement of Marks which he accepts as correct (because it would be an insult to you for him to introduce evidence on his side which he did not accept as true) proves Joseph Smith was into polygamy and received a revelation endorsing it. Don't anybody know that if Smith had received a revelation endorsing polygamy, that they could not have cut a man off from the church for accepting it, until the church had condemned the revelation?

The very procedure directed by Joseph Smith in this case destroys every presumption of there being such a revelation in existence at that time. This was, says Elder Marks in the same letter, "but a few days before his death." This seals the matter then. I have traced Joseph Smith with reference to this question from his boyhood to within a few days of his death with evidence that no man can deny, and every word and act has been against polygamy. Shall I go back on all this now and accept the undefined statement of Brigham Young made eight years after this—that he

"had a copy of the revelation?" Never. I should thus wrong justice and the dead, and so would any other man.

But he says Elder Sheen gave his testimony. Does that prove it? I will read it, page 27:

"The Salt Lake apostles also excuse themselves by saying Joseph Smith taught the spirit of wife doctrine; but this excuse is as weak as their excuse concerning the ancient kings and patriarchs. Joseph Smith repented of his connection with this doctrine and said that it was of the devil. He caused the revelations on that subject to be burned and when he voluntarily came to Nauvoo and resigned himself into the arms of his enemies he said that he was going to Carthage to die."

This is an argument of Sheen's; he never pretended to have had any knowledge of his own. He was arguing from the accepted statement of the Brighamites. *Emma Smith had been charged* by them with burning the revelation on polygamy, and that Joseph gave it to her to burn; and Elder Sheen here argues from the premises that if Joseph did this, he must have repented of polygamy. Then he bases his argument that it was a "cursed doctrine," upon the statement made by Elder Marks in the letter to which I have already referred. There is absolutely no more evidence in this than in the remarks of the lawyer after the witnesses have given in their evidence. The letter of Elder Marks was one thing he based his argument upon, and the statement of Brigham Young, "that Joseph gave the revelation to Emma to burn and she burned it," was the other. You and I can argue and draw our conclusions upon the statements as well and as truly as could Elder Sheen.

But hold a moment. Elder Sheen had not got all of the statements or evidence to this time; when that came there was another tale altogether.

Mrs. Emma Smith is the next witness. She says: "I never burned any revelation of my husband's nor anything claiming to be such. I would not have thought of doing such a thing." Here it is. It has come down to this, as to whether we will believe Brigham Young on this point of the revelation or the *Elect Lady*. For my part I believe the lady. Braden prefers to believe Brigham.

Take with this the published statement of Brigham Young in the Tabernacle in Utah in 1856, that there was no child of Joseph Smith's in Utah Territory (where the only persons were who claimed to be his wives) and you have polygamy knocked in the head as to him, and the purported revelation is as the church has ever claimed, a *fraud and a forgery*. Brigham Young himself said, on August 7th, 1852, reported in his sermon in his own Journal of Discourses, that no man in existence knew that he had such a copy of a revelation till that day. Yet Braden will ignore the plain clear line of facts relating to Joseph Smith's views, and drink in the lies of John C. Bennett, William Law, Joseph Foster, et al, who got mad at Smith and tried to destroy his character because "Smith in a public meeting exposed Bennett for kissing a Mrs.

Pratt over a picket fence." This picket fence business Smith determined to break up, and this is the reason that the nest of these licentiates rebelled, and began a furious assault upon Joseph Smith. The charge of his *succaring* in the Council at at Nauvoo is a most infamous lie from this same gang. But I will not take up further time replying to such a charge. Every sane man knows that Smith could never have acted in this way, and retained the confidence of his followers as he did all through. This is the family, then, that Braden has been so unjustifiably and maliciously slandering and berating, even speaking disrespectful of the girls of the family. As foul a slander as was ever made against any person. He has continually misrepresented Mrs. Smith's history, and now turned to vilifying the old lady herself, just for the purpose of carrying out his boast before he came here of making war upon the Latter Day Saint's cause. "War to the knife and the knife to the hilt." He has avowed war, yet signed an agreement to discuss for the purpose of eliciting truth, and of having an honorable discussion. Anything is honorable in "war to the knife and the knife to the hilt," so he has worked. Since he has boldly proclaimed war against this church, I give him now to understand that when he wants to renew the attack my address is Kirtland, Ohio. (Applause).

My opponent still claims that there were only two Melchizedek priests, that of Melchizedek and Christ. But Christ was made a priest, Paul says, "after the order of Melchizedek." What kind of a line or order would it be with only two priests in it?

I have already exposed the idea that because Christ was a priest *continually* that therefore he was the last. Melchizedek before him as positively shown, is a priest continually, and he is not the last. You just as well take the ground that Jesus was the last apostle, and that Peter, James and John and all others were frauds because he abides an apostle continually.

He is also "consecrated for evermore," to be a priest; but does that do away with the necessity of the priest's office being filled again here on earth in the church.

John the Apostle was a priest, as well as an apostle, so laid down by Polycrates. He says: "John, that rested on the bosom of our Lord, who was a priest that bore the sacerdotal plate." Moses and Elijah and Job and Isaiah and Jethro were priests. Not of the Aaronic order, either, and must have been of the higher priesthood. The other is called the "*lesser*;" it would not be the "*lesser*" if there were more than two, nor spoken of in that way. Not *least*, but *lesser*, signifying but two orders.

Upon this subject of priesthood, Smith, in his *Bible Dictionary*, under the name *Priest*, says: "That the New Testament writers recognize in Christ, the First-born, the King, the Anointed, the Representative of the true primeval priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, from which that

of Aaron, however necessary for the time, is now seen to have been a deflection." There having been a change under the law there was a change in the priesthood; but the change of the priesthood was not to abolish any more than it was abolished as long as Moses and Joshua held another office than in the Aaronic line, at the same time that the Aaronic was in force. And there may come a time when there will be no use for the Aaronic order, since it is a *deflection*, but not till man is able to live in a more perfect state than now. But of the other it is "without beginning of days or end of years;" and hence, continues forever, and they who are priests therein, and overcome the evils of life, retaining the priesthood, are priests forever, necessarily. John the Baptist evidently was an Aaronic priest. But I must pass rapidly on.

It must be apparent to everyone who has attended this discussion, that it has not been the object of my opponent to evince truth and advance the right, touching the faith of the Latter Day Saints, but that he has continually manifested a morbid desire to scandalize, falsify and misrepresent, and has exhibited all the characteristics of *personal spite and pique* toward the Latter Day Saints. Accepting and using any kind of warfare, just so he fancied it would heap opprobrium upon the objects of his hate. His desperate threat made before his arrival in Kirtland, that he had declared eternal war on the Latter Day Saint's cause; "war to the knife, and knife to the hilt," is his Christian-like language he has endeavored to carry out to the utmost. Anything has been fair means with him. He has done his utmost, but has been foiled and defeated in his mad and desperate purpose. He has not brought facts and argument, but tales, scandal and ridicule and lying and blasphemous assertions. Objecting to honorable and true methods of debate, like the bird called the turkey-buzzard, he has skimmed the country from east to west for dead carcasses, rotten and putrifying flesh in the shape of gossip, slander, stories and scandal circulated by lying hypocrites, black legs and the licentious, because they had nothing better with which to meet the truth, has filled his craw, and night after night has come and puked it out to this audience as argument. No lie has been too great, or scandal too low and contemptible, for him to keep back. Not satisfied with scandalizing honorable and worthy men, but innocent women and girls are assailed by his vile and slanderous tongue; and when done with the living, hyena-like he has entered the graves of the dead and gratified his hate by attacking their decaying bones. All who slander and lie about the Latter Day Saints, are *first citizens and Christians* with this holy Clark. All others are liars and thieves and not worth believing. When reminded that vituperation and lying slanders are not argument, and that a similar line of tirade against the Bible will destroy the institutions of Moses

and the prophets, he has always called out, you are attacking the Bible.

On this account *only*, I have been led the past few evenings to use arguments that would cut, and handle his matter according to its rottenness; and throughout, I have been more than ever in my life before, confirmed in the belief, that Jesus meant truly what he said, when he was accused of all that was evil and abominable, and maltreated and scourged:—"If they do this in the green tree what will they do in the dry?" If they have so abused the Master of the House, what will they not do to the Household?

Ladies and gentlemen, the question is:—Is the Re-organized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, in fact the church of God and accepted with him?

I have shown you: *First*. By Eph. 3d, that the family of God take the name of Jesus Christ, "of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." Also, that the children are called Saints, and ought to be so known; that we live in the last times, and hence are Latter Day Saints—not Former Day Saints. That the church was organized in 1830, was rejected in 1844, and its ministry and members scattered, and Re-organized in the year 1852. Hence the church to-day is properly incorporated under the laws of the United States, as the Re-organized church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

2. I have shown that in faith and doctrine it is identical with the church in the first century, established by Jesus and the apostles.

3. That in organization it is with the church of Christ in the first century, having Apostles, Prophets, Seventy, (Evangelists,) Bishops, High Priests, Elders, Priests, Teachers, Deacons and Assistants.

4. That, as in the early church, there is order and arrangement so that the members in the body are regularly guided and directed in their work, and that the officers taking precedence under the law are also known as Presidents, Apostles, High Priests, Bishops, Presidents of Quorums, and Presiding Elders, Priests, Teachers and Deacons.

5. That as in the church Jesus established there is faith, repentance, the ordinances of baptism in water for the remission of sins, and the laying on of hands for confirmation and the gift of the Holy Spirit, the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment, which judgment is for the purpose of rewarding all men according to the deeds done in the body, and in accordance with the *degree* of good and evil they shall have done.

6. That in organization there is also provision for an associate Presidency of three, as was that of James, Peter and John under the constitution, the New Testament, after Jesus had ascended to Heaven. That when he was here in person there were thirteen apostles, and he presided, and being the Son of God, I conclude that he could do so without associates, but that afterwards,

Peter, James and John held the pre-eminent right, and hence the apostle Paul refers to them as "Pillars" in the church.

7. That besides the *twelve* which Jesus chose while here, he afterwards through the manifestations of the Holy Spirit, chose others of which we have record, to-wit:—Matthias, Acts 1: 15–20; Barnabas and Paul, Acts 13: 1–6 and 14; Andronicus and Junia, Rom. 16: 7; James, the Lord's brother, Gal. 1: 19; and Sylvanus and Timotheus, 1 Thess. 1: 2–6.

These, including Jesus who was an apostle, shows a succession in the church of these officers to the number of twenty-one. Besides these there were prophets and prophetesses in the New Testament church as Agabus and the four daughters of Philip.

8. That the church was adorned in this manner when John saw it go into the wilderness with the crown of twelve stars and the Gospel light of the Son of Righteousness, and that the same beautiful adornment and working organization is revealed in the order presented by the church to-day, and that it is clothed with the same Gospel of peace—the way of life and immortality.

9. That the church has not only been re-instituted in organization and Gospel light, but that in fact the gifts, powers, blessings, graces, promises and "faith once delivered to the Saints" are restored again and may be enjoyed by all who will live godly in Christ Jesus and seek after them.

10. That inspiration and the gift or baptism of the Holy Spirit was not confined to the first century, but that the promise was to all, "even as many as the Lord should call." And that truly "a manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man [in the church of Jesus Christ] to profit with all," and that it is thus "a spiritual house," "a habitation of God through the Spirit," when acceptable with him. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me, and my Father will love him and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ he hath both the Father and the Son."

Has my opponent showed a single thing wherein we differed from the doctrine of Christ?

All of you must say no. He has been all the time telling stories on Smith, Rigdon, Whitmer, *et al.*, and raking around in the dust of the *Spaulding story*. But that story is done. I have traced that tale to its very seat. I found the manuscript for him, showed him it was placed in the hands of one of his "*first citizens*," Hulburt; that it was then put into the hands of another of his "*first citizens*," Howe; that then these two "*first citizens*" had said it did not read as they expected and they did not use it; that afterwards they tried to make out it was not the one, in order to protect their "statements" of certain parties; that they were foiled in this because the one they had was the one on parchment which purported on its face to have been "*Found in a Cave*;" that Howe and Hulburt promised to return

this to Mrs. Spaulding which, had they done, it would have forever prohibited them from claiming it was not the right one, and that they broke their promise and destroyed it; but they kept their statements from trumped up persons who were bent on *sinking the Book of Mormon* and published them. That satisfies me on the Spaulding tale forever.

I have not only showed you all of this

and the identity in faith, practices, ordinances, organization and work of the church, but that we were in fact sowing the word of life, the good seed of the kingdom of God which Jesus promised should bring forth fruit "some an hundred fold, some sixty and some thirty." I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your every courtesy and attention. (Applause).

