



Type: Book Chapter

---

## Objections to the Book of Mormon (continued)

Author(s): B.H. Roberts

Source: *New Witnesses for God: Volume III - The Book of Mormon*

Published: Salt Lake City; Deseret News, 1909

Pages: 407-460

---

---

## CHAPTER XLVI.

### OBJECTIONS TO THE BOOK OF MORMON (continued).

#### I.

#### *Errors of Style and Grammar.*

One of the chief objections to the Book of Mormon from the first has been the uniformity of its literary style, and the defects in its language—errors in grammar, New York Yankee localisms, and the use of modern words—unwarranted, it is claimed, in the translation of an ancient record. Alexander Campbell, in his attack upon the Book of Mormon, 1831, on this subject, said:

The book proposes to be written at intervals and by different persons during the long period of 1020 years, and yet for uniformity of style there never was a book more evidently written by one set of fingers, nor more certainly conceived in one cranium since the first book appeared in human language, than this same book. If I could swear to any man's voice, face, or person, assuming different names, I could swear that this book was written by one man. And as Joseph Smith is a very ignorant man and is called the "Author," on the title page, I cannot doubt for a single moment but that he is sole "Author and Proprietor" of it.

He then proceeds to point out the same idioms of speech in the preface to the first edition—the Prophet's own composition, of course—in the testimony of the witnesses, and in various parts of the Book of Mormon proving, as he claims, unity of style and identity of authorship for the various books that make up the volume. He points out a large

number of errors in grammar, also, a number of supposed anachronisms, modernism, etc., giving the pages where the defects occur. Indeed, so ample was Mr. Campbell's criticism on this point, that he has furnished the materials for this argument against the Book of Mormon which has been repeated by nearly all subsequent writers. Howe, for instance, takes up the refrain in this manner:

The style of the Book of Mormon is *sui generis*, and whoever peruses it will not have doubt but that the whole was framed and written by the same individual hand.<sup>a</sup>

Then follows quotations which he regards as justifying the conclusion.

Professor J. B. Turner of Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois, in his "Mormonism in All Ages" follows in the same strain and uses like illustrations.<sup>b</sup>

So also John Hyde in his "Mormonism." He perhaps is more elaborate in his criticism on this point than any other Anti-Mormon writer excepting Campbell.<sup>c</sup>

Samuel M. Smucker, also criticises in the same kind.<sup>d</sup>

So also Rev. M. T. Lamb devotes a chapter to the same kind of criticism.<sup>e</sup>

Linn, adopts the same argument, and with some manifestations of glee, quite unbecoming in a sober historian who professes to write at least a serious history of Mormonism; but who, while he points to these defects in grammatical construction, etc., he nowhere considers in any spirit of fair-

---

<sup>a</sup>Howe's "Mormonism," p. 56.

<sup>b</sup>"Mormonism in All Ages" (1842), p. 200.

<sup>c</sup>See Hyde's "Mormonism" (1857), chapters 9, 10.

<sup>d</sup>Smucker's "History of the Mormons" (1881 edition), p. 49.

<sup>e</sup>"The Golden Bible" (1887), chapter 7.

ness the evidences that tend to support the truth of the Book of Mormon.<sup>f</sup>

The things to be considered in these objections, are:

First: does the uniformity of style exist: do the errors in grammar exist; are there modernisms and localisms in the book, and more especially in the first edition, since it was with this edition that this criticism began? These questions must be answered in the affirmative. The existence of uniformity of style, errors in grammar, modernisms and localisms cannot be denied, as all know who have investigated the matter. A comparison of current editions with the first edition will disclose the fact that many of the most flagrant verbal and grammatical errors have been corrected, besides many unimportant changes, such as "which" and "that," to "who" and "whom," and vice versa, to conform to modern usage;<sup>g</sup> and many more such corrections, without changing the slightest shade of statement or thought, could still be made to advantage.

Many of these changes, perhaps most of them, were effected under the supervision of the Prophet Joseph himself. In the preface to the second edition published in Kirtland, 1837, the following occurs:

Individuals acquainted with book printing are aware of the numerous typographical errors which always occur in manuscript editions. It is only necessary to say, that the whole has been carefully re-examined and compared with the original manuscript by Elder Joseph Smith, Jr., the translator of the Book of Mormon, assisted by the present printer, Brother

---

<sup>f</sup>"The Story of the Mormons" (1902), chapter 11.

<sup>g</sup>Linn says that there are more than 3,000 such changes. This, I think, is an exaggeration. "Story of the Mormons," p. 89. In 1889, Lamoni Call, formerly a Mormon, published a treatise on the subject which he entitled "Two Thousand Changes in the Book of Mormon," even this I think is an exaggeration; but there have been many changes as conceded in the text.

Cowdery, who formerly wrote the greatest portion of the same as dictated by Brother Smith.

In the third edition published at Nauvoo, 1840, this occurs on the title page:

*“Carefully Revised by the Translator.”*

Of course the fact that the Book of Mormon was published in a country town, on a hand press, and by persons unfamiliar with book making, and the proofs read by Oliver Cowdery, who was entirely without experience in such work, will account for many errors verbal and grammatical. The further fact that the employees at the printing establishment where the book was published, were unfriendly to it, and were more anxious to make it appear ridiculous than to turn out a good job, may account for other errors that appear in the first edition. But after due allowance is made for all these conditions, the errors are too numerous, and of such a constitutional nature, that they cannot be explained away by these unfavorable conditions under which the work was published. Besides, examination of the fragment of the original manuscript, now (1909) in possession of President Joseph F. Smith, discloses the fact that many of the verbal errors in grammar are in the manuscript, written as the Prophet dictated it.

Second: How are these errors in language to be accounted for? How is it that errors in grammar are found in a work said to be translated by the “gift and power of God, through the medium of the Urim and Thummim?” Are these errors in language to be assigned to the Urim and Thummim, or to God? Is it true, as stated by Professor Turner, that such is the description of the manner in

which the Book of Mormon was translated, that all accounts "agree in making the Lord responsible not only for the thought, but also for the language of the book, from the necessity of the case, for they [those who have described the manner of translation] all claim that the words passed before Smith's eyes while looking through the pellucid stones?"<sup>h</sup> Must we remember, as the professor admonishes us to "remember," that according to Smith's story "the Lord is responsible not only for the thought, but also for the language of this new translation? The words of the translation being read off through the stone spectacles?"<sup>i</sup>

For one, I refuse to accept this statement of the case. I do not believe that the Lord is responsible for any defect of language that occurs in the Book of Mormon, or any other revelation. On the contrary, I stand with Moroni here: "And now, if there be faults [i. e. in the Nephite record], they are the mistakes of men."<sup>j</sup> Also with Mormon: "If there be faults, they be the faults of a man."<sup>k</sup>

If the Lord should speak directly to man without any intermediary whatsoever, it is reasonable to conclude that his language would be perfect in whatever tongue he spoke. If, however, he elected an intermediary through whom to communicate his message to the world, the language in which that message would be couched might, or might not, be perfect, according as the intermediary was learned or unlearned in the language through which the Lord communicated the revelation.

Third: Can these verbal errors, and errors in grammar, these modernisms and localisms arise from equivalent defects in the original Nephite records? That is to say,

---

<sup>h</sup>"Mormonism in All Ages," p. 19.

<sup>i</sup>Ibid, p. 200.

<sup>j</sup>Moroni's Preface, title page Book of Mormon.

<sup>k</sup>Mormon viii: 17.

can these errors have been transferred from the ancient Nephite language into our English idioms? I know how unreasonable such a proposition as that will seem to readers in any way familiar with translations. I speak of it, however, because there are those friendly to the Book of Mormon who contend that such is the case. Those who take this view believe that because the Prophet used Urim and Thummim in the translation of the Nephite record, therefore, the process of translation was a word for word bringing over from the Nephite language into the English; that the instrument did the translating rather than the Prophet, the latter merely looking into Urim and Thummim as one may look into a mirror and tell what he sees there reflected; and that, therefore, the translation was really an absolutely "verbatim et literatim" translation of the record. They further believe that since the instrument was of divine appointing it could make no mistakes, and therefore if errors in the translation into English occur it is because these errors were in the Nephite language as recorded by Mormon.

As already remarked, to those at all acquainted with translation, this will be recognized as impossible. They know that such a thing as an absolute literal translation, or word for word bringing over from one language into another is out of the question; that for the most part such a literal translation would be meaningless, I give as examples the following from the Latin:

1. "*Aversum hostem-videre*"—original.  
 "Turned away—foe—to see"—word for word.  
 "To see a foe in flight"—translation.
2. "*Non satis commode*"—original.  
 "Not—enough—conveniently"—word for word.  
 "Not very conveniently"—translation.
3. "*Ad eas se applicant*"—original.

“To—these—themselves—attach”—word for word.

“They lean up against these”—translation.

4. “*Impii est virtutem parvi estimare*”—original.

“Of an impious man—it is—virtue little—to value”  
word for word.

“It is the mark of an impious man to think little of  
virtue”—translation.

5. “*Christiani est quam plurimis prodesse*”—original.

“Of a Christian—it is—as very many—to do good”  
word for word.

“It is the duty of a Christian to do good to as many  
as possible”—translation.

Fourth: Granting, as preforce we must, that there are verbal and grammatical errors, together with modernisms and localisms, in the English translation of the Nephite record; that the thought is expressed not only in English idioms, but also, at times, in Western New York localisms; that the whole body of phraseology is of the time and place where the work of translation was done; and all the errors are such as would be made by one circumstanced as Joseph Smith was as to knowledge of the English language; and that these local idioms and errors in grammar were not found in equivalent terms in the Nephite language and brought over into English by a process of word for word bring over—granting all these things, is there any way by which this criticism, based upon the faulty English of the translation, may be effectually met, and the truth still maintained that the translation of the Book of Mormon was made by a man inspired of God, and aided by an instrument of divine appointment?

