

nesses have you that miracles were wrought in the days of our Savior or in the days of his Apostles who succeeded him? You have no person outside the Church only those who, like Josephus, bore their testimony from hearsay. Within the Church you have six witnesses. There are eight writers in the New Testament, but only six of these eight have borne any testimony concerning the performing of miracles, but you believe it on their testimony. The Book of Mormon, I presume, has more than six thousand, if not sixty thousand witnesses to its divinity and to the miracles that have been wrought in these latter days. Which is the greatest? Has anyone you have ever seen at the present day had an angel sent to him, who held up before him the tables on which the law of Moses was written, commanding him to hear testimony to the divinity of that law? No: no one in the Christian world makes any pretension to anything of this kind. Then is not the testimony in favor of the Book of Mormon superior to that which you possess in favor of the law of Moses? Yes. We can show you witnesses, men still living, to whom an angel appeared and told them that the Book of Mormon was a divine record. The Christian world have no such evidence as this in favor of the Bible, and they cannot, by any living witness, substantiate the divinity of the Bible. Moreover, we have another advantage; the Book of Mormon was translated directly from the original. Now, have you, either in the Old or New Testaments, a book that was translated directly from the original? Not one. Is there one that was translated from a secondhand copy even? Not, one. I presume there is not a book compiled in the Bible

but what went through many hundreds of transformations before it fell into the hands of King James' translators. How do you know that these copyists copied correctly? You have no access to the originals. It is true that you have Hebrew Bibles, but they are not originals; they are only copies. They were multiplied, before the art of printing was invented, for many generations, and the copies that were in possession of King James' translators had perhaps been handed down through a thousand other copies of older date, and how can you be sure that they were correct? We are told by some of our archbishops and learned men, who have spent their whole lives in collecting copies of ancient manuscripts from which to translate the Bible, that they at last despaired of obtaining a correct copy of the work. One archbishop, mentioned in the Encyclopedias, had collected a vast number of copies of the Bible in Hebrew, as ancient as he could possibly get hold of them. But when he came to compare them he found about thirty thousand different readings. Almost every text would read different in one copy from what it would in another. Finally, he gave up the idea of making a translation at all, none of his copies being original; and consequently when the translators of the English Bible performed that work they did it according to the best judgment they had, and they no doubt did it well as far as human wisdom could, under the circumstances. Now, then, the difference between the Bible of the West—the Book of Mormon—and the Bible of the East—the Old and New Testament, is that one was taken directly from the original, the other from a multitude of manuscripts which differed almost in every text. It would seem, then,