CERTIFICATE.

I hereby certify that I have corrected and prepared the foregoing speeches of myself without access to, or consultation with, those of Mr. Braden since the debate. I have read the proofs of the same furnished by the publishers, and that they have been set forth as delivered in the discussion of the respective propositions.

E. L. KELLEY.

MR. BRADEN'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

GENTLEMEN MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:—We will merely notice the frantic effort of my opponent to set to one side the evidence that Joe Smith was author of the revelation on polygamy. The facts are these: In the first number of the official organ of the Re-organized Mormon faction there appeared—I. A statement in the first and leading editorial written by Zenos H. Gurley that Joseph was the author of that revelation and was slain for his conduct in the matter. Gurley was one of the Re-organizers, was a leader, and is to-day. II. A statement by Isaac Sheen, one of the Re-organizers, and a leader, one of the editors, that Smith said that he was the author of it and said that it caused all of his troubles, and would cost him his life. Kelley says Sheen retracted it. I deny it. He cannot furnish one scrap of proof. III. Another statement by W. H. Marks, another Re-organizer and editor, that while Smith was prophet and his influence was omnipotent in the church, polygamy prevailed to such an extent that Marks declared the only way to purify the church was to dis-organize it; that Smith became alarmed and come to Marks, whom he had been denouncing as an apostate for opposing polygamy, to get him to help stay the tide of infamy, believing that public feeling would drive Mormons and polygamy out of the country. These declarations stood unchallenged fifteen years. Now Mormons are trying to lie out of them.

In the discussion of this question we tested Mormonism by its teachings in regard to the eight great elements of Christianity laid down by Paul. I. One God. II. One

Lord. III. One Spirit. IV. One faith. V. One baptism. VI. One hope. VII. One body. VIII. One name. We read from the works of the Pratts and others that were published before Smith's death, approved by him, and that were standards of the Mormons, and that expressed what were their universal sentiments—from their papers published before his death, from his own declarations published in their papers and from publications universally accepted by them, and from the Book of Mormon, declarations that God has a body like man, is a material organism with all of man's organs, even of eating, drinking, digesting, evacuating, and procreating, and that he uses them. That he procreated spirits, and that spirits are procreated in heaven, before inhabiting bodies, procreated for them by men and women on earth. That matter is self-existent and eternal, and that God is the creature of matter. That he is not infinite in knowledge and power, and not everywhere present, but has been increasing his attributes since he came into being from matter, and will ever increase. That all Saints will increase and become Gods. That they will equal Christ. We exposed the materialism, idolatry and disgusting sensuality of the system in its teaching in regard to God and heaven. My opponent tried to deny it. At last he appealed to the figurative language of the Bible, literalizing it in the most gross manner, assuming that God has literal hands, feet, eyes, mouth, ears; that man is like him in his physical organization, and though he stopped short of announcing it, he logically endorsed all of the gross sensualism

of the Pratts and Joe Smith. The Bible declares that there is nothing to which God can be likened. He is infinite everywhere present, infinite in power and wisdom, not finite in time, space, form or attributes. The Mormon God has all of man's organs, and as Pratt has it, eats, drinks, digests, evacuates, procreates, just like man; is an idol of matter, a creature of matter, and very finite, as all Saints will equal him, surpass what he is now. Mormonism is a disgusting compound of materialism, sensualism and idolatry, and as unlike the pure spirituality of the teachings of the Bible as the system of the Hindoo Jugger-naut.

We next exposed the blasphemy of the system in regard to the origin of our Savior's spiritual nature. We showed that it denied that he is our sole divine prophet, by placing above his teachings in the Bible, the Book of Mormon, and Joe Smith's lying frauds, as "the fullness of the Gospel." That it denied that he is our sole divine King, by placing above his law in the Bible, Joe Smith's lying frauds as "the fullness of the law of God."

We next showed that it was unscriptural and false in every teaching in regard to the Holy Spirit. It assumed that the only influence of the Spirit is the direct and miraculous influence, in opposition to the Scriptures and common sense. The Scriptures teach there are four powers of the Spirit. The miraculous inspiration and revelation and the converting, the sanctifying and the indwelling power, and through the truth. My opponent has denied this clear teaching of reason and revelation, and confounded all power exerted by the Spirit, and claimed that all is miraculous power. He has mis-applied promises of the miraculous power. He has applied what was promised to the apostles, miraculous power to qualify them for their work, to all Christians. He, in flat contradiction of the word of God, applies the promise of the baptism in the Spirit to all Christians, and claims that it is in the church now, in flat contradiction of God's word, that declares there is only one baptism in the church, baptism in water. He has absurdly tried to make one the baptism in water and the baptism in the Spirit, when John says men administer one; Christ alone administered the other. He does not know the difference between immersion *by* one Spirit, that is, by the command of one Spirit, and immersion *in* the Spirit. Between born *of* the Spirit and immersion *in* the Spirit; between renewal of the Spirit and immersion *in* the Spirit. He does not know the difference between the moral influence of the Spirit, through the word in conversion and sanctification and the miraculous power of the Spirit in inspiration, spiritual gifts, miraculous powers, immersion in the Spirit. He does not know the difference between the indwelling of the Spirit and the miraculous influence of the Spirit. He reads instances of the miraculous influence of the Spirit, claims it for

all Christians, because he finds the Spirit promised to all Christians, overlooking the teaching of the Bible, that all Christians receive the moral influence, the influence through the truth alone, and that only those that God used to do work requiring miraculous influence, received it. He absurdly assumes that because some men whom God used for purposes that required miraculous influence received it, all Christians must have it, overlooking the fact that they are not called to such work, and do not need it. He flatly contradicts Paul's teaching that there is a better way than the exercise of the best miraculous powers. That all miraculous powers shall cease when they have accomplished their purpose, the completion of the constitution of the church, the New Testament, and the organization of the church under it. This clear, positive teaching of God's word he rejects. He claims miraculous powers and has utterly failed to furnish one single proof of them. He might as well claim creating power in his church. His claim is as impudent as the claim of his prophet, Joe Smith, to see money with his peep-stone—money that was never found. We showed that not only does Mormonism pervert the one faith, God's word, but it blasphemously places above the faith as "The fullness of the Gospel" the lying frauds of Joe Smith and other deceivers and visionary fanatics. We have rung in our opponents ears the demand, "What need for new revelations?" Do you say you have a truth that Christ's perfect Gospel did not give to the world? Dare you say that you express any truth better than he and his apostles expressed it? This question he dare not answer. It meets his lying frauds at the threshold of the temple of God, as the angel with flaming sword met sinful man at the gate of Eden.

We next showed the false teachings of his system in regard to the one baptism. After admitting that immersion in water was in the church, it gives the lie direct to the Holy Spirit, and asserts there is also in the church, immersion in the Spirit, when the Holy Spirit declares there is in the church one immersion, as there is one God, and teaches that immersion in water, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, unto the remission of sins is the one baptism that is in the church. We next exposed the farce of baptism of the living as proxies for the dead, taught by Mormonism. We asked how do the dead know what the living proxy has done? How does the living proxy know whether the dead has believed and repented. If the dead have believed and repented, will they stay in hell, because of the failure of some living person to be baptized as proxy for him? If the living is baptized and the dead does not repent, what good in the farcical blunder? These questions he has not noticed.

We exposed the materialistic, senesualist nature of the teachings of Mormonism in regard to the Millennium, and the final

reward of the righteous. Rigdon in his gross literalizing of the figurative teaching of the Bible, in regard to the future, made nonsense out of them, and taught the most absurd, extravagant, and gross materialistic ideas of the Millennium and future life. Sensible Mormons hide these ideas, as they do his gross literal material teaching in regard to God.

We next showed that Mormonism makes a hideous monster of the one body. It discards the teaching of the New Testament, that Mosaism with its Priesthood and ritual is abrogated, and the simple church of Christ has taken its place. It foists into Christianity the Mosaic Priesthood, when Christ's law declares that the law is changed, the Priesthood is changed. It gets up a fiction called the Melchizedek Priesthood, when the Bible teaches that there were but two—Melchizedek and another priest, Christ. Only two. This fiction of two Priesthoods—Aaronic and Melchizedek in the church, has no more foundation than the Catholic seven sacraments. It ends in placing in the church pretenders to all Spiritual gifts, when the Bible teaches they have accomplished their purpose, and ceased. It has presidents, vice-presidents, a presidency, twelve apostles, several seventies of apostles, presidents of quorums of apostles, quorums of apostles, presidents of tens, in the seventies, councillors, high councillors, priests, and high priests, presidents of stakes, bishops, presidents of bishops, traveling elders, organizations of elders and bishops, presidents and other officers of such organizations, prophets, seers, evangelists, revelators, translators, patriarchs, and not even an inspired Mormon can repeat all their lingo. This monstrosity is the true church of God, like that Paul addressed in Philippi, when he wrote "Paul and Timotheus to all the Saints, Overseers and Servants of the church in Philippi." As much like it as a Hindoo idol with a dozen heads, a hundred arms, and as many feet as a millipede, is like the human body as it came from the hands of God. We next assailed the name. The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, by the apostles, a true reading declares. Mormons were called Latter Day Saints at Kirtland, by Rigdon. The Holy Spirit called the congregations "Churches of God," "Churches of Christ." Mormons called their monstrosity with its officers as numerous as the devils cast out of the man in the tombs "The Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints." We have exposed the Book of Mormon. We traced its origin in Spaulding's "Manuscript Found." Proved by Rigdon himself that he took it from the office, where Spaulding sent it to be printed. That he remodelled it into a pretended revelation by putting into it portions of the Bible and his own notions. We have proved that he gave it to Smith to publish to the world as a pretended revelation, dug from the earth and translated by his stolen

peep-stone. That he was seen at Smith's and was absent often when engaged in this work. That he preached its ideas and prepared his congregations, converts, and certain preachers to receive it. That he predicted its coming. That Pratt went from him to Smith, and came back to him. We have exposed that transparent fraud, his pretended conversion. We have exposed the Rigdonisms on every page. We have exposed its plagiarisms from King James' translations. Its absurd imitation of the brogue of the translators. Its quotations of the New Testament, before it was written. Its quotations of modern authors hundreds of years before they lived. Its adaptations of modern events. Its anachronisms in speaking of modern things. Its utter lack of one particle of evidence needed to sustain an uninspired book. Its lack of evidence needed to sustain an inspired book. Its flat contradictions of the Bible history, of the Bible teachings. Its scores of self-contradictions and blunders. We have showed the contradictions between the Book of Mormon and the Bible. Between the Book of Mormon and the Inspired Translation of Joe Smith. Between the Inspired Translation and the Bible. Between the Inspired translation and the Book of Doctrines and Covenants. Between the Inspired Translation and Joe Smith's preaching. Between the Inspired Translation in its different parts. We have proved that the Mormon God has learned printer's art, composition and grammar, and has revised himself from title page to finis; making seventeen changes on one page and over five thousand in the book, and changes that omit whole lines and insert lines and entirely change the meaning. We have showed the atrocious outrages on all grammar and composition in all Mormon frauds called revelations. We examined the Book of Doctrines and Covenants and exposed its displays of trickery, low cunning, avarice and selfishness, its meanness, its flat contradictions of the Bible in teachings and spirit. Its failure in predictions, its gross blunder. We exposed the gross absurd and unscriptural character of Smith's lie about the ordination of himself and Cowdery, by John the Baptist. As this is the corner stone of Mormonism, my opponent abandoned all hope of his system, when he dodged defending this lie of Smith. We showed it contradicted the Bible in fourteen particulars. We showed that Joe lacked every evidence of a prophet. He never uttered what must have been a revelation. He never prophesied. He never wrought a miracle. All such claims are transparent frauds. We then examined Smith's antecedents, we exposed the low, dishonest, lying character of the family, its career and associates. We showed that Smith was lazy, a liar, a drunkard, a thief. That he was noted for his lies, all through his career, and for his tricks, fraud and deception. In New York, in Pennsylvania, in Ohio, in Missouri, in Illinois. He began witching for water, a lying fraud. Peep-

ing for lost articles. A lying fraud. Pointing out buried treasures. A lying fraud. Digging for them. A lying fraud. His pretended fac simile of what was on the plates was a lying fraud. So were his pretended plates. His pretended translation of the Book of Abraham was a lying fraud. So was his pretended translation of pretended plates, the Book of Mormon. He admitted that he never had any plates. That it was all a hoax. The witnesses repudiated their testimony. Mormons excluded them as liars and criminals of the blackest dye. We showed the innumerable lies and contradictory stories, that Smith and all connected with the fraud, told, showing that it was a clumsy fraud, gotten up by ignorant knaves.