I firmly believe that all these requirements can be met; that, as a matter of fact, the defects in English in the Book



of Mormon constitute no real difficulty; that the difficulties, so far as they exist, are of our own creation (I speak of those who accept the Book of Mormon as a divine record); that our trouble arises through having accepted too literally the necessarily second-hand accounting, given by Martin Harris and David Whitmer, of the manner in which the translation was done. Because it has been said that the Prophet saw the Nephite characters in the Urim and Thummim; that the translation would appear in English under these characters; that the Prophet would read the translation to the scribe and that both characters and translation would remain in Urim and Thummim until written—because of this description of the manner of translation, our opponents have insisted—and we by our silence have conceded to some extent—that Joseph Smith had nothing to do with the translation except to see what the instrument revealed and parrot-like repeat it; therefore it has been concluded by our opponents that the translation must be attributed entirely to the Urim and Thummim; and as it is unreasonable to think that God, or a divine instrument provided by him for the purpose of translating unknown languages—that is, that God directly or indirectly could be charged with these errors in English—they have argued that the translation was not inspired; that God had nothing to do with it; that Joseph Smith's pretensions were blasphemous, and the Book of Mormon untrue.

To this contention of our opponents we have either made no reply, being quite generally of the opinion that there was little or no force in the argument (a mistake in my judgment), or else have lamely and vainly argued that the errors were in the original Nephite records, and were brought over bodily into the translation, which is an absurdity.

The foundation for the answer to this objection and the argument by which it is sustained was laid in Vol. I, chapter VII of this work, where it is argued that the translation of the Book of Mormon was not merely a mechanical process in which the instrument Urim and Thummim did all and the Prophet nothing, except to give out to the scribe the translation said to have appeared in the divine instrument. The Lord's description of the manner of translating, by means of Urim and Thummim, is cited there in proof that the translation was not mechanical; that on the contrary it required deep thought, the employment, in fact, of all the mental and spiritual powers of the translator; that it was necessary for him to be in an exalted state of mind to get the meaning of the Nephite characters at all. The thought, however, and the ideas he obtained by concentrated mental effort, under the inspiration of God; but the language in which the translation was thought out was in such words and forms of expression as Joseph Smith could use; and this mental translation in language was doubtless reflected in the Urim and Thummim, where it remained until written by the scribe. And now, as the Prophet Joseph was uneducated at the time of translating the Nephite record, the language of his translation was in the faulty English of one circumstanced as he was, and was of the period and place when and where the translation took place. This I regard as a complete answer to all the objections that can be urged upon the score of the Book of Mormon's faulty English, and it is the only answer that can be successfully made to it. Such faults as exist are the faults of men, not of God. Such is the answer to this class of objections wherever made against the scriptures, for this sort of objection is not confined to the Book of Mormon. It has been urged with well nigh equal force against the Bible. In fact, there are not wanting

those who claim that human speech, oral or written, is inadequate to convey a revelation from God.<sup>l</sup>

“The human language,” says one of these, “whether in speech or in print, cannot be the vehicle of the word of God. The word of God exists in something else. Did the book called the Bible excel in purity of ideas and expression all the books now extant in the world, I would not take it for my rule of faith, as being the word of God, because the possibility would nevertheless exist of my being imposed upon.”<sup>m</sup>

Again, the same author says:

“Human language, more especially as there is not an universal language, is incapable of being used as an universal means of unchangeable and uniform information, and therefore it is not the means that God useth in manifesting himself universally to man. It is only in the Creation that all our ideas and conceptions of a word of God can unite. The creation speaketh an universal language, independently of human speech or human lan-

---

<sup>l</sup>There is some justification for such a view as this, if we have in mind the idea of God making a full and perfect revelation to man. When God gives a revelation it necessarily has to be such an one as man can comprehend, and in terms with which he is familiar—in man’s language; and as man’s language is inadequate to express truth in its perfection, it follows that any revelation which God deigns to give to the children of men will fall somewhat below the perfect truth, hence the Apostle of the Gentiles declared, notwithstanding the existence of revelations in the scriptures which were extant in Paul’s time, “We know in part, and we prophesy in part; we see [as] through a glass, darkly.” This condition arises not out of any lack of power on the part of God to make a perfect revelation of truth, but out of man’s inability to comprehend such a revelation; and hence God graciously condescends to meet man’s somewhat narrow limitations by giving such a revelation of truth in the scriptures, as man by faith and diligence may comprehend.

<sup>m</sup>“The Age of Reason,” Paine, p. 19.

guage, multiplied and various as they be. It is an ever-existing original, which every man can read.<sup>n</sup>

This writer may be objected to on account of the ribald nature of his criticism of the Bible, but nevertheless, in the foregoing paragraph he represents the views of a very large class of people—a class that I fear is increasing rather than diminishing in numbers.

This author attacks the Book of Isaiah in the following fashion:

Whoever will take the trouble of reading the book ascribed to Isaiah will find it one of the most wild and disorderly compositions ever put together; it has neither beginning, middle, nor end; and, except a short historical part, and a few sketches of history in two or three of the first chapters, is one continued, incoherent, bombastical rant, full of extravagant metaphor without application, and destitute of meaning; a school-boy would scarcely have been excusable for writing such stuff; it is (at least in translation) that kind of composition and false taste that is properly called prose run mad.<sup>o</sup>

Referring to the entire volume of Hebrew scripture our author says:

For my own part, my belief in the perfection of the Deity will not permit me to believe that a book so manifestly obscure, disorderly, and contradictory can be his work. I can write a better book myself!<sup>p</sup>

---

<sup>n</sup>Ibid, p. 25.

<sup>o</sup>"The Age of Reason," Part II, p. 98.

That Joseph Smith appreciated how inadequate human language is to express divine thought is evident from the following prayer of his, uttered when writing to his friend, W. W. Phelps: "Oh Lord God, deliver us in due time from the little, narrow prison, almost, as it were, total darkness of paper, pen and ink—and a crooked, broken, scattered and imperfect language."—History of the Church, Vol. I, pp. 227-8.

<sup>p</sup>Ibid p. 252.

Other authors of the same school, and in like spirit attack the Hebrew scriptures. What is the reply to such attacks? Fortunately, on this point, I have at hand the views recently set forth of a very learned man, and one of high character, the Reverend Joseph Armitage Robinson, D. D., Dean of Westminster and Chaplain to King Edward VII of England. In a recent lecture delivered in Westminster Abby on the subject, "How the Bible Was Written," he says:

The message of the Old Testament was not written by the Divine hand, nor dictated by an outward compulsion; it was planted in the hearts of men, and made to grow in a fruitful soil. And then they were required to express it in their own language, after their natural methods, and in accordance with the stage of knowledge which their time had reached. Their human faculties were purified and quickened by the Divine Spirit; but they spoke to their time in the language of their time; they spoke a spiritual message, accommodated to the experience of their age, a message of faith in God, and of righteousness as demanded by a righteous God.<sup>r</sup>

So, also, Lyman Abbot, in a series of lectures on "The Bible as Literature:"

Neither in ancient nor in modern theology is there a simpler, a more comprehensive statement of the origin and character of the Bible than in the single sentence with which the Second Epistle of Peter describes it: "Holy men of God spake, moved by the Holy Ghost." \* \* \* According to this definition the Bible is written by good men, and it is written by good men under the inspiration or on-breathing of the Spirit of God. \* \* \* These men are not amanuenses who write by dictation; they embody in their writings their own experience, their own thought, their own life. Thus, we should expect to find

---

<sup>r</sup>The lecture was published in the "St. Louis Globe-Democrat," of Sunday, March 19, 1905.

in the Bible the personal equation of the writers strongly marked. We should expect, as the sunshine develops each seed after its kind, so the shining of God on the human soul would develop each germinant soul after its kind. \* \* \* We see not men writing as clerks write, embodying only the work of a dictator; we find in each one the stream, the current, the color of his own personality. We shall expect, also, to find all these men writing as Paul says he wrote: "We know in part, and we prophesy in part," and "We see in a glass darkly."<sup>s</sup>

Views similar to those were entertained by the late Henry Drummond, the author of "Natural Law in the Spiritual World." Referring to the writers of the Hebrew scripture he said:

These men when they spoke were not typewriters. They were authors. They were not pens. They were men; and their individuality comes out in every page they wrote. Sometimes they write a better style than they do at other times. Sometimes their minds are clearer and their arguments more condensed and consecutive and logical.<sup>t</sup> Look at some of the involved theological statements in the New Testament, and contrast them with the absolutely pellucid utterances of the same author written on a different occasion, when he was in a different mood. Those men were not mere pens, I repeat; they were authors, and it is not the book that is inspired, so much as the men. God inspired men to make an inspired book. \* \* \* Just as a scientific man in communication with nature reads its secrets, drinks in its spirit, and writes it down, so a man who walks with God catches the mind of God and gets revelations from God and writes them down; religion is not the result of this, but the cause of it.<sup>u</sup>

---

<sup>s</sup>Dr. Abbott delivered these lectures in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, during the winter of 1896.

<sup>t</sup>This is also true of the translation of the Book of Mormon. Some of its passages rise to heights of sublimity, and then again descending to levels that are commonplace and labored.

<sup>u</sup>"The Evolution of Bible Study" (Henry Drummond, 1901).

Jenyns in his treatise on the "Internal Evidences of the Christian Religion" says:

Others there are who allow that a revelation from God may be both necessary and credible; but allege that the Scriptures, that is, the books of the Old and New Testament, cannot be that revelation—because in them are to be found errors and inconsistencies, fabulous stories, false facts, and false philosophy; which can never be derived from the fountain of all wisdom and truth. To this I reply that I readily acknowledge that the Scriptures are not revelations from God, but the history of them [i. e., the history of the revelations]. The revelation itself is derived from God; but the history of it is the production of men, and therefore the truth of it is not in the least affected by their fallibility, but depends on the internal evidence of its own supernatural excellence. If in these books such a religion as has been here described actually exists, no seeming or even real defects to be found in them can disprove the divine origin of this revelation, or invalidate my argument. \* \* \* If any one could show that these books were never written by their pretended authors, but were posterior impositions on illiterate and credulous ages—all these wonderful discoveries would prove no more than this, that God, for reasons to us unknown, had thought proper to permit a revelation by him communicated to mankind, to be mixed with their ignorance, and corrupted by their frauds from its earliest infancy, in the same manner in which he has visibly permitted it to be mixed and corrupted from that period to the present hour. If in these books a religion superior to all human imagination actually exists, it is of no consequence to the proof of its divine origin, by what means it was there introduced, or with what human errors and imperfections it is blended. A diamond, though found in a bed of mud, is still a diamond, nor can the dirt which surrounds it depreciate its value or destroy its lustre.

