

of Jesus Christ, just as we believe them, and hope for their fulfilment. Is that anything new?

"Well, if you have not a new Bible, you have certainly got a new book." Is that anything strange? Have not other societies got new books? The Church of England have not only the Scriptures, but the Book of Common Prayer, and the time was when they did not have such a book, therefore when they made that, it was something new. They are not alone in that however, for the Methodists have a new book called the "Methodist's Discipline." One hundred and twenty years ago there was no such thing in existence. If having a new book be an innovation, then all are guilty of it as well as the "Mormons."

"But those other people do not profess that their books are inspired, and we have learned that you have a book that you believe is inspired. What is it, anyhow?" This is all a fact, and if it is wrong we will cheerfully plead guilty. We have got another book besides the Bible, that was an ancient book, and profess that it is inspired, and was written by Prophets, and men that enjoyed the ministering of angels, more or less of them, and had communion with the heavens, and the spirit of prophecy. And moreover, we profess that this ancient book was restored to the knowledge of the modern world by inspiration, and the ministering of angels. Is that something new? It may be new to the world in its history, and in its bearings; in that respect it may be new to them; but suppose, after all, it should contain no new doctrine, no new principle, no new prophecy, that is, differing from or doing away that which is already extant in the Bible? Well, then, I do not say that it would be a new doctrine. Men had books revealed in the days of old.

"If it is no new doctrine, and if

its predictions do not differ from those contained in the old and new Testaments, what is the use of it?" The same question was investigated in ancient times. A great conqueror had taken possession of an ancient library, when there were no printing presses, containing one hundred thousand volumes, all in manuscript comprising more history than was in any library extant in the ancient world. The conqueror was a Mahommedan. He wrote to the head of the department to know what to do with this library. It was invaluable in its cost and intrinsic worth. "What shall I do with it?" The reply was, "If it agrees with the Koran, we have no use for it; and if it does not agree with the Koran, it is false anyhow; so in either case burn it."

"Now if these Latter-day Saints have a book extant among them, and it agrees with the Bible, there is no kind of use for it," says the opposer, "for the Bible contains all that is necessary; if it does not agree with the Bible, it is false anyhow; so in either case burn it." This was a principle of Mahommedanism, and may be a principle of what is called modern Christianity. I hope not, however.

"What is the use of the book in question, anyhow?" Why, in the first place, it differs in its history from the Bible. The Bible is a history of things that took place in Asia, principally, and a little of what took place in Europe and Africa. The Book of Mormon is a history of things in another hemisphere: The one book is the ancient history of the Eastern Hemisphere, in part; and the other is a history of the Western Hemisphere, in part. Shall we say, because we have the history of one part of the world, that the history of the other part of the world is good for nothing? Could the rulers of nations realize that fact, and could they only have a copy in their libraries at the cost of