We exposed Joe's lying tricks of casting out devils in New York. We showed that all his powers was a remarkable power as psychologist, or mesmerist, and that as people knew nothing of this power then, they mistook it for supernatural power, as ignorant people so mistake the same power in Spiritism. We traced Smith's career in Kirtland, and that of Mormon leaders. Their lies, frauds, swindles, that ruined hundreds and compelled them to flee the country to escape the penitentiary. We exposed their career of violence, fraud, murder, assassination, swearing and villainy in Missouri. We exposed their career of similar villainy in Illinois. We proved that Smith was a swindler and cheat, and liar and villain wherever he lived. We proved that nearly one-third of the leaders of Mormonism have abandoned it, and denounced it as a fraud. That Rigdon, the author, did so. We proved that Joe Smith was the author of the revelation on polygamy, and that Mormons have no more right to reject that than the Book of Mormon. We took up the career of Mormonism as a religion, in Kirtland. We exposed its fanaticism, madness and immorality. We exposed Smith's attempts at assassination. His frauds called speaking with tongues. We exposed the lies, tricks and deceptions enacted to carry out the fraud in Kirtland. We showed that the Book of Commandments published in Independence, Missouri, was changed, revised, and patched up until the Book of Doctrines and Covenants is no more like it than Catholicism is like Apostolic Christianity. These revelations were uttered by Joe by inspiration, published in the "Morning and Evening Star" as revelations. Published as revelations in the Book of Commandments. Then so re-modelled in the Book of Doctrines and Covenants that the printers who set up the first book would not recognize the second.

We charge Mormonism with blasphemy and presumption. It claims to act under the infallible inspiration of God, and work miracles. Book of Doctrines and Covenants. Its emissaries are pledged by the same authority to work miracles when it is demanded of them. Mormons profess to have intercourse with angels, that they fre-

quently see them and have intercourse with them. Mormonism claims to be the only true church, and that all others will be damned. Mormonism taught that God would send down a city from heaven, the New Jerusalem, into Missouri and that all Saints were to gather there under fear of divine wrath. Afterward they gathered under the same pretended revelation at Nauvoo. The prophecies about Missouri have all failed. Mormonism places its pretended revelations above the New Testament. That contained only the Gospel, their frauds contained the "Fullness of the Gospel." Mormonism threatens all who only accept the Bible and reject it with eternal damnation. Mormonism changes the terms of salvation laid down in God's word. God's word teaches that if men accept it and live it out in life they will be saved. Mormonism teaches that they must accept its frauds also, and even place them above the Gospel of Christ as the "fullness of the Gospel." We showed from the Book of Doctrines and Covenants that Mormonism is a scheme for enriching its knavish leaders. Mormonism teaches resistance to evil. Smith did so in his revelations. So does the Book of Mormon.

Mormonism, like spiritism and the animal excitements of negroes, mistakes abnormal, unhealthy frenzy for the work of the Spirit. It mistakes mere frenzy and nervous meretric excitement for the influence of the Spirit of God. Such delusion has ever led to frenzy, madness, crime and pollution. It did in Mormon excitements in Kirtland. It did in Missouri, Nauvoo. Spiritual wifery and polygamy are only the inevitable results of such ideas of the work of the Spirit as Mormonism teaches. Infidelity works with Mormonism for two reasons. It attempts to make out that Mormonism has as much evidence as Christianity. If men can be led to believe this and that Mormonism is the perfection of Christianity they will reject such a humbug as Mormonism and reject Christianity also. It wants to load Christianity with Mormonism to destroy Christianity. Again, when Mormonism is exposed it betrays its infidelity. It assails Christianity and the infidel wolf recognizes his brother wolf in sheep's clothing. No one fact connected with this debate has been more apparent than that. My opponent's infidelity will stare the reader of the debate in the face in nearly every speech.

The ease with which this fraud has been exposed, exploded in this debate will be a standing proof of the difference between it and Christianity. No such assaults can be made on Christ or on his teachings. The Bible is a wonderful part of the world's history, and has evidences that no other book has. It does not stand out apart from the world's history, like Gulliver's Travels, or the Book of Mormon. The discussion will illustrate the difference between the genuine, the Bible, and the counterfeit, the Book of Mormon. Mormonism re-hashes and even exaggerates infidel falsehoods about

the purity or the text of the Bible. That has been done in this debate. Any decent infidel would denounce as an ignoramus a person who would make such charges as have been made in this debate. When the vile character of the prophet and leaders have been exposed, it eclipses Ingersoll in his infidel attacks on the character of the Bible personages. Every unfair misrepresentation and sneer of infidelity has been repeated here. When its pretended miracles are exposed, it assails with more than infidel falsehood those of the Bible. That has been done in this debate. Sneers have been thrown out about "Jonah swallowing the whale." Yet this infidel system is the "Fullness of the Gospel." Its organization is the only true Church of God now on earth. Its infidel emissaries have the miraculous power of Spirit,—can work miracles—give revelations, and those who believe the Bible, and defend it, are apostates from the Bible; because they do not accept the lying frauds of these infidels. Infidelity recognizes its ally wherever Mormonism rears its head. There is never a debate with Mormonism, that infidelity in the place does not hurrah for the Mormon.

Mormonism had its origin in a scheme of a backslidden doubting preacher, to deceive the world, in pretending that he had dug a manuscript from the earth and translated it; that he might get money out of it. Some think that his stupid plagiarism of Bible style was intended as a deliberate caricature of the Bible. This intended fraud was stolen by a back-slidden sceptical preacher who blasphemously plagiarized the ideas and language of the Bible to re-model it into a pretended revelation, to make a "big thing out of it." It was given to the world by an infidel, an admirer of Paine, who was duping the superstitious and ig-

norant with pretences to witch for water, peep for lost treasures, etc. It has displayed its infidelity and hostility to the Bible all through its course. If an error of Mormonism was exposed it retorted with an infidel attack on the Bible. It assails the Bible to revenge the exposure that friends of the Bible have made of its fraudulent character. When we point out that it is destitute of the evidence that an inspired book should have, it re-hashes infidel falsehoods that the books of the Bible are no better. It asserts, in the face of all history, that the Books of the New Testament were composed two or three hundred years after Christ.

Mormonism is a hodge-podge of Mosaism, Mahomedanism, Methodism, Episcopalianism, Catholicism, Campbellism, Rigdonism, Smithism and Prattism, Infidelity, Mesmeric Power and Devilism. Infidelity was its father, ignorance and superstition was its mother, and like Milton's whoredom of Satan and Sin, the monstrous progeny has been death.

All who accept the Bible and believe that the Scriptures are given by inspiration, and are profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, and that by the Scriptures all children of God are made perfect, and thoroughly furnished unto all good works, will reject this monster Mormonism. All who accept Jesus as the only Divine Prophet, source of all teaching, their only Divine King, source of all law, will reject the backslidden, doubting Solomon Spaulding, the unprincipled, infidel Sydney Rigdon, the scoundrelly infidel pretender of Manchester, Joe Smith, with his stolen peep-stone. They will accept the one God, one Lord, one Spirit, one faith, one baptism, one hope, one body, one name of the religion of Christ.

CERTIFICATE.

I hereby certify that my speeches appear in this book just as I furnished them to the printer, without any restrictions whatever. I read all the proofs myself, and my speeches are printed just as I directed, without any change or restriction.

CLARK BRADEN.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

"KIRTLAND, OHIO, February 22, 1884.

"MAJ. J. H. GILBERT,

"Dear Sir: Kelley assailed your statement that the manuscript of the Book of Mormon lacked punctuation—as it came to you.

He got a telegram from David Whitmer, who claims that he has the original manuscript—that it is punctuated.

Will you please answer these queries:

I. As the manuscript was handed to you was it punctuated? If it was, to what extent?

II. Were the sentences commenced with capital letters. If so, to what extent?

III. Were there mis-spelled words? Were they frequent?

IV. Did you correct grammatical blunders to any extent?

Please to answer these queries, stating the facts in each case. Return questions, and answers. You can append your statement to this. Do not fail to do this, as Kelley has read what he wrote in "Saint's Herald," which is the reverse of what you told me. Answer as soon as you can.

"Yours,
"CLARK BRADEN."

"PALMYRA, February 27, 1884.

"MR. BRADEN,

"Dear Sir: Answer to questions

I. "Not a punctuation mark of any kind from beginning to end of manuscript.

II. "Sentences were not commenced with capitals: If they had been there would not have been so much difficulty in punctuation.

III. "The spelling was good. The word "travail" occurred twice in one "form" and was spelled "travel" in both instances. The copyist evidently not knowing the meaning of the word: and furthermore, Cowdery looked over the manuscript when the proof was read.

IV. "We were not allowed to correct any grammatical errors.

"If Mr. Whitmer claims that he has the manuscript that I used in setting up the Mormon Bible, and that it is punctuated and the sentences begin with a capital, I say it has been altered since it left my hands, or that he has not got the original.

"Mr. Kelley mis-represented me in every important particular in his article published in the "Saint's Herald" of Plano, Illinois. If Mr. Kelley has to resort to falsehood and mis-representation to defend Mormonism, he had better leave them and become an honest man if possible.

"Yours truly,
(Signed) J. H. GILBERT."

APPENDIX B.

"STATE OF NEW YORK,) ss.
Wayne County, }

"Samuel J. McIntyre being duly sworn, says: Since 1851, have been an attorney and Counselor practising in all the Courts of this State, and in the United States Courts. During all my life I have resided in the village of Palmyra, in this county, except from August 1862 to September 1865, when I was in the army, and am fifty-six years of age.

"I have been shown a letter of inquiry from Mr. Clark Braden of Kirtland, Ohio, and requested to answer the inquiries therein, as to Thomas P. Baldwin and his holding the office of Judge of Wayne County in 1833. Was also informed of the fact that our County Clerk had written to a Mr. Kelley, that no such person was Judge of Wayne County Court.

"To properly understand the matter, and perhaps explain the mistakes that have been made, let me preface, by stating that since the change in the constitution of the State in 1846, which took effect January 1, 1847, we have but one County Judge, and two "side judges," who are entitled "Justices of sessions." These two-side judges, are justices of the peace elected to the position of Justices of sessions. They sit with the County Judge in criminal trials, and form with him the Court of sessions. The County Judge is also elected.

"This constitution of 1846, made a radical change in the Judiciary all over the State, and of all Courts.

"Before the constitution of 1846, there were appointed in each County five Judges of County Courts, one of whom was designated as first Judge of the County, who presided at the Sessions. The other four sat with him as associated Judges. The first Judge was entitled First Judge of Wayne County Courts, and the others were entitled Judges of Wayne County Courts. Each of these Judges was appointed by the Governor, and confirmed by the Senate, and held office for five years. This was the order of things at the organization of this County in 1823.

"I find by the records in Wayne County Clerk's office which I have examined and also by the examination of authentic histories of Wayne County, that in February 1830 William Sisson was appointed First Judge of Wayne County Courts and that he held the office until February 1835 when he was re-appointed; and that during the same time Russell Whipple, Daniel Eddy, Thomas P. Baldwin and David Arne, Jr., were Judges of Wayne County Courts and acted as such from February 1830 to February 1835. The records of the Courts on file in the Wayne County Clerk's office at Lyons, New York, show them to have acted as such during this time. On file in said office are the appointments of these gentlemen to these offices under the hand of the Governor of the State (or rather of Enos T. Throop who was then acting Governor) with the Seal of the State attached. Certified copies of these papers can be obtained at any time from the Clerk of Wayne County.

"Either of these Judges of Wayne County Courts had the jurisdiction to take affidavits and acknowledgements.

"The Wayne County Courts in which these Judges sat was the Court of Common Pleas for the trial of civil matters of small amount, and hearing argument of appeals from judgments rendered by Justices of the Peace; and the Court of Sessions for the trial of criminal matters where the punishment was lower than imprisonment for life; also all five of these Judges sat with the Circuit Judge when he held a Court of Oyer and Terminer in the County which is a Criminal Court at which a Grand Jury sat and found indictments, and the Oyer and Terminer tried the criminal cases of a higher grade and all criminal cases that were not ordered by it to be tried at the Sessions.

"Therefore the propriety of the titles 'Judges of Wayne County Courts,' and not as now simply 'County Judge.'