The point of Jenyns' argument is, that both in doctrine and ethics the New Testament is so far superior, so far surpasses in sublimity of idea and beauty of moral precept, all that is known amongst men outside of the New

Testament, and is so far removed from the uninspired utterances of men that he claims the conclusion to be irresistible that the Christian Scriptures derive their origin immediately from God; that the knowledge which they teach is divine, no matter what faults may be charged to the expression of this knowledge. From this view point he becomes almost reckless in the admission of errors and defects in the writers of the New Testament. He has been much criticized, in fact, by the professional Christian ministry—for he was a layman as to his relation with the church, a member of the British parliament—for the admission of errors in the New Testament in the passage I have quoted above, but I think unjustly so. What is needed, both as to the New Testament scriptures and the Nephite scriptures, is a thoroughgoing recognition of the fact that the truth is of more consequence than the form in which it is expressed. The wheat is of more importance than the chaff in which it grows, and which holds it until the thrashing and the winnowing. The question is not so much is all the mine-ledge gold, but is there gold in the ledge."

---

"Replying to this criticism of the Book of Mormon some time ago (June, 1904), wherein the critic insisted that the question concerning the Book of Mormon was not where men say they got it, but "is it gold"—he insisted that the "assay test" must be applied—to which the writer made the following reply:

"I declare my willingness, as one of the believers in the Book of Mormon to see it submitted, as perforce it must be, to the 'assay test.' Is it gold? Are these important truths we have been considering this evening, wherein the welfare of half the world is concerned, gold or dross? Is the light which the Book of Mormon throws upon the word of God contained in the four (New Testament) Gospels of importance? (See this Vol. ch. 42: vi for the items here referred to). Is the fact that Jesus visited this western world and announced the saving power of his Gospel in such a manner that millions finally came to the knowledge of salvation a golden truth? Is the solemn warning to the Gentile nations inhabiting the western world (See chapter 42.) Worth while considering? May not these prophecies be golden, especially if heeded? I



The inspiration of God falls upon a prophet as a white ray of light may fall upon a prism, which separates the white ray of which it is composed—blue, orange, red, green,

---

shall leave you to answer that. But I want to suggest an improvement on the gentleman's simile—to this 'assay test.' I think it could be improved. The question is not so much as to whether in the four (New Testament) Gospels or in the fifth (i. e., the Book of III Nephi in the Book of Mormon) all is gold, but is there gold in them. I do not think the four Gospels are without alloy. In other words I do not think the four Gospels are perfect. I believe there are imperfections in them in forms of expressions and in the fact that they do not convey all that Jesus both taught and did; at best they are but fragmentary. St. John informs us in his Gospel that if all the things that Jesus had done were written, the world itself would hardly contain the books. We have not the full reports of Messiah's discourses. The full and absolutely pure word of God just as it fell from the lips of the Savior, is not in the four Gospels. For the most part we have but the recollections of the evangelists of what Jesus said and did. Only those who read the Greek, and unfortunately they are very few, may read even the four Gospels in the language in which the Apostles wrote them. We have translations of these records, and each time they are translated dilution takes place. The force of what is said becomes in the translation somewhat abated. \* \* \* So with the book of III Nephi, that comes to us in abridged form. It is not the original book of Nephi; it is Mormon's abridgment of that book. He has condensed it, and in doing so has doubtless given us less perfect accounts of Christ's mission to the Nephites [than would have been found in the unabridged book of III Nephi]. That is to say, we have not all the surrounding circumstances or all the utterances of the Savior, or of the men the book represents as speaking. Then we have not even Mormon's original abridgment of Nephi's book—the real fifth Gospel—but only the Prophet Joseph's translation of Mormon's abridgment, and that it is admitted in his imperfect English. So that the whole five Gospels are fragmentary and tainted with imperfections and limitations, as all things are that pass through human hands; but they contain nevertheless, God's precious truths [the gold of the mine]; and some of these are found in the fifth Gospel as well as in the four Hebrew Gospels; and to me the truths of the fifth or Nephite Gospel are as precious and important as are those of the other four Gospels." (Discourse by the writer, "The Fifth Gospel," "Deseret Evening News," June 11, 1904). The whole discourse will be found in "Defense of the Faith and the Saints," Vol. I, pp. 373-399.

etc. The clearness of these several rays and the sharpness with which they are defined will depend upon the purity, and perhaps the position, of the prism through which the white ray passes. So with the white ray of God's inspiration falling upon men. It receives different colorings or expressions through them according to their personal characteristics. While it is true that the inspiration of God may be so overwhelming in its force at times that the prophet may well nigh lose his individuality, and become merely the mouth-piece of God, the organ through which the Divine speaks, yet the personality of the prophet is not usually so overwhelmed; hence each prophet preserves even under the inspiration of God his agency and his personal idiosyncrasies. Thus Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Amos, Nephi, Mormon, Moroni, all preserve their individuality in conception of ideas and in the expression of them, though inspired by the same spirit. So also Joseph Smith imparted certain characteristics to his translation of the Nephite record, notwithstanding the use of Urim and Thummim and the inspiration of the Lord that rested upon him. Just in what manner the Urim and Thummim was of assistance to him may be beyond human power to at present explain, but of this we may be certain, it was by no means the principal factor in the work; its place must forever be regarded as secondary; it was an aid to the Prophet, not he an aid to it; wonderful as it may be as a divine instrument it could not be so marvelous as the mind of man, especially as the mind of this man, Joseph Smith, this Seer, by way of pre-eminence; it is Joseph the "Seer" who translated the Book of Mormon aided by Urim and Thummim. This his statement: "Through the medium of the Urim and Thummim I translated the record by the gift and power of God."<sup>v</sup> Mark these words—"I translated the

---

<sup>v</sup>"Millennial Star," Vol. XIX, p. 118.

record, —not the Urim and Thummim. Of course the Prophet recognizes in this, as he did in all his prophetic work and his seership work, his obligation to the inspiration of God, and surely I do not wish to detract from the inspiration of God as a factor in his work. I merely desire to emphasize here that it was the Prophet under the inspiration of God that did the work, and that the divine instrument, Urim and Thummim, however wonderful, was merely an aid to the Prophet, as “glasses” may be an aid to the dim-sighted. But notwithstanding this aid provided by man’s ingenuity, it is the eye after all that does the seeing, though this contrivance called “spectacles” helps the vision, and makes it more perfect. So, analogously, but in some way unknown to us, the Urim and Thummim aided the Prophet in his work of translation.

The defense of written revelation then against the existence of human elements in it—evident limitations in the knowledge of prophets concerning things other than the immediate matters on which they are inspired of God; unequal expression of ideas, falling sometimes from the sublime to the commonplace; lack of clearness and directness in expression, circumlocution;<sup>w</sup> grammatical blunders; tautology; sometimes long suspension of thought (a frequent

---

<sup>w</sup>One Anti-Mormon writer—the Rev. M. T. Lamb—devotes two chapters to this subject of circumlocution alone—“The Golden Bible,” chapters i and ii. He brings into contrast passages from the Book of Mormon, lacking in directness of expression, with passages from the Bible celebrated for their directness, and thereby is most unfair in his argument; because he compares the best of the Bible with the worst of the Book of Mormon, a proceeding which might be reversed with disastrous results to the Bible, if the comparison were to end with this comparison of the worst in the one with the best in the other. Now let it be understood that I am not contending that the English translation of the Book of Mormon compares as literature with the English translation of the Hebrew scriptures. The latter is a translation by the most finished scholarship of the time in which it was accomplished—I refer to the authorized

fault of both Old and New Testament writers), and some thought never completed at all—all these and many other faults of mere construction,—disarrangement of the mere garments of thought—are to be attributed to the weaknesses of men and their limitations in knowledge, rather than to any fault in the inspiration supplied of God. It is the body that is defective, not the soul; the expression that is defective, not the inspired truth struggling for utterance through the faulty diction of prophets, ancient or modern—“If there be faults, they are the faults of men; therefore, condemn not the things of God because of the faults of men,” will yet come to be regarded as a golden text in defense of written revelation.

## II.

### *Objections Based Upon the Existence of Passages in the Book of Mormon Which Follow King James' Translation of the Bible Verbatim.*

It is objected to the Book of Mormon that there are found in it whole chapters, besides many minor quotations, from King James' English translation of the Bible. Since

---

version, the translation completed 1611 A. D.—while the Book of Mormon is translated by an unlearned youth limited in educational opportunities, without even the advantage of a common school education. True, it is claimed for him that he was assisted by a divine inspiration. That, however, insures only the accuracy of the facts, the statement of the truth as contained in the Nephite record, not directness, accuracy, or charm of literary style. As for circumlocution in the expression of thought, that is but natural to one possessed of only a limited vocabulary. The existence of circumlocution, therefore, in the Book of Mormon is in harmony with and helps to illustrate what in these pages has been contended for, as to the manner in which the Book of Mormon was translated, and the fact that the Prophet Joseph was left to express the thought he received from the Nephite record in such language as he could command; which theory of translation once accepted, I here repeat, makes easy an answer to all the objections urged upon the ground of literary defects in the Book of Mormon.

these chapters and passages in some cases follow the "authorized English version" verbatim, and closely resemble it in others; and as it is well known that in translating from one language into another almost infinite variety of expression is possible, the question arises, how is it that Joseph Smith in translating from the Nephite plates by divine assistance follows so closely an independent translation made in the ordinary way, by dint of scholarship and patient labor, and by diligent comparison of former translations.<sup>x</sup> This King James' translation was made by scholars of the sixteenth century. It is well known that no two translations of the same matter from one language to another, by different scholars, would ever be alike, hence these passages from the Hebrew scriptures found in the Book of Mormon, so closely resembling and in places following word for word the language of the King James' translation, constitute a difficulty, and what is regarded by some as an insurmountable objection to the claims of the Book of Mormon. Nearly all the Anti-Mormon writers raise this objection, though perhaps John Hyde,<sup>y</sup> 1857, makes the most of it. Following him the Rev. M. T. Lamb,<sup>z</sup> 1887, and last, but not least, Linn,<sup>a</sup> 1902.