"Thomas P. Baldwin was a lawyer and for a long time held the office of Commissioner of Deeds having authority to take affidavits and acknowledgements. In my practice I have seen a very large number of documents signed by him as Commissioner of Deeds and some as 'Judge of Wayne County Courts,' and in all cases he signed his name of 'Th. P. Baldwin.' His oaths of office on file in Wayne County Clerk's office are all so signed.

"After all this it is perhaps unnecessary to say that such a man as Thomas P. Baldwin lived and moved and had his being in Wayne county. Although young myself at the time spoken of I very well recollect the man. He was spoken of as 'Judge Baldwin' and 'Tom Baldwin.' His daughter (now Mrs. Breck of Greenfield, Massachusetts, near Springfield, Massachusetts) was here on a visit but a month ago to her half brother, William H. Cuyler of this place.

"Her father, Thos. P. Baldwin, married the widow of William Howe Cuyler who had two sons, Geo. W. Cuyler formerly President of the First National Bank of this place who is now dead, and Wm. H. Cuyler now living here. By this marriage there was the child Mary Baldwin, now Mrs. Breck. The widow of George W. Cuyler now lives in the place where Judge Baldwin formerly lived in this village.

"The letter of Mr. Braden was handed to me yesterday, and being very much surprised at learning from it that our County Clerk had written a letter containing such a mistake as to the judgeship of Thomas P. Baldwin, while on an errand to Lyons to-day I took pains to investigate and found that the letter of Mr. Kelley had been turned over to a young man in the office by the name of Van Marten who was utterly

ignorant of the changes of our judiciary and judicial system and knew of no Judges of Wayne County Courts except the County Judge of the present day or since 1816. I asked him to make a certificate of the facts after examining the records and documents and send to me, and hope to receive the same in time to accompany this.

"I have made this statement in a narrative form rather than in the strict form of a deposition as I thought it would be more easily understood.

"(Signed) S. B. MCINTYRE.

"Sworn to before me, February 27, 1884.

"(Signed) T. W. COLLINS,

"Wayne County Judge.

STATE OF NEW YORK, } ss

WAYNE COUNTY.

"William H. Cuyler of the village of Palmyra, New York, being duly sworn says, I am 72 years old, and have resided in this village all my life. I am the son of Major Wm. Howe Cuyler who was killed in the war of 1812.

"After my father's death, my mother married Thomas P. Baldwin and by him had one daughter, Mary, now Mrs. Breck of Greenfield, Mass."

"The wife of Joseph Smith, the father of the Mormon, nursed my mother at the birth of Mary Baldwin. I attended school with Joseph Smith the Mormon, and his brothers—particularly Alvin and William."

"Thomas P. Baldwin was a lawyer, held the office of Commissioner of deeds for a long time, and was one of the judges of Wayne County Courts from 1830 to 1835, being appointed to the position by Enos T. Throop, the Lieutenant Governor of the State then acting as Governor, as the Governor Martin Van Buren resigned in 1829, on being appointed Secretary of State under President Jackson.

"My step-father always signed his name 'Th. P. Baldwin'. He died early in the year 1853 at Greene Bay, Wisconsin and was buried there."

"(Signed) W. T. CUYLER."

"Sworn to before me February 27th 1884.

"(Signed) T. W. COLLINS,

"Wayne County Judge."

LYONS, NEW YORK, February 27th, 1884.

"I, J. M. Van Marten, Special Deputy Clerk of Wayne County, New York, do hereby certify that on or about February 1, 1884, and February 7, 1884, there were received at this office two letters, which are hereto attached, and in reply to the inquiry in the first letter, and to the first inquiry in the second letter, I replied substantially that no person named Thomas P. Baldwin was a judge of the County Courts of Wayne County, New York in 1833 or 1834, and that David Arne, Jr., was Wayne County Judge. When I made those statements I supposed the office of County Judge was always the same, in title and jurisdiction, as it is at present, i.e., one County Judge and two side judges, called Justices of Sessions.

"But I find upon investigation that prior to 1846, at which time the new State Constitution went into effect, there was appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate one person with the title of First Judge of the County, and four others 'Associate Judges,' who were each called 'Judge of Wayne County Courts.' I find by the records of this office that Thomas P. Baldwin of Palmyra and David Eddy of Marion, were on the 10th day of February, 1830, duly appointed by the Governor of the State of New York and confirmed by the Senate 'Judges of the County Courts of the County of Wayne.' Their commission is on file in this office, and it now lies before me. It was filed February 15th, 1830. I also find by the records of this office that the said Thomas P. Baldwin sat and acted as such Judge of Wayne County Courts during the years 1830, 1831, 1832, 1833 and 1834, the first Court at which he acted commencing June 14, 1830, and the last Court, September 8, 1834. I also find that prior to 1830 and after 1834 he was a Commissioner of Deeds in the town of Palmyra, in this County, and find his signature as such to a number of documents. In each case his signature is written thus: 'Th. P. Baldwin.'"

"He was a practising attorney at the time of the organization of this County in 1823, as I find by the list of attorneys and their signatures on file in this office of that date. I also certify that David Arne, Jr. was for a long time an associate Judge of the same rank and title as said Baldwin and acted as such Judge at the same time with Baldwin. I further find by the records of this office that William Sisson was the first Judge of the Courts of Wayne County from January, 1830, to February, 1835. When he was re-appointed as such judge, during that time the following were associate Judges, having the title of Judges of Courts of Wayne County,

viz: Thomas P. Baldwin, Daniel Eddy, Russell Whipple, and David Arne, Jr. And I will also add that at that time the oath of office was not always administered by the County Clerk.

"(Signed) M. J. VAN MARTEN,

"Special Deputy Clerk."

APPENDIX C.

Evidence taken in open Court before S. C. Carpenter, Esq., justice of the peace in and for the township of Kirtland, Lake county, Ohio, Lorenzo Fay, reporter. Taken on the 8th day of March, 1884, upon the matter of the faith and practices of the Re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and the reputation and moral character of certain of the prominent men of the church as existing in Kirtland, Ohio, and elsewhere, between the years of 1830 and 1844, by mutual agreement.

PRESENT:

Elder Clark Braden, representing the Disciple Church.

Elder E. L. Kelley, representing Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

J. J. Moss being produced, first being duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINED BY MR. BRADEN.

Q. Mr. Moss may state the time when he was teaching school here and the appearance of three Mormon preachers here, his attending meetings. What the facts are? A. I commenced teaching school in Kirtland, in the old red school house, just across the bridge that goes from the post-office on the road to Chardon on the right hand side, in the fall of 1830. The week that I commenced my school three Mormon preachers came from York State. If any one can tell me the time of the month I can get at the time. Two of these preachers I recollect, the other I do not. Parley Pratt and Oliver Cowdery I recollect. In the course of the winter I attended their meetings. The things that were stated last night in reference to the things that took place here are correct. On the side hill across the flat, east of the present mill at night, Black Pete and two white men went from a meeting in a log house on the flat and got up on to stumps, and were preaching to imaginary audiences.

John Taneur and myself were at the foot of the hill. John Taneur came from the State of New York with me, and when I took a school at the flats he took a school in the Newell district. He put his hands to his mouth and made an awful screech, when they all jumped from the stumps. The two white men ran angling down the hill, and black Pete ran straight down on the snow and ice, crying out, "Here we go, here we go." His feet slipped from under him, and as his seat struck the ground he sang out, "Oh God, here we go." He went back into the house, and they had some tomahawking, scalping and ripping up the bowels, and Indian talk; and that was the scene that night. I saw Black Pete in the orchard on the left hand side of the road from the post-office as you go to Mentor, or where the

road now goes to Painesville, There was but one house on that corner then; the orchard was just back of that house. Black Pete chased the Devil sometimes, and sometimes the Devil was chasing him around the stumps and apple trees. That I saw. I was called out of my school in to the shoemaker's shop of Mr. Cahoon—I do not remember his first name—right by the side of my school house. I left my school in charge of one of my largest scholars, went out after he called. I found his eldest son, I do not remember his first name, fighting with the Devil. I seems when I got in he had got a little the advantage of the Devil, and had him under, but still the Devil was trying to steal a march on him. He acted like a crazy man as much as anything else, and would say, "there you come; I see you." And when the Devil got pretty close to him he would jab his fingers at him and say, "Zick! Zick!" I went to my school room and called in eight or ten of my largest scholars, some young men and some young women, to witness the scene. He got the Devil at last in the corner where there was some old boots and shoes, jabbing his fingers at him—"Zick! Zick!" I slipped behind the scholars and got my foot behind an old shoe, and when the Devil was coming again I suddenly shoved it before him. He jumped about two feet high and ran down stairs out into the field, just back of the school house, and there was quite a number of stumps, and the Devil was after him; he dodged first around one stump and then another.

I believe I was the first person, with a young man, whose name I have forgotten, who was present when they took what was called the sacrament up at the Morley house. They were in the habit of turning every body out of the door when they partook of the bread and wine, putting blankets up at the windows, shutting off the sight from without. They started a regular pow-wow, and when they got well going, then they opened the door and let us all come in again. A young man and myself made it up that we would stay in unless they took us out by force. The young man got asleep, and I had a dumb evil and could not talk; but they did not carry us out but went on with the sacrament. The poor-house in Portage County, Ohio, where there were half a dozen insane and idiotic persons, was the best comparison of anything to the scene that night. And if I had had my cloak on I would have stolen the wine and carried it home to see whether it was drugged or not.

By Mr. Kelley: Q. I would like to know whether those three preachers, including Oliver Cowdery, were at the pow-wow? A. I do not think they were. I told them in the public meetings and on the street, that that was from the Devil, the Spirit of God had nothing to do with it. Some time after they got a revelation from Joseph Smith, and he said such conduct was from the Devil, and then they quit their performances. They believed him but they

would not believe me. They held meetings at the Morley Farm a good deal, and they used to invite people that came from abroad to stay all night, and it so happened by accident or some other cause, that all that stayed overnight were immersed by the Mormons before noon the next day, and after awhile they got to inviting some of the citizens of the vicinity to stay all night. Some of them I knew were bitterly opposed the day before, and they were immersed before noon. I made up my mind I wanted to stay all night. I asked some people who lived in the neighborhood how it happened "you did not believe in Mormonism yesterday and to-day you are a Mormon?" They said "Oh! If you had seen what I have seen, and heard what I have heard, you would believe as well as I." "What have you seen and heard?" "I can't tell." I then began to wear a long face, stopped arguing against the Mormons either on the street or in their meetings. So I got an invitation to stay all night, and that was what I was after. They came to me at the close of the meeting and said that there were so many that had come from abroad, and asked me if I would not wait till the next night. Before the third night came, Matthew Clapp, of Mentor, came all the way from there to see if he could not save me from Mormonism, and he cried over me and shed tears till he wrought upon my feelings and I told him what I was at, but I enjoined it upon him to keep it to himself until I got to stay there all night; but he told it, and before the third night came it got out; and I did not get a chance to stay there another night. And it was found out why I was wearing my long face, and that what I wanted to stay there for was to see if they had got angels there that appeared in the night that caused everyone that the angels appeared to go to the water the next day.

I stated that I had studied the black art, and leger-de-main once, and I knew just how those things were done. I can appear to you in a dark room or on a dark night as a living pillar of fire. That got noised all over the country, and that was the last of their inviting anybody to stay over night. The angel that held the lamp to baptize I did not see. I heard of it when I came to my school in the morning.

There is one thing more that I will state and then I think I am done with everything that is personal. In one of these meetings there was a young married woman that I was perfectly satisfied was making her own calculation to get the power and fall into my lap. I watched for it, and was looking for it and finally it came, and she came down with the power right into my lap, but she got up quicker than she came down. I guess the Mormons never knew how she got up so quick.

CROSS-EXAMINED BY MR. KELLEY:

Question. Who was it fell in your lap? Answer. I could not give the name now.

Q. When did you say that was? A. It was in the winter of 1830-31.

Q. Who was present at the time the lady fell into your lap? A. I could not tell that.

Q. What was Mr. Morley's first name? A. I can not tell that.

Q. Who did you tell that you supposed they had angels there? A. I told a good many people; I told Mr. Riggs who kept the hotel, and Squire Moss and Mr. Jones, who lived at the foot of the hill on the road that goes to Chardon, and Mr. Howe that lived opposite the school-house, and his wife.

Q. Why did you tell them that they kept angels there? A. Because I got that into my head.

Q. How did you know they had angels there? A. I did not say I knew it.

Q. What did you say they kept angels for then? A. I did not tell them it was so.

Q. Who was it that invited you to stay there the first night? A. I cannot tell that now. It is fifty-three years ago.

Q. Was this before or after Mr. Morley united with the church? A. The Mormon church you mean, I suppose?

Q. Yes, sir. A. It was after.

Q. What citizens do you know, who staid over night and were baptized the next day? A. I do not remember any of their names now.

Q. Can't you give one? A. No.

Q. How do you know it was the first time they staid over night? A. I did not say it was the first time they staid all night. I said they were invited to stay over night.

Q. You do not know but that they had been to the preaching a number of times before that? A. No, sir.

Q. Why did you think staying over all night, had anything to do with it? A. Because they that stayed over all night, most all joined.

Q. What were the names of some that were baptized? A. I cannot give you the names.

Q. You say that a short time after that Mr. Smith received a revelation that it was all from the Devil. A. Yes, sir, that was in the year 1830-1831.

And after they got that revelation there was no more scenes of that kind. A. No, sir.

Q. How long were you here? A. Five months.

Q. And that time was the time that they received a revelation of Joseph Smith? A. Yes, sir, they got that revelation at the time I was teaching school here. That was not the revelation I took out of Martin Harris's hat.

Q. How long before had the members you spoke of being in those conditions been members of some church? A. That I could not tell you.

Q. Was the Morley family all the members of the Christian church that joined the Saints? A. I did not know how many there were.

Q. Did not they have that same falling down before the preachers came. When they belonged under the Disciple faith? A. I cannot tell.

Q. How long before this had they been members of the Disciple church? A. I do not know how long they had been members; they were members when I came here, all of them.

Q. Was there any of our ministers around or about here when the Cahoon boy was acting as he was? A. No, sir, I think Cahoon had been ordained to some office in the church; I am pretty sure he was.

Q. Did you ever hear any of our preachers endorse such actions as that as being according to our faith? A. I do not know as I did? they were about here and knew as it was going on.

Q. Which ones were about here? A. Why, all three of them that came from York State. They were preaching around the country and were here occasionally when the things were going on.

Q. What time of day was it when the sacrament meeting took place? A. It was at night.

Q. How did they partake of the sacrament at the meeting? A. Passed bread and wine just as other folks do.

Q. How did they pass it? A. They passed it to the different members.

Q. Who passed it? A. I do not know whether they were called deacons or what kind of officers.

Q. What did they do previous to passing this? A. They gave thanks once or twice, and then they gave it to the members, and passed it around similar to the Disciples. I have no recollection, but it was the same as I have seen it, and if I had my cloak on I would have carried off the wine.

Q. Do you think that would have been right? A. Yes. That would have been just as proper as to carry off the revelation.

Q. Do you not know that it is the law of the church that they cannot use any wine except it is new wine? A. I do not know anything about it.

Q. Did you not know that they could not cast people out of the Sacrament? A. I know they did. I have seen them put people out.

Q. What did they do it for. Because they were making a noise? A. I do not know! may be you can tell.

Q. Did you not hear me read out of the Book of Mormon that they should not cast any one out of their sacrament meetings? A. I did not know what you read. I know what they did there.

Q. You did not know any of our ministers that were there? A. No sir. I did not know any.

Q. Now that girl that dropped in your lap. Had she been a member of the Disciple church? A. She was not a girl, she was a young married woman.

Q. You can remember how she looked, but cannot remember whether she was ever a member of your church? A. No sir.

Q. How long did you know her? A. Well I think I had known her four or five weeks at the meetings. I think I knew her only at the meetings.

Q. Who was presiding at the meeting at the time the woman fell into your lap? A. I do not know who was presiding at the time.

Q. What made her get up so quick when she fell? A. That is my business.

Q. How often did you hear Parley Pratt and Oliver Cowdery preach Mr. Moss? A. That I could not tell.

Q. Did you hear them a number of times? A. Yes sir.

Q. Did these preachers endorse any such actions that you say were practiced from time to time while they were about here? And did they endorse any such actions to you? A. No sir.

Q. Did they teach any such principles? A. They said it was the Holy Ghost.

Q. Then they did endorse those actions, and they told you those actions were the Holy Ghost? A. If endorse and declare are the same, and if actions are the Holy Spirit, then they endorsed it.

Q. When was that? A. I could not tell you.

Q. Did you hear any of those preachers declare that the falling down performances in the meeting was the influence of the Holy Spirit? A. Cahoon said so in the shoe shop.

Q. Did you hear them after that revelation came, preach against the falling down power? A. I heard the officers speak against it in private.

Q. Did you ever see their revelation? A. What revelation?

Q. The one Joseph Smith gave in regard to the falling down power? A. No sir.

Q. Can you identify that revelation if you heard what was in it? A. I never heard it but they said they had got a revelation that the fall down power was of the devil.

Q. Was all this transaction denounced as from the devil? A. That is what they said.

Q. You understand that? A. I did at the time.

Q. Why have you been telling it then as the practice of the church now? A. I did not do it.

Q. Why did you bring it into this controversy? A. I did not bring it into controversy, I was only telling what happened that year.

Q. It is just something that occurred by members that came out of the Disciple Church? A. Some of them were Disciples and some of them were Methodists.

Q. Was he a member of the Church? I mean Black Pete. A. He attended their meetings.

Q. Did you see him partake of the sacrament? A. I think I did. I could not swear to that positively.

Q. How old was Black Pete? A. He was about 20 to 25 somewhere. He was the one that was on the stump.

Q. What other preachers did you say were on the stump? A. I do not know their names.

Q. Was it either Pratt or Cowdery? A. It was neither.

Q. What is your business? A. Preaching.

Q. In what Church or Society? A. The Disciples or Christians.

Q. Were you ever here after you left in the early part of 1831? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When? A. I cannot tell the time it was; after the temple was finished.

Q. Did you ever meet any of our preachers after the year 1831? A. Yes, sir. I have had more debates with them than I have fingers and toes.

Q. Who did you debate with? A. I cannot give the names. I debated with one in Akron, N. Y., and one in Cincinnati.

Q. How long did you debate with them? A. Sometimes longer, sometimes shorter.

Q. Were they public debates? A. Yes, sir, public debates of course, but I do not remember the length of time.

Q. Can you not remember a single one? A. I cannot remember one man.

Q. Did you know Joseph Smith when he was here? A. I never saw him but once.

Q. Did you ever know anything bad about him? A. No, sir.

Q. Know anything about Parly Pratt bad? A. No, sir.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Did the Disciples ever to your knowledge, in any meeting, allow such things as you witnessed? A. No, sir.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. When were you in a Mormon meeting? A. The first time was in the Fall of 1830, I am sure. I cannot tell the last time.

Q. Did they call themselves Mormons? A. I think they did.

Q. Are you as positive of that as you are of any other statement you made? A. I will answer it emphatically that I am just as positive of that as I am of anything that I have said to-day, that they called themselves Mormons. I think I could go to Pittsfield, Ills., and bring members of the Mormon Church, that they will testify that they called themselves Mormons in my presence.

Q. What else did they call themselves at that time? A. I have no recollection of anything but Latter Day Saints.

Q. Did they call themselves Latter Day Saints at that time? A. I think they did.

Q. Are you positive of that? A. No, I am not positive of that.

Q. Are you positive that they called the Church the Mormon Church then? A. I am positive that I never heard them call it the re-organized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints until I heard it at this debate. That was the first.

Q. Now I will ask you if you were ever with those persons while they were members of the Disciple Church, and do you say you never saw them get into any of those freaks at the Christian Church at any time? A. No sir.

Q. Were you ever in the Christian Church with them? A. No sir.

Q. Then you did not know what they did

while they were Christians? A. You want to know whether I had any association with them before I knew them as Mormons, I answer, no. Those persons united with the Mormon Church so soon after I came here that I had no association with them at all.

Q. Elder Moss, do you know how those parties acted while members of the Christian Church? A. How many times do you want it answered.

By the Court: Yes, answer it.

A. I had no association with them before they were Mormons.

Q. You did not know then but what they acted in the same manner of falling down and receiving the power before they came into what they termed the Saint's Church. A. I have answered it three times.

Q. You do not know but what they had acted that way: do you, or do you not. A. I have answered that question three times. I had no association with them at all before they were Mormons.

Q. Did you think that the Devil was present when that fellow said "Zick?" A. I don't know as I did.

Q. Why did you say it was all of the Devil then, for? A. Because it was all Devilish things.

Q. Afterwards a revelation came to you that it was of the Devil? A. Yes, sir.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. You may state Mr. Moss, what Martin Harris said to you about seeing the Devil? A. He said he saw the Devil and he looked like a jackass, and he had hair like a mouse. I was present, there were from twenty-five to thirty persons present. It was in that brick house down on the flats.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. When was that? A. I could not tell.
Q. Who was there? A. Some of them were people of the world, and some of them were Disciples.

Q. You had an argument, did you not? A. Well, the general conversation was of the Latter Day Saints or Mormons, and that the Book of Mormon was a new revelation.

Q. Did he claim that the general form of the Devil was like a jackass? A. I did not ask him that question. I did not hear him say.

Q. How did he come to state that? A. I do not know.

Q. Was that in December or in the Spring of 1831? A. It was the first visit he made here, it was the winter of 1830-31.

Q. What was it that brought the expression out? A. I don't know.

Q. Did Martin Harris give that as a part of his faith, or was it a joke. Was he giving it as a joke? A. I do not think he was.

Q. He was giving his experience the reason he came to speak of it? A. That was what called it out, the general conver-

sation in reference to the truth of the Book of Mormon, and revelations, and as an evidence that he had revelations, he stated that the Devil appeared to him.

Q. Now, Mr. Moss did you hear Martin state that he had received revelations from the Lord, or make such a claim, or receive personal revelations from the Lord? A. He said he saw the Devil, he was giving us as an evidence of revelation or vision that he had seen the Devil.

Q. Were not the people running on him? A. I do not think they were, it was one of his revelations that the Lord had revealed to him.

Q. Did people laugh at him? A. I do not think there was any laughing, I do not remember. There may have been some laughing at one side. There was no laughing out loud. I am sure. But I smiled some out of one corner of my mouth.

Q. Did you ever hear Martin Harris preach? A. No sir, I have heard him talk sometimes.

Q. Did you ever hear Sydney Rigdon preach? A. Yes sir.

Q. Did you ever hear Parly Pratt preach? A. Yes sir.

Q. Did you suspect they were into something they ought not to be in? A. No, sir.

By the Court:

Q. Did Martin Harris carry that idea as a fact that the Devil was always in such a form as a jackass? A. I had no thought at the time that Martin Harris told that story to convey the idea that the jackass was the real form of his Satanic Majesty.

BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. Did you know the exact language that Martin Harris used? A. I do. The language was that he looked like a jackass.

Q. The idea from what he said did you take it that the Devil himself in his own region, in his own place, lived like a jackass? A. I did not get any such idea as that; that was the form in which he appeared to him.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Who immersed you, Mr. Moss? A. Sydney Rigdon, September, 1829.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. At that time did you suspect that he was into anything he ought not to be? A. No, sir.

(Signed:)

J. J. Moss.

STATE OF OHIO, } ss.
Lake County, }

Subscribed in my presence and sworn to before me this 13th day of March, A. D. 1881, at Willoughby in said county.

(Signed:)

J. C. WARD [SEAL.]
Notary Public.

William Smith, being produced and first being duly sworn, testified as follows:

EXAMINED BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Mr. Smith, will you please state how you came by that pike? A. Mr. Cluff gave it to me.

Q. What was he religiously? A. He was a Mormon.

Q. State the facts about the pike and how you came by it? A. Mr. Cluff was a neighbor of mine, and we exchanged work. I called on him for settlement, and discovered the pike in a corner by the door. I asked him what that was for. He said about the time the Methodist meeting house was burned we were afraid of being mobbed, and we armed ourselves for self-defense. I said if I had it I would make a reamer out of it, and when he left he gave it to me.

Q. You may state next, Mr. Smith, whether you attended the meetings of the Saints during the winter of 1830-31, and what you saw? A. I have attended the meetings at Mr. Morley's, I think the given name is Isaac. The buildings were upon a little flat, and if my memory serves me, when the people began to come there they put up a log cabin or small addition to the house part. I am sure I have attended those meetings, and my first attendance was when it began to be generally noised around that there was strange things done, and we young folks were curious to see what it was.

Q. You may state about the falling and what you saw in the meeting? A. I attended three or four at Isaac Morley's in the evening. I have heard Black Pete, as we called him, as he went over the hills halloaing and making strange noises, and the common report was that he was speaking in tongues and making speeches. And in the house I have seen young men and women seemingly unconscious and the folks said they had lain so for two days and they were there on their beds and nobody tried to prevent us looking at them, but we were not allowed to go into the room. That is all I have got to say with regard to the meeting.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. Have you been in those meetings?