This objection was most carefully and intelligently stated recently (October 22, 1903), by Mr. H. Chamberlain, of Spencer, Iowa, U. S. A., in a letter of inquiry on the subject to President Joseph F. Smith, of Salt Lake City, in the course of which he said:

I find that Christ in quoting to the people on this side of the water, the third and fourth chapters of Malachi, quotes, accord-

---

<sup>x</sup>See translator's preface and title page of the "Authorized English Version."

<sup>y</sup>Hyde's "Mormonism," chapters ix, x, xi.

<sup>z</sup>"Golden Bible," chapter vii.

<sup>a</sup>Linn's "Story of the Mormons," chapter xi.

ing to the Book of Mormon, in the identical text of King James' version, not missing a word. I find chapters of Isaiah quoted practically in the same way. I find that in many instances, in his talks with the people, and to his disciples here, he used the identical language of King James' version, not omitting the words supplied by the translators. Now, I know that no two parties will take the same manuscript and make translations of a matter contained therein, and the language of the two translators be alike; indeed, the language employed by the two parties will widely differ. These translations are from different manuscripts, and from different languages, and still it appears in the Book of Mormon as King James' translation. I can conceive of no other way in which such a coincidence could have occurred, within the range of human experience, except where one writing is copied from another, and then it takes the utmost care to get them exactly alike, word for word, and letter for letter as this is. \* \* \* Now, what I want to know is, how do you as a Church account for these things appearing in the Book of Mormon in the identical language of King James' version, when we know his version is faulty, and the same translators could not have made it twice alike themselves? Did Joseph copy it from the Bible, or did the Lord adopt this identical language in revealing it to Joseph?<sup>b</sup>

This communication was referred to the writer by President Smith for an answer, which was written, and from which I quote:

"The difficulty which you point out of course has been recognized by believers in the Book of Mormon, but I do not know that I can say that the Church as yet has settled upon any explanation which could be regarded as an authoritative view on the subject. Each one has been left to settle the matter upon the lines which seem most reasonable to him. As a matter of fact, though our opponents have frequently called attention to the difficulty in question, it has not occa-

---

<sup>b</sup>"Improvement Era," Vol. VIII (1904), pp. 180, 181.

sioned any particular anxiety in the minds of our own people. Accepting the overwhelming evidences that exist for the truth of the Book of Mormon, we have regarded that difficulty, with some others, as of minor importance, which would in time be satisfactorily settled. Still, I realize the reasonableness of the objection that may be urged against the Book of Mormon from the point of view from which you present the subject, and realize that it constitutes a real difficulty; and one, too, in which we have no word from the Prophet Joseph Smith, or those who were immediately associated with him in bringing forth the Nephite record, to aid us in a solution of the matter. We are left, therefore, very largely to conjecture, based on the facts in the case, which facts are most tersely put in your esteemed communication, viz :

“First. It is a fact that a number of passages in the Book of Mormon, verses and whole chapters, run closely parallel in matter and phraseology with passages in Isaiah, Malachi, and some parts of the New Testament.

“Second. It is a fact that no two persons will make translations of the same matter from one language into another, and the language of the two translations be alike.

“Third. It is a fact that the translations of the words of Isaiah, of Malachi, and the words of the Savior, in the Book of Mormon, are generally supposed to be independent translations from different manuscripts or records and from different languages.

“Then, of course, comes your question: how can the strange fact be accounted for, viz., that the translations in the Book of Mormon corresponding to Isaiah, Malachi and the words of the Savior, are in the language of King James’ translation?

“Of course, you will remember that according to the Book of Mormon, the Nephite colony carried with them to

America so much of the Old Testament as was in existence at the time of their departure from Jerusalem (600 years B. C.). The prophecy of Malachi, chapters 3 and 4 quoted in the Book of Mormon was supplied by the Savior. The Nephites engraved portions of these scriptures in their records, and this both in the Hebrew, and what the Nephites called the reformed—i.e., altered—Egyptian. I simply mention this in passing, that you may remember afresh how these passages came to be in the Nephite record, and that you may remember that the Nephites had the Jewish scriptures in much the same form as they were to be found in Judea, 600 B. C. When the Savior came to the western world and appeared to the Nephites, he had the same message to present to them that he had presented in Palestine; the same ordinances of the gospel to establish, a similar church organization to found, and the same ethical principles to teach. The manner of the Savior's teaching would doubtless lead him to present these great truths in the same forms of expression he had used in teaching the Jews, so that in substance what he had taught as his doctrines in Judea he would repeat in America. This is mentioned also, by the way, that it may appear reasonable to you that in a general manner the Savior must have taught the people in the western hemisphere substantially the same things that he taught the people in Palestine. With this remembered, I think we find a solution of the difficulty you present in the following way: When Joseph Smith saw that the Nephite record was quoting the prophecies of Isaiah; of Malachi, or the words of the Savior, he took the English Bible and compared these passages as far as they paralleled each other, and finding that in substance, they were alike, he adopted our English translation; and hence, we have the sameness to which you refer.

“It should be understood also, in this connection, that



while Joseph Smith obtained the facts and ideas from the Nephite characters through the inspiration of God, he was left to express those facts and ideas, in the main, in such language as he could command; and when he found that parts of the Nephite record closely parallel passages in the Bible, and being conscious that the language of our English Bible was superior to his own, he adopted it, except for those differences indicated in the Nephite original which here and there made the Book of Mormon version of passages superior in sense and clearness. Of course, I recognize the fact that this is but a conjecture; but I believe it to be a reasonable one; and indeed the only one which satisfactorily disposes of the difficulty you point out.

“There exists, however, another difficulty; and that is, while the foregoing explanation may account for the sameness in phraseology between these Book of Mormon passages and King James’ translation, there remains to be accounted for the differences that exist between these Book of Mormon passages and those which parallel them in King James’ translation. I am led to believe that you have been so absorbed, perhaps, in tracing out the sameness in the expression that you have failed to note the differences to which I allude, for you make the claim of strict identity between the Book of Mormon and King James’ translation too strong when you say that there is used the “identical language of King James”<sup>c</sup> version, not even omitting the words supplied by the translators.” Throughout the parallel passages, there are here and there differences (with the single exception, perhaps, in the chapters from Malachi, and even in these is a slight difference), and a close compari-

---

<sup>c</sup>When the translators of our English Bible found it necessary to supply words to make clear the meaning in English, they printed those words in italics, and it is to these words that reference is made in the above.

son of these differences will show that in the matter of supplied words by King James' translators, there are very frequent changes, and in all the changes that appear, the Book of Mormon passages are far superior in sense and clearness. I quote you a few passages in illustration:

## BOOK OF MORMON.

Thou hast multiplied the nation and increased the joy; they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoils!—II. Nephi xxix: 3.

## BIBLE.

Thou hast multiplied the nation *and not* increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil!—Isaiah ix: 3.

Here you will find the Book of Mormon passage more in harmony with the facts in the case. How inconsistent the passage is in Isaiah, "Thou hast multiplied the nation and not increased the joy!" And yet that statement is followed by this one—"they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil!" But in the Book of Mormon it is perfectly consistent, for there it says "Thou hast multiplied the nation, *and increased the joy.*" The following passages also indicate the superiority of the Book of Mormon version:

## BOOK OF MORMON.

And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter; should not a people seek unto their God, for the living to hear from the dead?—II. Nephi xvii: 19.

## BIBLE.

And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep and mutter; should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead.—Isaiah viii: 19.

As an illustration of my statement that Book of Mormon version of passages is sometimes markedly different

from our common English version in the matter of supplied words, I quote you the following passages. The supplied words in the Bible text are written in *italics*.

## BOOK OF MORMON.

Say unto the righteous that it is well with them; for they shall eat the fruit of their doings.

Woe unto the wicked! for they shall perish; for the reward of their hands shall be upon them.—II. Nephi xxiii: 10, 11.

## BIBLE.

Say unto the righteous that *it shall be well with him*: for they shall eat the fruit of their doings.

Woe unto the wicked! *it shall be well with him*: for the reward of his hands shall be given him.—Isaiah iii: 10, 11.

If you will carefully compare the passages in the Book of Mormon, and some of the chapters in Matthew, say the 12th chapter of III. Nephi, with Matthew v; the 13th chapter of III. Nephi with Matthew 6th chapter; the 14th chapter of III. Nephi, with Matthew 7th chapter, you will also find throughout that there are differences between the two, as much so as between the Catholic Bible (generally called the Douay Bible) and King James' translation, which, of course, are independent translations by different scholars. I give the following passages by way of illustration:

## KING JAMES' BIBLE.

Matt. ch. v: verse 3.

## BOOK OF MORMON.

III. Nephi ch. xii: verse 3.

## DOUAY BIBLE.

Matt. ch. v: verse 3.

Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Yea, blessed are the poor in spirit who come unto me,<sup>d</sup> for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

<sup>d</sup>The addition of the words in this verse, "who come unto me," are important. Surely, it is not enough for man to be merely poor in spirit. Not on that hinges salvation. A man can be poor in spirit and still fail of salvation; but "blessed are the poor in spirit 'who come unto me,' for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," is a reasonable doctrine.

KING JAMES' BIBLE:

BOOK OF MORMON.

DOUAY BIBLE.

Verse 4.

Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

Verse 4.

And again, blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.

Verse 5.<sup>e</sup>

Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted.

Verse 6.

Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.

Verse 6.

And blessed are all they who do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled with the Holy Ghost.<sup>f</sup>

Verse 6.

Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice: for they shall have their fill.

Verse 7.

Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.

Verse 7.

And blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.

Verse 7.

Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy.

Verse 10.

Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Verse 10.

And blessed are all they who are persecuted for my name's sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Verse 10.

Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice's sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

---

<sup>e</sup>Verses four and five in the "Douay" version are transposed, hence verse 5 here.

<sup>f</sup>The addition of the words, "with the Holy Ghost" are important to this passage, for they make the statement of Messiah more definite, and take the passage out of all controversy as to what those who hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled with. They shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, the spiritual power that makes for righteousness.

KING JAMES' BIBLE.

Verse 12.

Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.

BOOK OF MORMON.

Verse 12.

For ye shall have great joy and be exceeding glad, for great shall be your reward in heaven, for so persecuted they the prophets who were before you.

DOUAY BIBLE.

Verse 12.

Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven; for so they persecuted the prophets that were before you.

Chapter vi: verse 25.

Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

Chapter xiii: verse 25.

And now it came to pass that when Jesus had spoken these words, he looked upon the twelve whom he had chosen, and said unto them,<sup>g</sup> Remember the words which I have spoken. For behold, ye are they whom I have chosen to minister unto this people. Therefore I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?

Chapter vi: verse 25.

Therefore I say unto you, be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat nor for your body what you shall put on. Is not the life more than the meat: and the body more than raiment?

---

<sup>g</sup>Observe that this and the remaining passages quoted from the Book of Mormon are addressed directly to the Twelve Apos-

KING JAMES' BIBLE.

BOOK OF MORMON.

DOUAY BIBLE.

Verse 26.

Verse 26.

Verse 26.

Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather in barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?	Behold the fowls of the air, for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?	Behold the birds of the air, for they neither sow nor do they reap, nor gather into barns: and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not you of much more value than they?
--	--	---

---

tles, to whom especially they apply, not to the multitude. May it not be that when Jesus gave the same instructions in Judea he made a like distinction? If so, it was to the Twelve that he said: "Take no thought for the morrow; for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient is the day unto the evil thereof." That is a passage of scripture against which infidels have leveled their sarcasms ever since it was written. They have denounced it as instruction utterly impractical; as false in theory, as it would be impossible to practice; and as giving the evidence that Jesus was a mere idle dreamer, not a practical reformer. For, say they, this doctrine of taking no thought of the morrow, and taking no thought respecting food and raiment, if applied to the world's affairs, would turn the wheels of progress backward, and plunge the world into a state of barbarism. There could be no civilization under such conditions, they argue; and man would go back to the condition of the savage. I have never heard a Christian argument against that assault that has been an answer to it. But I find the key to the situation in this Book of Mormon version of the passage. It throws a flood of light upon this matter that makes the defense of the doctrine of Christ not only possible but easy against the assaults of the infidel world. This instruction about taking no thought for the morrow was not addressed to the multitude, nor is it to be followed generally by the members of the Church, nor by the people of the world at large. Jesus confines his instructions on this head, according to this Book of Mormon version, to the twelve men whom he chose among his disciples, and especially commissioned to go and preach the gospel; he admonishes them to so completely dedicate themselves unto the Lord that they would give no thought to these temporal things, but put heart, and soul into the work of their ministry; and promises

KING JAMES' BIBLE.

BOOK OF MORMON.

DOUAY BIBLE.

Verse 27.

Verse 27.

Verse 27.

Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

Which of you by taking thought can add to his stature one cubit?

Verses 28, 29.

Verses 28, 29.

Verses 28, 29.

And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon, in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

And for raiment why are you solicitous? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they labor not, neither do they spin. But I say unto you, that not even Solomon, in all his glory, was arrayed as one of these.

Verse 30.

Verse 30.

Verse 30

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, *shall he* not much more *clothe* you, O ye of little faith?

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, even so will he clothe you, if you are not of little faith?

And if the grass of the field, which is today, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, God doth so clothe: how much more you, O ye of little faith?

---

that their Father in heaven, who knew they had need of food and raiment, would open the way for them; and by his bounty and grace would clothe them even as he clothed the lilies of the field; and care for them as he cared for the birds of the air. Thus limited to the twelve men especially dedicated to God's service, the doctrine is reasonable and practical, and subject to no objection that may not be successfully answered.

KING JAMES' BIBLE.

BOOK OF MORMON.

DOUAY BIBLE.

Verses 31, 32, 33.

Verses 31, 32, 33.

Verses 31, 32, 33.

Therefore take no thought, saying: What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or Where-with shall we be clothed? for after all these things do the Gentiles seek: For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

Therefore take no thought, saying: What shall we eat? or, what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.

Be not solicitous therefore, saying: What shall we eat? or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek therefore first the kingdom of God, and his justice: and all these things shall be added unto you.

Verse 34.

Verse 34.

Verse 34.

Take therefore no thought for the morrow: For the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.

Take therefore no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient is the day unto the evil thereof.<sup>h</sup>

Be not therefore solicitous for tomorrow. For the morrow will be solicitous for itself; sufficient for the day is the evil thereof.

---

<sup>h</sup>"Sufficient is the day unto the evil thereof." I suggest a comparison here to that found in the other two versions, the Protestant, the Catholic. The Protestant: "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof;" the Catholic: "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof." In the Protestant and Catholic versions you will observe that the evil is made sufficient for the day; in the Book of Mormon version the day is made sufficient for the evil. Three learned commentators in collaboration—Jamieson, Fausett, Brown—say of that sentence as it stands in the Pro-



But how are these differences to be accounted for? They unquestionably arise from the fact that the Prophet compared the King James' translation with the parallel passages in the Nephite records, and when he found the sense of the passage of the Nephite plates superior to that in the

testant version: "An admirable, practical maxim, better rendered in our version than in any other, not excepting the preceding English ones. Every day brings its own cares, and to anticipate is only to doubt them." If these learned commentators can thus speak in high praise of the saying of the Savior as it stands in Matthew, how much more reason they would have for praising it as it is found in the Book of Mormon!

Or it may be that the changes occurred to the inspired mind of the Prophet when reading the English version, without referring to the Nephite plates. In this connection it is to be remembered that the Prophet, 1831-1833, was engaged in such an inspired "revision" of the Old and New Testament, sometimes miscalled a "New Translation" of the Bible. It is more proper, however, to speak of it as a "revision," as the Prophet did not at any time pretend to the knowledge of the ancient languages that would enable him to translate from the Hebrew or Greek, as translation is commonly understood. What he did was to revise the English text of the Bible under the inspiration of God, and that led him not only to give different renderings of various passages, but also to supply missing parts made known to him by the inspiration of God. The fact that he thus made a "revision" of the scriptures rather inclines one to the belief that when he turned from the Nephite records, to what must have been substantially parallel passages in the English version, the changes were suggested to him in this manner; that is, by the inspiration of the Lord operating in his mind when reading the English text. And indeed, may it not be possible that these changes suggested by the Spirit when reading the English text, during the translation of the Book of Mormon, led him finally to attempt the revision of the whole body of the Hebrew scriptures from the English text? It is interesting to note that it was by such an inspiration in relation to the 29th verse of the 5th chapter of John's Gospel, that led not only to a different reading of the text, but also to that marvelous vision of the future state of man, and the different degrees of glory that he will inherit. The text in the English version stands, "And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." To the Prophet it was given, "and shall come forth, they who have done good in the resurrection of the just; and they who have done evil in the resurrection of the unjust;" then followed the vision.

English version he made such changes as would give the superior sense and clearness. This view is sustained by the fact of uniform superiority of the Book of Mormon version wherever such differences occur. It is also a significant fact that these changes occur quite generally in the case of supplied words of the English translators, and which in order to indicate that they are supplied words, are printed in Italics. \* \* \* \* \* I fancy to all this, however, another inquiry will arise in your mind and that is since Joseph Smith translated the Book of Mormon by means of the Urim and Thummim, why is it that he did not give throughout a translation direct from the Nephite plates, instead of following our English Bible, where it paralleled passages on the plates, since translation by means of the Urim and Thummim must have been so simple and so easy? It is at this particular point where, in my opinion, a very great mistake is made, both by our own people, and our friends in the world. That is, translation by the Urim and Thummim is not so simple and easy a thing as it might at first glance appear. Many have supposed that the Prophet Joseph had merely to look into the Urim and Thummim, and there see, without any thought or effort on his part, both the Nephite characters and the translation in English. In other words, the instrument did everything and the Prophet nothing, except merely to look in the Urim and Thummim as one might look into a mirror, and then give out what he saw there. Such a view of the work of the Urim and Thummim I believe to be altogether incorrect. I think it caused the the Prophet the exercise of all his intellectual and spiritual forces to obtain the translation; that it was an exhausting work, one that taxed even his great powers to their uttermost limit; and hence, when he could ease himself of those labors

by adopting a reasonably good translation already existing, I think he was justified in doing so."

Such was the answer made to Mr. Chamberlain's inquiries, and as the reader will doubtless be interested to know how this answer was received by this unprejudiced gentleman, I quote the following from his letter in response to the explanation.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, I realize that if the Book of Mormon was not just what it purported to be, the whole fabric [of Mormonism] must fall to the ground, so far as being an inspired religion, and would then only be worth what good one could get out of it as the best organization or controlled religion on earth. \* \* \* Upon studying the Book of Mormon, I, of course, found these portions of King James' version of our Bible, and judging it by the applied law of human experience, as we lawyers learn to judge everything, I could account for it in no other way, than that Joseph Smith copied it therefrom, and I am free to say that your reasons for his so doing are not only probable, but the only solution that can be given. \* \* \* I believe and think that your suggestion is the only theory upon which it is possible to advocate its divine character. It seems to me that God, so far as I know, has never supplied man with what he already possessed, and Joseph Smith already had language with which to express his ideas, and all that was required in addition from God was, that he furnish him with the thought, and then let him express it in his own language. I never could for a moment believe that God is interested in placing his approval on King James' translators' style of translating, nor upon the composition of the English language therein adopted. I do not see wherein your theory detracts in any manner from the value of the Book of Mormon, as an inspired work acknowledged by God as authentic, nor makes more impracticable the manner of its introduction.