A. Yes sir.

Q. Have you seen any display of power in the meetings? A. I have seen people lose their consciousness and fall off from their seats.

Q. Any other performances aside from this? A. No other performances in the congregation except those I have stated to you.

Q. Now was there any other performances or anything of that kind? A. Black Pete used to make a noise like Indians but I can not say how he made it. It was made close to me sometimes in the dark and sometimes in the moonlight. Report said it was Black Pete, I say we all thought so.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Have you ever seen them jump up in the air and go through the performance of scalping and so on? A. I never did, sir.

Q. You may state next about your speaking in tongues, and Sidney Rigdon interpreting? A. Shall I answer that question by itself or shall I go farther back?

Q. Did you ever speak in tongues and did any man interpret it? A. I do not think, sir, I ever spoke in tongues. I made some kind of a language.

Q. Did any man ever pretend to interpret it? A. Yes, sir, Sidney Rigdon.

Q. You may describe the circumstances connected with it. Tell what you did and what he did. A. The first that I ever heard of what was acknowledged to be a speaking with tongues was at a gathering a little West of here on this bank, not far from the house where old father Smalley used to live. I can not think of the man's name. People were in the habit of having what they called feasts and we would commonly have a short address as opening of the feasts, and the address would be from a text something like this, "And we shall have a feast of fat things. Wine on the lees well refined." I have quoted one of the texts. They generally had two pails of wine. It was called a feast. We had a tin cup and when the audience was convened and a speech made then with a cup in each pail they passed around the pails, the women on one side of the house and the men on the other, and we had as much wine as we wanted. Then we had a hymn and sometimes prayer. Then the wine would be passed around again, and then we would have cakes and wine and the outside people not wishing to sponge would take doughnuts in their pockets from their homes and everybody had access to them and was welcomed to what they wanted. After the cakes and wine had been passed it was the season then to speak with tongues and I spoke with the rest. Of course I heard the rest of them and I made such noises as the rest of them did; and somehow or other the story obtained that I had the power to speak with tongues. They had a meeting I think in an old log house on the Ayer's place. That was the first time, I think, I ever heard Rigdon interpret the unknown tongues. I talked in unknown tongues and others talked and he interpreted my speech. And allowing that Sidney interpreted what I said I never made so fine a speech in my life. Sidney said I had got beyond him. I have spoken a good many times before Rigdon and Smith.

Q. Did you ever see the patriarch Joseph? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever see the patriarch Joseph at any of these feasts when you thought he was under the influence of wine? A. I will say I could not tell. The old gentleman took a place in the corner. I do not know as I ever saw him set anywhere else when sitting at a feast, only in a corner. I do not know that I ever saw him leave his position.

Q. From Mr. Smith's appearance what was your belief with reference to his condition as to intoxication when you were at those feasts? A. I would not say that he was intoxicated.

Q. At the time Mr. Smith was sitting in the corner did he appear to be intoxicated?

A. I could not form any conclusion from the looks of the man.

Q. Did you know anything about their digging for treasure or money in this vicinity? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When was that done? A. I will fix the time if somebody will tell me when this temple was plastered. I burned the lime to plaster the inside of the temple for a man that belonged to the Church; that man's name I cannot think of. I was working for him by the month, and he set me to do that kind of work, and that was the hardest part of my month's work; the digging was done on what is now Mr. Tryon's farm.

BY THE COURT:

Q. What kind of treasure were you digging for? A. You will get the idea better to tell you how the man dug.

Q. Was it minerals of any kind or money treasure? A. I do not remember that the man told me what to dig for. But he took a little leather bag and he told me to dig. I would dig down about as deep as my shoulders and the water would come in, and then he would go there and set this way (stooping over and looking toward the floor) a little leather bag, a little bigger than my thumb, but not as big as a broom handle; there was something in the bag that the man was very choice of, and he kept it in a secure place. He would hold the string up to his eyes, and the bag would begin to vibrate, and whichever way it swayed the farthest that is the way he would dig. Then if we did not find anything he would use the bag again, and whichever way it swayed the farthest they would dig the farthest in that direction.

BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. You did not know what he was digging for, did you, Mr. Smith. A. No, sir.

BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Were there any other cases of digging that you know of? A. Yes, sir. There was an old lady that belonged to the Church, a widow Petingail, that had a vision that there was money buried on a hog-back covered with hemlock. Mr. Campbell brought her along the road near to my shop, when she pointed out the place she had seen in her vision, and they dug there.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. They were digging for money there? A. They were digging for money.

Q. Were any of the Church officials in that, Mr. Smith? A. Nobody but the old lady, I think.

Q. You did not know whether the man you was working for was digging for money or not? A. His term was this, that it was a treasure.

Q. Were any of the people around helping him? A. I could not say.

Q. Now don't you know that he was not digging under the direction of the Church? A. I don't know anything about it. I will say this, that we burned lime for the

Church, and some of them were there for lime twice a day, and there were a good many there that thought there was treasure there. I did not think there was any sanction of the Church.

Q. Did you not know of any person digging for money here before the Saints came? A. No, I don't know that there was.

Q. What was this gentleman's name that you were working for? A. I do not remember, he was an old gentleman. He was a man who had lost his wife. He had found a treasure, and it is true that he did discover a bank of horse bone lime.

Q. Was he a Mormon? A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long had he belonged to the church? A. Indeed, sir, I do not know.

Q. Now Mr. Smith give me your opinion, whether or not it was a kind of freak of his and he said something there that he thought he could see, and it was his eccentricity that you may find over the country, or was it anything according to his faith? A. I do not think I can form any opinion now.

Q. Did you think at the time it was his religion that made him do it? A. I do not know.

Q. Did not that report about money being buried make others dig besides the Saints? A. I never heard of them digging; my impression is there was some digging done where Mr. Smalley lived.

Q. Who was that digging down there where Mr. Smalley lived? A. I don't know anything about it, but report said Martin Harris caused it to be done.

Q. I will ask you to state with regard to these feasts, Mr. Smith, if they were not wedding feasts? A. No, sir. When they first started out they were attended weekly. It seemed to be a little expensive, so they did not have them quite so often. I think they had a gallon of wine or two, and they discontinued having them weekly and had them semi-monthly.

Was this a sacrament meeting? A. Oh, no! It was a feast.

Q. Did you belong to the church then? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever unite with them? A. No, sir.

Q. They never ever cast anybody out? A. No, sir, they had attractions that called young folks in.

Q. Did you see any immoral things in their meetings? A. Not immoral; but I have seen them jolly. They acted as though they felt good.

Q. Did you taste of the wine? A. Yes, I drank with the rest of them.

Q. How many glasses did you generally drink? A. About two; we were all of us young folks, and we behaved ourselves well. There was no bad conduct at the feast, and we had a good time.

Q. At the time you speak of speaking in tongues you had heard them speak in tongues at their meetings? A. Yes, sir.

Q. And your speaking was the representation of these sounds. A. I heard unknown tongues and I thought I could imitate them.

Q. And when Sydney interpreted you you do not know but what he actually interpreted? A. Sydney Rigdon said I spoke three languages. That my best language was Nephite.

Q. I will ask you to state the first time that you have heard anybody speak in tongues? A. I think it was here in Kirtland.

Q. Do you know the first man in the Church that was ever reported to have spoken in tongues? A. No, sir. I do not.

Q. You know it was some time after the church was organized before they professed to have that gift, do you not? A. Really I do not know when the church was organized. I know when the feasts were held, and about the time and it might have been the same season when they were plastering the temple. I cannot say I first took the thought from young boys getting up on a stump and speaking in tongues.

Q. Those cases where they seemed to fall over was it not sometimes from fainting through over-crowded houses, or something like that? A. I never saw it anywhere else. They were wholly unconscious, and some roguish boys would stick a pin into the arm and there was no manifestation of sensation.

Q. Did you ever know of such occurrences in any other church? A. No, sir.

Q. Did not such action occur in the Christian church? A. I do not know that they ever did in the Christian church.

Q. What is your business Mr. Smith? A. Nothing! I have no business.

Q. Are you a minister? A. No, sir.

Q. What church are you a member of? A. I am a member of the Christian church.

Q. You were quite well acquainted with Joseph Smith, the old gentleman? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did they try to force you into their religion? A. No, sir.

Q. Were Joseph Smith and Sydney Rigdon dishonest men? A. I do not know but what they were all right.

Q. Was this club or pike ever used by any of our people? A. Not that I know of.

Q. Do you know how many they had made? A. I do not know but they had those three and Mr. Cluff said we armed ourselves.

Q. At that time had not a number of the Saints left here? A. I could not answer that. He was going away, and that was the reason he said he did not want it?

Q. Had not a number gone before the church was burned? A. I cannot remember about that.

Q. Did you ever know Joseph Smith, or Oliver Cowdery, or Martin Harris to do any immoral thing? A. No, I never did. I never saw any of these things done. I never heard any complaint about Sydney Rigdon here in Kirtland. Oliver Cowdery's name was not so good, and Martin Harris was a good honest soul as you would wish to be with. Some said he was a little visionary. I heard him challenge Bro.

Moss here in the street for a debate, and Bro. Moss would not go in.

Q. I will now ask you, Mr. Smith, if sometime during the year directly after the temple was built, if there was not some members cut off for these peculiar freaks?

A. It might have been done, but I have no recollection of it.

Q. Did not you know the Parishes? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Perhaps you know of their being severed from the Church? A. I remember the name of the Parishes, as not a name to be desired. I cannot remember what was done with them.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, have you told the worst you know about the people and their worship. Personally have you told the worst you know about the people, commonly called the Mormons, while they were here? A. I have, and I could satisfy you that the Mormons called themselves Mormons.

Q. In regard to their acts, or their immoral acts, or what they did as to immoral conduct, do you personally know anything that would be derogatory to the Mormon character? A. I do not know that I have told the worst, I know I have tried to answer these questions.

Q. Are you afraid that if they should come back they would injure anybody? A. I would not like to have them come back. We kept our doors all locked, and somebody tipped over a smoke house and carried off nine hams. I did not know it was Mormons though. I say honestly this, I am afraid we should get the same impression that we did before. I would not like to have them carry on as they did before.

Q. Do you know whether it was them? A. No, sir. I say I do not.

Q. Are there others that lived around there then? A. Mr. Harmon and myself, that is about all I know of.

Q. Now, were you here last Spring when the Latter Day Saints were here? A. Yes, sir.

Q. You met with them here, and talked in their meeting? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did not you say, you welcomed them back? A. No, sir. Not to my recollection. I will tell you the first remark I did make when Uncle Wm. Smith had been speaking. He was a little older than myself, and I arose and said, Wm. Smith had better continue that subject a little longer, and then I said I think you are all wrong.

Q. Did you learn anything bad at that convention? A. No, I did not learn anything bad. I heard some foolish stories though.

Q. You hear things similar to what you hear in any testimony meeting? A. I will refer to one or two assertions of marvellous interpositions of Divine power raising the dead and healing the sick.

Q. You simply thought they were foolish because you did not believe such things? A. That was all.

Q. You would not have been in their meetings if you had thought them bad dur-

ing the time of the convention? A. Mr. Joseph Smith made the best temperance lecture that I have ever heard, and I "warned" to him as the German's say. He said "I would like to see the Garfield farm." I said "Why don't you get into some old wagon and go there?" He said "I would like to go to-morrow," and I said "I would come over and take him there;" and I came over and we went down there. I had a good ride with Joseph, and brought him back again; and the brethren thought it some thing wonderful. They said "Did he convert you?" I said I have been past praying for, for years. It was our good friend Mr. Blair that asked me the question.

RE-DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Is it your recollection or your impression, Mr. Smith, that you have heard of the sealing of women to men here in Kirtland, and the sealing of Nancy Rigdon to Joseph Smith? A. My impression is I have.

Q. You have heard it spoken of and talked of here? A. My impression is I have.

RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. KELLEY:

Q. Did you ever hear it talked of while the Saints lived here? A. I say I have heard it talked of. My impression is that I have heard it talked of here in Kirtland, and that the story obtained that the difficulty between Joseph Smith and Sydney Rigdon was in consequence of the wish or the manifestation on the part of Joseph Smith that Rigdon's daughter Nancy should be sealed to him.

Q. Will you say that was between Joseph Smith and Rigdon, and that it was a difficulty occurred here in Kirtland. Who did you hear talk about their having trouble here in Kirtland? A. I cannot tell.

Q. Was it any of the Saints? A. I can not tell you that.

Q. Do you not know, Mr. Smith, that there was not any report of any such thing as that as of Nancy Rigdon being sealed to Joseph Smith while the Saints were here in Kirtland? A. My impression is that that report was here in Kirtland. I went to school with Athalia Rigdon, and there was talk among the boys about sealing. I think there was difficulty between Joseph Smith and Rigdon with reference to having Rigdon's daughter sealed to Smith. I would not positively say it was so; that is my impression.

Q. How old was Nancy Rigdon at that time? A. I do not know; I went to school with Athalia Rigdon.

Q. How old was she? A. I cannot tell. Nor can I tell how old I was. Nancy Rigdon was the oldest. I do not know how much older than Athalia.

Q. Did you ever hear any of them talk about sealing? A. Yes, I am positive that I heard that language used among the boys.

Q. Did they not talk about the sealing of the Holy Spirit? Is not that what you heard them talk about? A. No, the sealing was in some way or other with the

women. My impression is that I have heard that story of the quarrel between Rigdon and Smith talked of here in Kirtland.

Q. Is it not probable that they were talking those things after they went to Nauvoo? You got it mixed. A. It may be, but I give you my best recollection.

(Signed:) WM. S. SMITH.

STATE OF OHIO, } ss.
Lake County. }

Subscribed by Wm. S. Smith, and sworn to before me this 15th day of March, A. D. 1881, at Willoughby.

(Signed) J. C. WARD,
Notary Public.

APPENDIX, No. 2.

EVIDENCE OF WITNESSES PRODUCED ON THE PART OF E. L. KELLEY.

REUBEN P. HARMON, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:

Q. What is your age Mr. Harmon? A. I am 69 years old.

Q. How long have you lived in the vicinity of Kirtland? A. I came to Kirtland in the year 1822; I have been absent part of the time in the South, perhaps six years during that time; part of the time here and part of the time in the South.

Q. Were you acquainted with Martin Harris while he lived here? A. I was, sir.

Q. Were you acquainted with his reputation for truth and veracity when he lived here? A. I was.

Q. State what that was. A. It was good, so far as I knew, sir.

Q. What was his reputation for honesty? A. He frequently came to my house, and very frequently stayed over night; sometimes two or three days.

Q. How often did you see him, and for how many years did you know him? A. I knew him most of the time until he went west to Salt Lake or Utah.

Q. About how many years ago was that? A. It is a good many years, and I would have to figure up from the dates. It is quite a number of years ago.

Q. What was his general reputation for honesty. A. I have never heard his character for honesty questioned by any one.

Q. Were you personally acquainted with Oliver Cowdery. A. I was but not as intimately as with Martin Harris.

Q. How long did he live here? A. I should think about six years, but I am not positive.

Q. Did you know what his general reputation for truth and veracity in the neighborhood was at the time he lived here? A. I did, and the whole Cowdery family; Oliver Cowdery's reputation was good.

Q. Did David Whitmer live here, or did you know him? A. I did, and I never heard anything against him.

Q. Were you acquainted with Joseph Smith? A. I was acquainted with him.

Q. You may state anything you know

about his conduct as being bad. A. I never knew anything bad about him.

Q. How long were you acquainted with him. A. Well, I can't give the dates. It might trouble me to give dates. From the time he came here till he went West.

Q. Did you know what his reputation was as to truth and veracity in this place at the time? A. I had opportunity of knowing it.

Q. Did you know? A. Yes, sir, I did know.

Q. What was that reputation? A. I regarded that it was good.

Q. What was his reputation for honesty? State that. A. I never heard it questioned.

Q. Did you belong to the church? A. I did not belong to any church.

Q. Now I will ask you to state with regard to the people known as Mormons, or Latter Day Saints, who lived here at that time. What was their general character as compared with people of other neighborhoods, Mr. Harmon? Just state how the people here compared with people in other places. A. If I was to state what I know, I would say that I had no right to question their honesty. I have heard reports, but I do not know anything against them.

Q. Mr. Harmon, was Mr. Harris's word always considered reliable in matters of religion? or did he tell big yarns and wonderful stories? A. He held ideas that I did not agree with.

Q. Well did he not tell extravagant stories of wonderful visions of sights and sounds? A. I never heard him tell many stories. With regard to his testimony about seeing the plates, and Joseph Smith, and the method of translation, some might think them extravagant stories.

Q. Would you regard his statements as visionary? A. I would, that is some of them.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Harmon, if these stories that you regarded as visionary, were stories about visions, and whether that is the reason you call them so? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Were his stories any more extravagant than others have stated with regard to visions, etc., in your estimation? A. About the same. John Wesley makes more extravagant expressions than I ever heard Harris make, as found in his work.

Q. Do you set Martin Harris with the rest of them? Was he honest? A. I always must regard him as being honest with regard to the Book of Mormon and its translation; and I do not know but that he was honest in his visions. I think that he was honest in his visions.

Q. Did you know Sidney Rigdon? and when did you first know him? A. I think I knew Sidney Rigdon in 1828 or 1829. He was then preaching in Mentor; preaching what we call Disciple doctrine. He came to my father's and held meetings in his barn, and baptized quite a number.

Q. How long afterwards did you know him? A. I knew him all through. Most of the time till he left Kirtland.

Q. What was his reputation for truth

and veracity in this vicinity? A. I never heard it questioned.

Q. What was his character other than for truth and veracity? A. I shall have to go into the description of the man. I heard him preach a funeral sermon in 1829. I heard him preach frequently after that. He is a man, I should judge, who had acquired a classical education. I would regard him as a good English scholar, and, perhaps, as well versed in the Bible and history as any other man that I ever heard speak; having read Grecian and Roman history, he frequently used descriptions from these authors. He was eloquent in language, and an excellent speaker, and carried an audience with him. He established a church in Mentor, also came and held a revival in Kirtland. The meeting-house, a one-story building, was completed in Mentor at the time when Oliver Cowdery and Parley P. Pratt came on here. I heard Sidney Rigdon the last speech that he made while he officiated as a Disciple preacher. He said he had been mistaken all his life-time, and he quit preaching and went into Mr. Morley's field and went to plowing. Worked at common labor for some time, until he took up the Latter Day Saint doctrine and began to preach it. He did not go to preaching right away after he left the Disciple church. I heard him make the remark that he never expected to speak in public again. There was quite a church of the Disciples here in Kirtland, and he carried a portion of them with him into the Latter Day Saints' church. He preached that doctrine from that time on until he left here. I considered him a good Latter Day Saint member.

Q. What is your opinion from what you saw and heard of him, in regard to the story that he was connected with Joseph Smith in getting up the Book of Mormon? A. I never could make out in my own mind that Mr. Rigdon ever had anything to do with the getting up of the Book of Mormon.

Q. Do you think there was an opportunity for Mr. Rigdon to have had access to Spaulding's manuscript at the time the Book of Mormon was gotten up? A. At that time he was preaching in Mentor.

Q. Did you ever hear him state his own views as to whether he ever had any connection with Smith and the Spaulding story, as it was charged to him? A. I heard him make this remark in his last speech that he made to the public here. He said, "It was a thing that I never thought of until Oliver Cowdery and Parley Pratt introduced it to me." When all of these stories first started about his having been connected with Smith, and the getting up of the Book of Mormon, they were first circulated by a man by the name of Hurlbut. He raised a little contribution in order to go to New York state, and inquire into the matter. He was a man of bad character, and I think he had been connected with the Latter Day Saint Church. We made up a contribution and sent him back to Palmyra to investigate the character of the

Smith family, and the means of their acquiring the Book of Mormon. He went on and got affidavits. The meeting was held in the Presbyterian church.

Q. Were you in the meeting and one of the parties who helped to send him? A. Yes, sir; but I will say, however, that Sidney Rigdon at the time he made his last speech here, said that he knew nothing about the Book of Mormon until it was presented to him by Oliver Cowdery and Parley Pratt. I never heard of the Spaulding story until it was sprung on me.

Q. Did you know anything about Hurlburt getting the manuscript? A. No, sir. We sent him to get the affidavits. He got the most of them in Palmyra. The principal ones are in a book that I have over here.

Q. Is it the affidavits in Howe's book that you refer to? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you know about these same parties sending him to New York to get a manuscript? A. They sent him to gather all the information he could about the Latter Day Saint Church.

Q. Did he get the affidavits first, or the manuscript? A. He did not get the manuscript at all, that I know of. I never saw the manuscript. He said he saw a man who had read the Book of Mormon, and that he said that it resembled the manuscript.

Q. Did you see him after he returned from the widow of Solomon Spaulding, where he went to get the manuscript? A. No, sir.

Q. Were you ever in the Saints' meetings while they were held here in Kirtland? A. Oh! Yes, sir.

Q. Did you ever see anything disorderly or unbecoming in them? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever attend any of the meetings of the Disciple church? A. I was in the meetings of the Disciples that were held on Mr. Morley's farm. A man by the name of Billings preached. The first ceremony that I remember witnessing was the washing of feet. It was in a little log building, the Disciple church. It was while Mr. Rigdon was preaching in Mentor. Afterwards I frequently went to their meetings that were held on the Morley place.

Q. Did you ever hear Rigdon shout or anything of that kind? A. I never heard him make any other demonstration than a plain address.

Q. When you attended the early meetings of the Saints, how did they act? A. After the discovery of the Book of Mormon there were frequently meetings around here and a large concourse of people attended them. Many came out of curiosity. They had singing and praying and a little preaching, and sort of social meetings.

Q. Would any of the women or men have the power? A. This negro, Black Pete, that they spoke of came here at an early time with a man from Pennsylvania. I saw him in that condition in a log building lying on his back.

Q. Was he a member of the Latter Day Saint church? A. I do not know.

Q. Did you ever see any one else in that condition in their meetings? A. No, sir; only this negro. He would jump up and display a great deal of strength and activity.

Q. Was any of the ministers present. A. I do not think there was. I did not hear of any more of such performances after Joseph Smith came here.

Q. Did you ever see anything of the kind in the meetings held by Parley Pratt, Oliver Cowdery or Sidney Rigdon, after Rigdon united with the Saints? A. No. I have heard them talk in tongues some, and heard Joseph Smith interpret once.

Q. Did you ever see any one fall down in their meetings after Joseph Smith came here? A. No, sir, I did not. I attended their large meetings, and when there was a sacrament of cold water and bread.

Q. You were well acquainted with the people, were you? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Tell us what you know about any one of them having more wives than one? A. If Martin Harris can be regarded as authority there was no such thing as polygamy among them until they went to Salt Lake. He told me so. There was nothing of the kind here that I ever heard of. I have heard them speak against polygamy.

Q. Would you be afraid that your property would be insecure if the Latter Day Saints were to come back here? A. No, I never was afraid of my neighbors taking my property, and I would not be of them.

REUBEN P. HARMON.

A. E. SANBORN, having been produced and duly sworn, testifies as follows:

Q. Mr. Sanborn, where do you live? A. I live about a mile East of here.

Q. How long have you lived here? A. About 47 years.

Q. Were you acquainted with the Latter Day Saints at the time they lived here? A. Yes, sir; and before they came here.

Q. Were you acquainted with Martin Harris? A. Yes, sir, I was.

Q. Did you know his reputation for truth and veracity in the neighborhood when he lived here? A. I never heard it questioned.

Q. Was his reputation good or bad? A. It was good. Nobody disputed his word in anything, unless it was his visionary stories. He was, to my mind, a little visionary.

Q. You may state if it was not on account of what he related about seeing the plates that makes you think he was visionary. A. Why, yes, I should think so.

Q. Were you personally acquainted with Oliver Cowdery? A. No, sir.

Q. Were you personally acquainted with Joseph Smith? A. Yes, sir. I was acquainted with Joseph Smith.

Q. Do you know what his reputation was for truth and veracity at the time he lived here in this neighborhood? A. At the time he lived here until the time he went west (he went before I did) it was not questioned. I lived just across the street from him in Nauvoo.

Q. You may state all you know about him. A. Well, I knew him to be a kind, generous and truthful neighbor; he was a very kind man.

Q. What was his general moral character? A. It was good.

Q. Were you acquainted with Sidney Rigdon? A. Yes, sir. He lived pretty close to Smith. Probably fifteen rods away.

Q. What kind of a man was Rigdon? State as nearly as you can describe him? A. Well, he was quite a good looking man; would weigh about 200 pounds; had rather a round face, shortish countenance and squeaking voice. For that reason I never liked to hear him preach. Some called him a good orator, but I did not. I never knew anything about him but what was all right as to character.

Q. What was his reputation for truth and veracity? A. I never heard it questioned, either here or in Nauvoo, and I lived there close by him, and talked with him nearly every week.