---

<sup>1</sup>The correspondence in full is to be found in the "Improvement Era" for January, 1904, pp. 179-196.

## II.

*Miscellaneous Objections Based on Literary Style and Language.*

The theory established that the language of the translation of the Book of Mormon is Joseph Smith's, and that at least for extended quotations from Isaiah and the New Testament writers he turned to the common English version of the Bible and adopted it, the answer to all objections based upon errors in literary style and grammar, and the finding of many passages from the Hebrew prophets and New Testament writers transcribed from King James' translation—is obvious:

(1) The language is Joseph Smith's; the errors in style and grammar are due to his very limited education, for which the lack of educational opportunities alone is responsible.

(2) To relieve himself somewhat of the mental strain in the work of translation when he came to matter transcribed from the Hebrew prophets into the Nephite record, or to instructions of the Messiah that paralleled his teachings to the people of Judea—of which there already existed a reasonably good English translation—the Prophet adopted that translation.<sup>k</sup>

The ideas underlying this explanation once adopted,

---

<sup>k</sup>For confirmation of the likelihood of his taking such a course, see his letter to the saints in Nauvoo on the subject of baptism for the dead (Doc. & Cov., Sec. 128: 17, 18). He quotes the 5th and 6th verses of the last chapter of Malachi, precisely as it reads in the authorized English version, and then adds: "I might have rendered a plainer translation to this, but it is

it is equally easy to meet the objections to the Book of Mormon based on the existence of modern words and phraseology found in it; of provincialisms of the time and place in which the translation was wrought; of phrases and words from modern poets and religious exhorters. These words and phrases made up the vocabulary of Joseph Smith; and his mode of expressing his thought is that of the period and place in which he lived; and hence the ideas obtained from the Nephite plates he couched in those modern words, phrases and modes of expression familiar to him.

Sometimes, however, more is claimed for the existence of these modern words, phrases and alleged quotations from modern poets than is warranted.<sup>1</sup> For example: Camp-

---

sufficiently plain to suit my purpose as it stands." Long before Moroni had given him a different rendition as follows:

BIBLE.

"Behold I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord;

"And he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.

MORONI.

"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.

"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."

And yet the prophet used the passage as it is found in Malachi, since it suited the prophet's purpose as it stood.

<sup>1</sup>The Rev. M. T. Lamb, author of the "Golden Bible, or the Book of Mormon. Is it from God," delivering a lecture in the town of Coalville, Utah, had the following experience: In the course of his remarks the reverend gentleman related how he had sat down to read the Book of Mormon for the purpose of really ascertaining for himself if it were true or false. He related how he found on the very first page of the book the statement that Lehi's family consisted of his wife Sariah, and his

bell, Hyde, Lamb, Linn, and many others, sarcastically remark that the words of Shakespeare are quoted in a passage in the Book of Mormon accredited to Lehi, 2200 years before Shakespeare was born! Linn puts it in this form:

Shakespeare is proved a plagiarist by comparing his words with those of the second Nephi, who, speaking twenty-two hundred years before Shakespeare was born, said, "Hear the words of a trembling parent, whose limbs you must soon lay down in the cold and silent grave, from whence no traveler can return."

The theory already advanced as an explanation of the existence of modern words and phraseology in Joseph

---

four sons, Laman, Lemuel, Sam and Nephi. "Sam, Sam," said he, "that sounds familiar! Sam, it occurs to me that I have heard that name somewhere before! Sam! Oh, yes, I remember, 'Sam' is the Yankee nickname for Samuel! Right then and there," said the speaker, "I had my doubts as to this book being a genuine, ancient record, since I found a modern Yankee contraction of a proper name given as the name of an ancient personage!" At the conclusion of his remarks the reverend gentleman gave opportunity for questions on the subject of his lecture. Whereupon, Elder W. W. Cluff of the "Mormon" faith, arose, and in the course of a good-natured and informal discussion he asked the Rev. Mr. Lamb what he would think of a person who would sit down and begin an examination of the pentateuch—the books accredited to Moses, and the most ancient of the Hebrew scriptures (except, perhaps, the book of Job), to ascertain its truth, and coming to the enumeration of the names of the sons of Jacob finds one of them named "Dan." "Dan, Dan," says this supposed investigator, "Dan, why it seems to me that I have heard that name before! sounds familiar! Oh, I remember now, 'Dan' is the Yankee nickname for 'Daniel.' Therefore the writings of Moses cannot be genuine, because here is a Yankee nickname given as the name of a very ancient personage, therefore these alleged writings of Moses must be modern; hence, not what they have claimed to be, ancient inspired scriptures!" It is needless to say that the Rev. M. T. Lamb had nothing further to say on this point. The simple parallel was too much for him.

"Linn's "Story of the Mormons," p. 96.

Smith's translation of the Nephite record is adequate as an explanation of such instances of modernisms as this.<sup>o</sup> Through school books extant, or through listening to itinerant preachers, the Prophet might have become acquainted with such phraseology as this alleged quotation from Shakespeare, and employed it where it would express some Nephite idea or thought found in the Nephite record. Still, this alleged quotation from the British poet, at least, is susceptible of another explanation.

In the book of Job I find two passages either of which, and surely both of them combined, would furnish the complete thought, and for that matter largely, the phraseology to both Lehi and Shakespeare. I quote Job's language, and afterwards that of Lehi's and Shakespeare's, that the reader may compare them:

1. *Job*, "Let me alone that I may take comfort a little before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death."<sup>o</sup>

"When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence I shall not return."<sup>p</sup>

2. *Lehi*, "Hear the words of a parent whose limbs you

---

"Through nature to nature's God" is another instance referred to by many anti-Mormon writers as being in the Book of Mormon (although this writer has failed to find it), and is also in Pope's Essay on man. "The God of nature suffers" (First Nephi 19: 11-12), an expression used by the first Nephi, quoting the words of the prophet Zenos; this, be it remembered, several hundred years before Christ. This expression is accredited to Dionysius, the areopigate, supposed to be living at the time of the Savior's death on the cross, and who, as he beheld the sun hide its face, and witnessed the bursting of the rocks and felt the earth tremble, exclaimed: "Either the God of Nature suffers or the universe is falling apart." And it is sneeringly urged that "Nephi, 2400 years ago, hears the saying of a pagan who lives 634 years after him! (Campbell.)

<sup>o</sup>Job x. 20-21.

<sup>p</sup>Job xvi: 22.

must soon lay down in the cold and silent grave, from whence no traveler can return."

3. *Shakespeare*, "That undiscovered country from whose bourne no traveler returns."

It will be observed that the passage from the Book of Mormon follows Job more closely than it does Shakespeare, both in thought and diction; and this for the reason, doubtless, that Lehi had been impressed with Job's idea<sup>q</sup> of going to a land whence he would not return; and Joseph Smith being familiar with Job, and very likely not familiar with Shakespeare, when he came to Lehi's thought he expressed it nearly in Job's phraseology; and undoubtedly Shakespeare paraphrased his now celebrated passage from Job.

It is also objected that many of the prophecies of the Book of Mormon respecting the earth-career of Messiah, especially the prophecies found in first Nephi, are given sometimes in the language of accomplished fact.<sup>r</sup> "Lehi," says Campbell, "was a greater Prophet than any of the Jewish prophets, and uttered all the events of the Christian Era and developed the records of Matthew, Luke, and John 600 years before John the Baptist was born." He follows the general statement with a number of passages illustrative of it.

This circumstance of writing prophecy in the language of accomplished fact, however, ought not to appeal to orthodox Christians as a very serious objection to the prophecies in the Book of Mormon, since they have on their hands the fifty third chapter of Isaiah to account for. This chapter

---

<sup>q</sup>It must be remembered that Lehi's colony carried with them, in their journey to the western hemisphere, the Jewish scriptures extant up to 600 B. C., which scriptures doubtless included the book of Job; hence my remark that Lehi was doubtless familiar with Job's reflection concerning death—of his going whence he would not return.

<sup>r</sup>I Nephi 22. 21. II Nephi 31. 5-10.



by a consensus of opinion of orthodox Christian scholarship is regarded as a wonderful prophecy, outlining the earth life, character and redemptive mission of the Christ; and for the most part this prophecy is given in the language of accomplished fact. I quote part of the chapter conceded to refer to the Christ:

He hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him.

He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief, and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.

He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. (Isaiah, LIII:2-10.)

Surely after this it is not worth while for orthodox Christians to be objecting to prophecies in the Book of Mormon on the ground that they are written in the language of accomplished fact. So far from this peculiarity of Isaiah's having brought him into disrepute as a prophet; it seems to have added to his glory, because so writing his prophecy, it is claimed, has given a vividness to his predictions, an exactness that made the messianic prophecies

all the more valuable. "The prophecies regarding the Messiah's birth, passion, glory, rejection by the Jews, and acceptance by the Gentiles are so exact as to have earned him the name of the 'Gospel Prophet.'"—(Oxford Bible Helps—Isaiah). It should be remembered, too, in this connection, that the Book of Isaiah's prophecies carried by the colony of Lehi into the Western hemisphere with them became a powerful influence among the Nephite writers. His book is quoted from more extensively than any other book of the Jewish scriptures possessed by the Nephites; and that because of the plainness with which Isaiah spoke of the coming and mission of Messiah. The first Nephi, commenting upon Isaiah and the esteem in which he held his writing, said:

And now I, Nephi, write more of the words of Isaiah, for my soul delighteth in his words. For I will liken [apply] his words unto my people, and I will send them forth unto all my children, for he verily saw my Redeemer, even as I have seen him. And my brother Jacob also has seen him as I have seen him, wherefore I will send their words forth unto my children, to prove unto them that my words are true.

Small wonder then if a prophet held in such large esteem, as was Isaiah, and so extensively quoted, influenced prophetic Nephite literature, and led to the habit of writing prophecies referring to the Christ in the language of accomplished fact.

The Rev. M. T. Lamb, in his "Golden Bible" makes practically the same charges as Mr. Campbell, saying, in addition that many of the quotations from the Jewish scriptures found in the Book of Mormon, are written "in the exact language of the New Testament."

It is sufficient to say to this objection that Joseph Smith having a full knowledge of the facts of the Christian story, as related in the New Testament, clothed the ideas

caught from the Nephite record in New Testament phraseology; and it has been suggested that he may have done so in places in stronger terms than a rigidly strict translation might have warranted.<sup>s</sup>

It is not necessary to go into detail in considering this objection,<sup>t</sup> or of objections of similar nature, for the reason-

---

<sup>s</sup>Such, substantially, is a suggestion made by Mr. H. Chamberlain, Esq., whom I have quoted before in this chapter.

<sup>t</sup>In the course of a brief discussion of the Book of Mormon, carried on through one of the leading journals of Salt Lake City, with an "Unknown" writer, the following rule of criticism, on the objection discussed in the text, was laid down:

"Any book which professes to have been written in ancient times and yet quotes from authors not born until centuries afterwards, is a spurious book."

To which the writer made the following reply:

"This canon of criticism, however serviceable when applied to books in general, can in no sense be made to do service against the Book of Mormon. When he formulated his canon of criticism, as throughout the discussion, the 'Unknown' failed to recognize the fact that, while the Book of Mormon is an ancient book, it is largely a prophetic book; and the strongest complaint that can be made against it along the line of the 'Unknown's' criticism is that some of its prophecies are here and there translated in phraseology somewhat similar to that of writers living subsequent to the period in which it was written. In explanation of this fact I have urged that the translator, Joseph Smith, being acquainted with the New Testament [and to a limited extent with the popular phrases of some modern writers] and his diction being influenced by the phraseology of those writers, sometimes expressed the thoughts and predictions of the ancient writers in the New Testament phrases. So that the question at issue at this point of the discussion is, first, whether the ancient writers in the Book of Mormon could have been acquainted with the events, to them then future, found recorded in the Book of Mormon, and is the theory reasonable that in translating their statement of these events Joseph Smith's diction would be influenced by the phraseology of the New Testament? In dealing with the question of the New Testament phraseology in the Book of Mormon it is Joseph Smith that has to be dealt with, not Nephi [or other Book of Mormon writers], the translator, not the original writers."

The whole controversy, consisting of four papers, will be found in the writer's "Defense of the Faith and the Saints." Vol. I. pp. 313-354.

that this whole class of objections is met completely by the theory suggested in these pages concerning the translation of the Book of Mormon.

### III.

*The Difficulty of Passages from Isaiah Being Quoted by Nephite Writers, that Modern Bible Criticism (Higher Criticism) Holds Were Not Written Until the Time of the Babylonian Captivity—586-538 B. C., and not Written by Isaiah at all.*

It is held that Isaiah's historical period—the period of his ministry—runs through the reign of four kings of Judah—Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. Some extend his ministry over into the reign of Manasseh, by whose edict, it is said, he was sawn asunder. In any event Isaiah would be a very aged man at the close of the reign of Hezekiah, 698 B. C.; and he would have been between eighty and ninety at the accession of Manasseh. So that it is safe to say that life ended soon after the close of Hezekiah's reign. Now if it be true that the latter part of the Book of Isaiah, from chapter forty to chapter sixty-six, inclusive, was not written until and during the Babylonian Captivity, 586-538 B. C.—as assumed by modern criticism—then of course the prophet Isaiah did not write that part of the book which bears his name as author.

Again: If it be true that these chapters 40-66 were not written until and during the Babylonian captivity, then Lehi could not have taken that part of the book of Isaiah with him into the wilderness and subsequently brought it with him to America, where his son Nephi copied passages and whole chapters into the record he engraved

upon plates called the plates of Nephi,<sup>a</sup> since Lehi left Jerusalem 600 years B. C.

The difficulty presented by the Higher Criticism is obvious, viz: If Joseph Smith is representing the first Nephi as transcribing into his Nephite records passages and whole chapters purporting to have been written by Isaiah, when as a matter of fact those chapters were not written until a hundred and twenty-five or a hundred and fifty years after Isaiah's death; and not until fifty years after Lehi's colony had departed from Jerusalem, then Joseph Smith is representing Nephi as doing that which is impossible, and throws the whole Book of Mormon under suspicion of being fraudulent. This, therefore, becomes a very interesting as well as a very important objection; and many among the Higher Critics will say a fatal one. Here it can only be treated in outline; it is undoubtedly worthy of exhaustive analysis.

The Book of Isaiah divides into two parts: first, chapters 1-39, universally allowed to be the work of the prophet Isaiah, whose ministry extended through the reigns of the four kings mentioned in Isaiah i:1; second, chapters 40-66, written by an unknown author, nearly one hundred and fifty years after Isaiah, sometimes called Isaiah II. It is claimed that these chapters 40-66; "form a continuous prophecy, dealing throughout with a common theme, viz, Israel's restoration from exile in Babylon. \* \* Jerusalem and the temple have been for long in ruins—the 'old waste places;' Israel is in exile."<sup>b</sup> It is to these conditions that the unknown prophet addresses himself. His object is to awak-

---

<sup>a</sup>Isaiah chapter 48 is found in I. Nephi, chapter 20; Isaiah 49 in I. Nephi 21; Isaiah 50 in II. Nephi, 7; Isaiah 51 in II. Nephi, 8; Isaiah 53 in Mosiah 14; Isaiah 52:9, 10; in III. Nephi 18-20; Isaiah 54 in III. Nephi 22.

<sup>b</sup>Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament—Isaiah, p. 230.

en faith in the certainty of an approaching restoration.

Three independent lines of argument are said to establish this theory of the authorship of chapters 40-66 in the Book of Isaiah:

(1) The internal evidence supplied by the prophecy itself points to this period [time of the captivity] as that at which it was written. It alludes repeatedly to Jerusalem as ruined and deserted; to the sufferings which the Jews have experienced, or are experiencing, at the hands of the Chaldaeans; to the prospect of return, which, as the prophet speaks, is imminent. Those whom the prophet addresses, and, moreover, addresses in person—arguing with them, appealing to them, striving to win their assent by his warm and impassioned rhetoric—are not the men of Jerusalem, contemporaries of Ahaz and Hezekiah, or even of Manasseh, they are the exiles in Babylonia. Judged by the analogy of prophecy, this constitutes the strongest possible presumption that the author actually lived in the period which he thus describes, and is not merely (as has been supposed) Isaiah immersed in spirit in the future, and holding converse, as it were, with the generations yet unborn. Such an immersion, in the future would be not only with parallel in the O. T., it would be contrary to the nature of prophecy. The prophet speaks always, in the first instance, to his own contemporaries: the message which he brings intimately related with the circumstances of his time; his promises and predictions, however far they reach into the future, nevertheless rest upon the basis of the history of his own age, and correspond to the needs which are then felt. The prophet never abandons his own historical position, but speaks from it.<sup>c</sup>

(2) The argument derived from the historic function of prophecy is confirmed by the literary style of c. 40-66, which is very different from that of Isaiah 1-39. Isaiah 1-39 shows strongly marked individualities of style; he is fond of particular images and phrases, many of which are used by no other writer of the O. T. Now, in the chapters which contain evident allusions to the age of Isaiah himself, these expressions occur repeatedly; in the

---

<sup>c</sup>Driver's Introduction, pp. 336, 337.

chapters which are without such allusions, and which thus authorize *prima facie* the inference that they belong to a different age, they are absent, and new images and phrases appear instead. This coincidence cannot be accidental. The subject of c. 40-66 is not so different from that of Isaiah's prophecies (e. g.) against the Assyrians, as to necessitate a new phraseology and rhetorical form. The differences can only be reasonably explained by the supposition of a change of author.<sup>d</sup>

(3) The theological ideas of c. 40-66 (in so far as they are not of that fundamental kind common to the prophets generally) differ remarkably from those which appear, from c. 1-39, to be distinctive of Isaiah. Thus, on the nature of God generally, the ideas expressed are much larger and fuller. Isaiah, for instance, depicts the majesty of Jehovah: in c. 40-66 the prophet emphasizes his infinitude; He is the Creator, the Sustainer of the universe, the Life-Giver, the Author of history, the First and the Last, the Incomparable One. This is a real difference. And yet it cannot be argued that opportunities for such assertions of Jehovah's power and Godhead would not have presented themselves naturally to Isaiah whilst he was engaged in defying the armies of Assyria. But, in truth, c. 40-66 show an advance upon Isaiah, not only in the substance of their theology, but also in the form in which it is presented; truths which are merely affirmed in Isaiah being here made the subject of reflection and argument.<sup>e</sup>

These arguments when expressed in these general terms seem quite formidable; but they are much stronger in general statement than when one follows the advocates of them through all the references cited by them in support of the theory; for then one is impressed with the very heavy weights which the Higher Criticism hangs on very slender threads. As before remarked, however, I may not go beyond outline treatment of the matter here.

The first thing those of us who believe Isaiah to be the author of the whole book through so many ages accred-

<sup>d</sup>Ibid. p. 238.

<sup>e</sup>Ibid., p. 242.

ited to him, both by Jews and Chritsians—the first thing we have a right to demand of these innovators is: If Isaiah the prophet is not the author of the last twenty-seven chapters of the book that bears his name, who is the author? Confessedly chapters 40-66 of Isaiah are the most important part of the book. How is it that chapters 1-39 can be assigned an author, but the more important chapters 40-66 have to be assigned to an “unknown” author? Was knowledge in those antique times so imperfect that the author of such a remarkable production as Isaiah 40-66 could not be ascertained?

Second, there is no heading to this second division of Isaiah 40-66; and it is not true that this second part is unconnectèd with the first part. Allowing something to the spirit of prophecy in Isaiah, by which I mean a power to foresee events, which carries with it a power in the prophet to project himself into the midst of those things foreseen, and to speak from the midst of them as if they were present—as indeed they were to his consciousness—and there is an immediate connection between the two parts. Chapter 39 predicts the Babylonian captivity. Hezekiah has just been made to hear the word of the Lord—

Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store until this day, shall be carried to Babylon; nothing shall be left, saith the Lord.

And thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon. (Isaiah 39: 6-7).

In the opening chapter of the supposed second division of Isaiah, chapter 40, the prophet launches out upon that series of prophecies that treat, first, of the deliverance of Israel from this captivity just spoken of through Cyrus, king



of Persia; and, second, a larger deliverance of Israel through the redemption brought to pass by the Christ. Because of this close and logical connection between the supposed divisions of the book, one is justified in holding that the inscription of chapter i: 1, applies to the whole book, and implies that Isaiah is the author of the second part, 40-66, as well as of the first part, 1-39. "Nor do the words concerning Judah and Jerusalem," says an eminent authority, "oppose the idea that the inscription applied to the whole; for whatever he [Isaiah] says against other nations, he says on account of their relation to Judah."<sup>f</sup>

Second, the Higher Critics must deal with some facts of history before their claims can be allowed. According to Josephus, the Jews showed the prophecies of Isaiah (chapter 44: 28; 45: 1-13) to Cyrus the king, to induce him to return the Jews to Jerusalem and order the building of the temple, upon which Cyrus issued the following decree:

Thus saith Cyrus the king, Since God Almighty hath appointed me to be king of the habitable earth, I believe that he is that God which the nation of the Israelites worship, for indeed he foretold my name by the prophets, and that I should build him a house at Jerusalem, in the country of Judea.

This was known to Cyrus by his reading the book which Isaiah left behind him of his prophecies; for this prophet said, that God had spoken thus to him in a secret vision; "My will is, that Cyrus, whom I have appointed to be king over many and great nations, send back my people to their own land, and build my temple." This was foretold by Isaiah one hundred and forty years before the temple was demolished. Accordingly, when Cyrus read this, and admired the divine power, an earnest desire and ambition seized upon him, to fulfill what was so written."<sup>g</sup>

---

<sup>f</sup>Jamieson-Faussett-Brown Commentary, Introduction to Isaiah.

<sup>g</sup>Antiquities of the Jews, Book XI., chapter I.

The above is confirmed also by Ezra i:2. Now the value of this exhibition of the word of the Lord to Cyrus grew out of the circumstance that it was a prophecy uttered by Isaiah one hundred and fifty years before it came to the knowledge of Cyrus. It was the fact that it was "fore-knowledge" that caused Cyrus to admire the divine power thus displayed; it was this that stirred him with the ambition to fulfill what was so written. Now either we must believe that the pious Jews, anxious to return to the land of their fathers, rebuild their temple and resume the thread of their national existence, deceived by a wretched subterfuge the king of Persia, and induced him to make this proclamation by such means; or else they really exhibited to him the writings of Isaiah, and this real prophecy respecting himself, fraught with such mighty consequences to a people chosen of God to stand as his witness among the nations of the earth. I cannot think that this action so important in the development of God's purposes respecting his people was founded in fraud; nor do I believe such mighty results were brought about by disclosing the prognostications of some "unknown" contemporary whose "eye had marked Cyrus in the distance as the coming deliverer of his nation;" such cause would be inadequate to the results.

Again, Luke represents the Christ as reading a passage from this second division of Isaiah (chapter 61:1, 2), and reading it as coming from Isaiah; and also as being fulfilled in his own person:

And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read.

And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias [Isaiah]. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written.

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.

And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down. And the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him.

And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.

And all bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. (Luke iv: 16-22).

One can scarcely think of Jesus being mistaken in respect of the authorship of the scripture from which he read, especially respecting a prophecy relating to himself. Furthermore, whoever wrote Isaiah 61: 1, 2, whether Isaiah, the admitted author of Isaiah chapters 1-39, or some other author a hundred and fifty or two hundred years later, and in the midst of the scenes of the Babylonian captivity, this much is true: he projected himself forward some several hundreds of years into the times of the beginning of the Christ's mission, (if we may believe the Christ when he applies the prophecy to himself and proclaims the fulfillment of it in the happenings of that day), speaks in the present tense, as if pleading with the men of his own day. So that if this power is admitted as being possessed by the supposed "unknown" author of chapters 40-66, it might as well be accorded to Isaiah as to him; and if that power be accorded to a prophetic writer, then all the difficulties conjured up by our modern critics, and to overcome which their theories were invoked, meet with easy solution.

As to the difference of literary style between the first and second division of Isaiah's book, urging as necessary the belief in different authors for the two parts, I am dis-

posed to give considerable weight to such evidence, since I know how strong the tendency in expression towards individuation is, but those more competent to judge of that subject than I am, hold that of all the prophetic writers, Isaiah possesses the widest range of literary style, the largest richness in coloring and forms of expression. And this when the view of his style is confined to that part of his book of which all allow he is the author. As for example, the one author most assured that Isaiah did not write chapters 40-66 of the book that bears his name, the author of "An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," speaking of Isaiah, and of course limiting his comment to the author of chapters 1-39, says:

Isaiah's poetical genius is superb. His characteristics are grandeur and beauty of conception, wealth of imagination, vividness of illustration, compressed energy and splendor of diction.

\* \* \* \* \* Examples of picturesque and impressive imagery are indeed so abundant that selection is difficult. These may be instanced, however: the banner raised aloft upon the mountains; the restless roar of the sea; the waters rising with irresistible might; the forest consumed rapidly in the circling flames, or stripped of its foliage by an unseen hand; the raised way; the rushing of many waters; the storm driving or beating down all before it; the monster funeral pyre; Jehovah's hand "stretched out," or "swung," over the earth, and bearing consternation with it. Especially grand are the figures under which he conceives Jehovah as "rising up," being "exalted," or otherwise asserting His majesty against those who would treat it with disregard or disdain. \* \* \* \* \* The brilliancy and power of Isaiah's genius appear further in the sudden contrasts, and pointed antitheses and retorts, in which he delights.

Isaiah's literary style shows similar characteristics. It is chaste and dignified: the language is choice, but devoid of all artificiality or stiffness, every sentence is compact and forcible; the rhythm is stately; the periods are finely rounded; Isaiah indulges occasionally—in the manner of his people—in tone-paint-

ing, and sometimes enforces his meaning by an effective assonance, but never to excess, or as a meretricious ornament. His style is never diffuse: even his longest discourses are not monotonous or prolix; he knows how to treat his subject fruitfully, and, as he moves along, to bring before his reader new and varied aspects of it; thus he seizes a number of salient points, and presents each singly in a vivid picture. \* \* \* \* No prophet has Isaiah's power either of conception or of expression; none has the same command of noble thoughts, or can present them in the same noble and attractive language.

Immerse such a writer as this into the spirit of the future, give him the theme of Israel's deliverance from Babylonian captivity, or the larger deliverance of Israel and the world from sin and death through the mission of the Christ; and what new coloring may he not give to his style? What greater depths of truth respecting God and man may he not sound, calling for new phraseology, new words and combinations to express the deeper knowledge of the enlarged "vision?" This I believe is what happened to the prophet. He was so immersed; and his style under the inspiration of God rose to meet the new environment and the enlarged views given by the wider vision.

One of the most forceful passages on this subject that I have yet found is one written by Professor Daniel Smith Talcott, D. D., of the Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine. He contributes the Article on "Isaiah" to Hackett's edition of Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, and in the course of his treatise, referring to the diversity of style between the two alleged parts of Isaiah, says:

The array of linguistic evidence in proof of a diversity of authorship, which has gradually grown within the last century into the formidable proportions in which it meets us in the pages of Knobel and others, rests very largely upon an assumption which none of these critics have the hardihood distinctly to vin-

dicare, namely, that within the narrow compass of the Hebrew literature that has come down to us from any given period, we have the means for arriving at an accurate estimate of all the resources which the language at that time possessed. When we have eliminated from the list of words and phrases relied upon to prove a later date than the time of Isaiah, everything the value of which to the argument must stand or fall with this assumption, there remains absolutely nothing which may not be reasonably referred to the reign of Hezekiah. Indeed, considering all the circumstances of the times, it might justly have been expected that the traces of foreign influence upon the language would be far more conspicuous in a writing of this date than they actually are in the controverted portions.

It is to be remembered that the ministry of the prophet must have extended through a period, at the lowest calculation, of nearly fifty years; a period signalized, especially during the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah, by constant and growing intercourse with foreign nations, thus involving continually new influences for the corruption of public morals and new dangers to the state, and making it incumbent upon him who had been divinely constituted at once the political adviser of the nation and its religious guide, to be habitually and intimately conversant among the people, so as to descry upon the instant every additional step taken in their downward course and the first approach of each new peril from abroad, and to be able to meet each successive phase of their necessities with forms of instruction, admonition, and warning, not only in their general purport, but in their very style and diction, accommodated to conditions hitherto unknown, and that were still perpetually changing.

Now when we take all this into the account, and then imagine to ourselves the prophet, toward the close of this long period, entering upon what was in some respects a novel kind of labor, and writing out, with a special view to the benefit of a remote posterity, the suggestions of that mysterious *Theopneustia* to which his lips had been for so many years the channel of communication with his contemporaries, far from finding any difficulty in the diversities of style perceptible to the different portions of his prophecy, we shall only see fresh occasion to admire that native strength and grandeur of intellect, which have

still left upon productions so widely remote from each other, in the time and circumstances of their composition, so plain an impress of one and the same overmastering individuality.—Smith's Bible Dictionary, Vol. II., p. 1165.

Believers in the Book of Mormon have no occasion of uneasiness because passages from the latter part of Isaiah's book are found transcribed into the Nephite record. The theories of modern critics have not destroyed the integrity and unity of the Book of Isaiah. And after the overwhelming evidences for the truth of the Book of Mormon are taken into account; and it is found that on the plates of Nephi there were transcripts from the latter part of Isaiah's writings, taken from a copy of his prophecies carried by a colony of Jews from Jerusalem to the western hemisphere, six hundred years before Christ—men will discern in this discovery new evidence for the Isaiah authorship of the whole book of Isaiah.