Q. Did you know David Whitmer? A. I do not recollect him. If he lived in Kirtland I do not recollect him at all.

Q. Were you living at Nauvoo at the time of Smith's death? A. I lived there until the fall of 1810, and then I came back here to Kirtland.

Q. Were you living here all the time the Saints were here? A. Oh, no. They were here when I came. This temple was built in 1834. I came in the spring, and I think it was dedicated in the spring of 1836. I have been a little confounded. I supposed the temple was dedicated when it was finished. This is all I recollect about it. I came here the spring it was dedicated, and think it was in 1836.

Q. What did you know of the people when you lived here, if anything that was immoral? A. I do not know anything. There was some stealing going on at the time the Mormons were here. It was laid on the Mormons by some at the time; but afterwards there was a revival here in the Presbyterian church, in which the parties that did the stealing owned to it. They were Presbyterians.

Q. State whether they were in the practice of polygamy here or not? A. Not that I knew of.

Q. You would have known it if they had been, would you not? A. I ought to, my father was a Mormon.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Mr. Harris' word and honor was regarded good in matters of business, but when telling his religious experience you thought him visionary? A. We rather thought him visionary.

RE-DIRECT:

Q. During your acquaintance and intimate association with Sydney Rigdon, what was your judgment with reference to his being connected with the Book of Mormon before its publication? A. I do not know anything at all as to that. I had this

Anti-Mormon Book 40 years ago, but I can not find it now.

Q. Did you ever gather from any conversation you had with Rigdon that he was connected in any way with the publication of the Book of Mormon? A. I never talked with him anything about that.

Q. State what you know about the introduction of polygamy into the church. A. I attended meetings both in Nauvoo and here in Kirtland, both in the evenings and on the Sabbath, and I never heard anything of polygamy at all until after Smith's death.

A. E. SANBORN.

J. M. PLAISTED, being duly sworn, testifies as follows:

Q. Mr. Plaisted, how long have you lived here in Kirtland? A. I have always lived here. I was born in Kirtland. I was born in 1831.

Q. Were you acquainted with any of the Latter Day Saints while they lived here? A. I was well acquainted with Martin Harris at the time he lived here.

Q. Do you know what his reputation for truth and veracity was in the neighborhood at the time? A. It was good.

Q. What was his general character as to honesty? A. It was considered good. I was well acquainted with him. Have lived in the same house with him.

CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BRADEN:

Q. Was he noted for his extravagant claims and extravagant stories in religion? A. Yes, sir. He always wanted to be preaching. That seemed to be on his mind. He understood the Bible first-rate and was quoting Scripture a good deal of the time.

RE-DIRECT.—

Q. Did it not arise from the fact that he had told that he had seen the plates? A. I think it did.

Q. He said he had seen the plates and other people thought he had not? A. Yes, sir; I have heard him say that the Lord appeared to him.

Q. In what manner did he say the Lord appeared? A. I do not know as I can state. I have told him that he would go crazy if he did not quit talking on that subject all the time.

(Signed)

J. M. PLAISTED.

EZRA BOND, being duly sworn testifies as follows:

Q. Mr. Bond, were you acquainted with Sidney Rigdon? A. Yes, sir; I was.

Q. You may state at what time you became acquainted with him? A. In the year 1834.

Q. How long afterwards did you know him? A. I could not state definitely, but during the years of his sojourn here. I think from the fall of 1834 to 1836. In fact, until he left here. This has been my home from that time until now.

Q. You may state if you know what his reputation was for truth and veracity. A. I cannot say. I was but a boy at that time, eight years old.

Q. Were you acquainted with Martin Harris? A. Yes, sir. In the years after, while he resided here.

Q. What time was that? A. From 1834 until he left. I do not know when that was.

Q. You frequently met him during the time that he was here, did you? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you know what his reputation was for truth and veracity in this neighborhood while he lived here. A. He was considered a truthful man. I have had some deal with him, and always found he acted honest and manly. That is my testimony in that respect. He might have been liable to be mistaken, but with no intention of telling an untruth.

Q. The people did not believe his statement about seeing the plates and the angel? A. No, sir. He was regarded as a kind of an enthusiast, or monomaniac on the religious question.

Q. Was he in the habit of making extravagant statements? A. He was in the habit of stating that the Lord had told him this or that thing. He seemed well versed in the scriptures, and was over anxious to give his opinions, and would talk to any one who would listen to him.

Q. Were not his sayings thought extravagant, because they pertained to visions, or hearing the voice of the Lord? A. Yes. People did not believe in such things. He was regarded in business as an honest and truthful man. I have known people that knew him in New York state and here, and that is the reputation they gave of him regarding business.

Q. Mr. Bond, you have been in the Saints' meetings here during the time of your living here, have you not? A. Yes, sir.

Q. State if you ever saw them fall down, act senseless, or anything in that way? A. No, sir.

Q. How old were you in 1832? A. I was born in 1826. I remember Sidney Rigdon better than any one else, as he was their foremost speaker. He spoke in the temple a great deal.

(Signed) EZRA BOND.

F. C. RICH, being duly sworn testifies as follows:

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Rich? A. In the city of Cleveland.

Q. Did you ever live in Kirtland? A. Yes, sir. I came here in 1831.

Q. Did you know, or were you acquainted with Joseph Smith, Martin Harris and Sidney Rigdon, or either of them? Did you know their reputation for truth and veracity in the neighborhood at the time they lived here? and were you acquainted with their moral character? A. I knew nothing against them. I was but a boy however, but the outsiders persecuted them on account of their religious views.

Q. You had an opportunity to know? A. Yes, sir; my father was here in an early day and was connected with the church.

Q. Were you in their meetings frequently? A. Yes, sir. Brought right up in the church. The first meeting I recollect very much about was after the temple was finished. I attended meetings right along after it was completed. I was too young during its building to take any particular notice outside.

Q. Did you ever see anything of an immoral tendency in the meetings? A. Nothing that could be considered immoral. They shouted Hosannah, and seemed to enjoy their religion; and, of course, got excited as other people do.

Q. Did you ever see them fall down and go into fits, or anything of that kind? A. No, sir.

Q. You may state what you know about any of the leading men being temperate or intemperate men; also in regard to their swearing, or drinking, or anything of the kind. A. They were men of good moral habits and temperate. Men that did not drink ardent spirits at any time.

Q. What time did you live here? A. I lived in Kirtland from a boy 10 years old until about ten years ago. I came here before the temple was built. I never heard of the spikes referred to before.

Q. Did your father ever have such a thing as a spike; such as Braden has shown? A. I never saw any spike. I do not think he required any.

Q. Mr. Rich, if the spikes had been very common around would you not have been likely to have known it? A. I suppose I should; would have been very apt to, I think.

Q. You may state whether they believed in having more than one wife? A. I never heard they were in favor of anything of the kind here.

Q. You heard them talk with your father, heard the elders preach, was in their meetings, and mixed with them in all the affairs of life; if there had been anything wrong or bad in their teachings and habits would you not have known it? A. I am perfectly satisfied that the church did not teach or practice polygamy, or any other immoral doctrine while they were in Kirtland.

(Signed) F. C. RICH.

STATE OF OHIO, }
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA. } ss.

The above named F. C. Rich, being duly sworn, says that the foregoing statement to which he has subscribed his name is true in substance and in fact.

(Signed) F. C. RICH.

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 10th day of June, A. D. 1884.

(Signed) ALEX. ELMSLIE,
Notary Public.

I, S. C. Carpenter, a Justice of the Peace in and for the township of Kirtland, Lake county, Ohio, do hereby certify that the above named Reuben P. Harmon, A. E. Sanborn, Ezra Bond and J. M. Plaisted were

by me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; that the foregoing depositions by them respectively subscribed were reduced to writing by Mr. Fay in my presence on the 8th day of March, A. D. 1884, at Kirtland in the county and state aforesaid; and by said witnesses respectively subscribed in my presence.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand this 11th day of June, A. D. 1884.

(Signed) S. C. CARPENTER,
Justice of the Peace.

APPENDIX, NO. 3.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, March 1, 1884.

DAVID WHITMER, ESQ., RICHMOND, MO., *Dear Sir:*—A person by the name of J. H. Gilbert, at Palmyra, N. Y., claims, I am told, that he set the type for the Book of Mormon and that there were no capital letters beginning sentences and proper names in the printers' manuscript; and if there are any in now they have been put in since.

Will you please examine the manuscript in your possession, which you claim to be the original of the Book of Mormon, and ascertain as to whether there are capital letters, and whether, if there are such, they are in the original writing? Or have they been placed in since?

Does the manuscript show any marks of having passed through the printers' hands? You will oblige by answering at once, as I desire to get the facts in the matter. It is also claimed that Oliver Cowdery denied his testimony.

Very Respectfully,

E. L. KELLEY.

APPENDIX NO. 4.

RICHMOND, MO., March 3, 1884.

E. L. KELLEY, *Dear Sir:*—Yours of 1st received. In answer to your first question. First, the capitals are in the first writing; Second, they are the manuscripts used by the printer and bear unmistakable evidence of the printer's using them, as many of that profession have attested. Oliver Cowdery never, to my knowledge, denied any part of his testimony, on the contrary, as I have done, protested against every fabrication made by designing persons and parties and emphatically testified, as written in the Book of Mormon, until death which occurred in this place. His wife and child yet living furnish one of the best pictures of a living faith in what their father testified to before death, as written in the Book of Mormon.

DAVID WHITMER.

APPENDIX NO. 5.

TESTIMONIAL OF CITIZENS.

We, the undersigned citizens of Richmond, Ray county, Missouri, where David Whitmer, Sr., has resided since the year 1838, certify that we have been

long and intimately acquainted with him and know him to be a man of the highest integrity, and of undoubted truth and veracity:

(Signed)

A. W. Doniphan.

G. W. Dunn, Judge of the Fifth Judicial Circuit.

T. D. Woodson, President of Ray Co. Savings Bank.

J. T. Child, Editor of "The Conservator."

H. C. Garner, Cashier of Ray Co. Savings Bank.

W. A. Holman, County Treasurer.

J. S. Hughes, Banker, Richmond.

James Hughes, Banker, Richmond.

D. P. Whitmer, Attorney at Law.

Jas. W. Black, Attorney at Law.

L. C. Cantwell, Postmaster, Richmond.

George I. Wasson, Mayor.

Jas. A. Davis, County Collector.

C. J. Hughes, Probate Judge and Presiding Justice of Ray County Court.

George W. Trigg, County Clerk.

W. W. Mosby, Doctor of Medicine.

Thomas McGinnis, ex-Sheriff, Ray County.

J. P. Quesenerry, Merchant.

W. R. Holman, Furniture Merchant.

Louis Slaughter, Recorder of Deeds.

Geo. W. Buchanan, M. D.

A. K. Reymann.

Given at Richmond, Mo., this March 19th, 1881."

APPENDIX NO. 6.

KIRTLAND, OHIO, Jan. 31, 1884.

HON. CLERK OF COURTS, WAYNE COUNTY, N. Y., *Dear Sir:*—Will you please turn to your records and ascertain for me information upon the following questions, to-wit:

First, was there an officer in your county in the years 1833 or 1834, by the name of Thomas P. Baldwin, who was a Judge of the County Courts?

Second, was there an office of your county with that title during the year 1833, or was his title, Judge of Courts of Common Pleas?

If it should take time to examine, or turn to your records to ascertain these facts, I will gladly remit to you the expense of the trouble, if you will designate the same by return mail.

Very Truly,

E. L. KELLEY.

APPENDIX NO. 7.

KIRTLAND, OHIO, Jan. 31, 1884.

JOHN MCGONIGAL, ESQ., LYONS, N. Y., *Dear Sir:*—Yours of Feb. 1st, in answer to inquiries is at hand.

Enclosed find fee, 50 cents, and 50 cents for troubling you additionally.

Can you tell me who was the Judge of your County Court in the year 1833, if anybody?

Was there a Justice of the Peace in your county in the year 1833 by the name of Fredrick Smith?

You need not examine for either of these for any other year except 1833; but I wish to be certain as to this year, as the matter is an important one.

Thanking you for your prompt reply, and hoping to again hear from you, I am,

Very Truly,

E. L. KELLEY.

[For answers to Nos. 6 and 7, see book.]

The matter set forth in Appendix "A, B, and C," and in Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, is by mutual consent.

E. L. KELLEY,

CLARK BRADEN.

Handwritten text, possibly a name or title, located in the top left corner.

Handwritten text, possibly a date or a short note, located in the middle left area.

BP871 .K29
Public discussion of the issues between

Princeton Theological Seminary, Speer Library



1 1012 00037 8937