

## PAPYRI NOT ABOUT ABRAHAM

In the year 1835 the Mormon people purchased some Egyptian mummies and rolls of papyrus. Joseph Smith, the Mormon prophet, translated a portion of the papyrus and published it under the title "The Book of Abraham." This book is now found as part of the *Pearl of Great Price*—one of the four standard works of the Mormon Church. For a long period of time the Mormon leaders claimed that the original papyri were burned in the Chicago fire. On November 27, 1967, however, the *Deseret News* (a Mormon newspaper) announced:

A collection of pa[p]yrus manuscripts, long believed to have been destroyed in the Chicago fire in 1871, was presented to the Church . . . by the Metropolitan Museum of Art. . . . Included in the papyri is a manuscript identified as the original document from which Joseph Smith had copied the drawing which he called "Facsimile No. 1" and published with the Book of Abraham. (*Deseret News*, November 27, 1967, page 1)

After the discovery was announced many members of the Mormon Church felt that Joseph Smith's work had been vindicated. Dr. Hugh Nibley, however, warned his people that there was trouble ahead. On December 1, 1967, the *Daily Universe*, published at the Brigham Young University, reported these statements by Dr. Nibley:

"The papyri scripts given to the Church do not **prove the Book of Abraham is true**," Dr. Hugh Nibley said in an academics office-sponsored assembly Wednesday night. "LDS scholars are **caught flat footed** by this discovery," he went on to say.

According to Dr. Nibley, Mormon scholars should have been doing added research on the *Pearl of Great Price* years ago. Non-Mormon scholars will bring in questions regarding the manuscripts which will be hard to answer because of lack of scholarly knowledge on the subject.

In the speech delivered primarily on the attitude of Brigham Young on education, Dr. Nibley said worldly discoveries are going to "**bury the Church in criticism**" if members of the Church don't take it upon themselves to become a people of learning. . . . Mormons ought to know as much or more as others, "but they don't," Dr. Nibley said, quoting Brigham Young. (*Daily Universe*, Brigham Young University, December 1, 1967)

Although these are strange words to be coming from the man whom the Mormon leaders have chosen to defend the "Book of Abraham," they are certainly the truth.

In the last issue of the *Salt Lake City Messenger* we stated that since the day the Metropolitan Museum presented the papyri to the Church, "the Mormon leaders have made one mistake after another until they have painted themselves into a corner, and truth now demands that they repudiate the Book of Abraham and renounce the anti-Negro doctrine contained in its pages." We also stated that "the fall of the Book of Abraham has been brought about by the identification of the piece of papyrus from which Joseph Smith translated the Book of Abraham." On the second page of the same *Messenger* we stated that "Mr. Heward has carefully examined the piece of papyrus that has been identified as the source of the Book of Abraham, and he feels that it is probably a part of the Egyptian 'Book of Breathings.'"

We can now announce that Grant Heward's identification was correct, and that the papyrus fragment which Joseph Smith called the "Book of Abraham" is in reality nothing but a part of the "Book of Breathings." One of the most noted Egyptologists in the world had confirmed the fact that it is part of the "Book of Breathings." His statement will be published at a later date. E. A. Wallis Budge has given us this information concerning the "Book of Breathings":

Of special interest among the works which were popular in the Ptolemaic and Graeco-Roman periods, and probably later, is the "Shai en Sensen," or "Book of Breathings." In this composition we find ideas and beliefs which were derived from the Book of the Dead. . . . (*The Book of the Dead, An English Translation of the Chapters, Hymns, Etc. of the Theban Recension, With Introduction, Notes, Etc.*, New York, 1951, page xlviij)

### A TRANSLATION

Many important things have occurred since the publication of our last *Messenger*. One of the most significant, however, is that Dee Jay Nelson, a Mormon philologist, has made a translation of the Mormon Papyri and was unable to find anything concerning Abraham. We have published Mr. Nelson's work under the title *The Joseph Smith Papyri—A Translation and Preliminary Survey of the Ta-shert-Min and Ter Papyri*.

Mr. Nelson examined the original papyri fragments with Dr. Nibley at the Brigham Young University. He was given photographs by special permission of N. Eldon Tanner (a member of the First Presidency of the Mormon Church) before they were published in the *Improvement Era*. After completing his translation, Mr. Nelson contacted us and asked if we wanted to print it. We felt honored, but we asked him why he did not have the Church print it. He replied that his translation came out unfavorable for the Church, and he felt that they would not print it. He stated that Dr. Nibley seemed to be stalling, and he felt that his people should know the truth about the papyri. Therefore, he decided to let us publish his findings.

### REJECTED

After we had finished the printing on Mr. Nelson's book we decided to advertize it in the papers in Salt Lake City. On April 1, 1968, we submitted the following ad to the Newspaper Agency Corporation:

#### "THE JOSEPH SMITH PAPYRI"

A Translation & Preliminary Survey  
BY DEE JAY NELSON

Price: 75¢

3 for \$2.00 — 5 for \$3.00 — 10 for \$4.50

#### MODERN MICROFILM CO.

Box 1884 — Salt Lake City, Utah 84110  
Utah mail orders add sales tax — we pay postage

They accepted our money, and we were given the understanding that the ad would appear in both the *Deseret News* and the *Salt Lake Tribune* on April 6, 1968. The ad did appear in the *Tribune*, but on April 3, 1968, the *Deseret News* informed us that they had decided not to run the ad. We tried to discuss the matter with N. Eldon Tanner, a member of the First Presidency, but he refused to give us any help with regard to this matter. It would appear, then, that the Mormon leaders are not willing to let their people know both sides of this issue. Dr. Hugh Nibley claims that it is the non-Mormons that are not willing to print both sides of the issue. Speaking of Spalding's work on the Book of Abraham, Dr. Nibley states:

And in the discussion that followed, the Mormons proved their good faith and sincerity by printing in the pages of the *Improvement Era* the letters of Bishop Spalding and his supporters. . . . There was **no such dialogue in the non-Mormon periodicals** in which Dr. Spalding published, including his own Utah newspaper, *The Utah Survey*; in spite of his constant protests of impartiality and intellectual integrity, only his own and like opinions ever appeared there. (*Improvement Era*, January, 1968, page 21)

While it may be true that publications controlled by the Mormon Church allowed some dialogue fifty years ago, it is certainly not true today. The fact that the *Deseret News* will no even allow us to advertize Dee Jay Nelson's book proves that the Mormon leaders do not want their people to know the truth about the papyri.

## NOTHING ABOUT ABRAHAM

As we indicated above, Mr. Nelson was unable to find any mention of Abraham or his religion in any portion of the papyri. He found the names of many pagan gods who were worshipped by the Egyptians but nothing concerning the God of Abraham. He classifies the fragment which has been identified as the source of the Book of Abraham as part of the "Ter Papyrus" and states that it is part of the "Book of Breathings":

The Ter Papyrus is a copy of a work which was particularly popular in Ptolemaic and Roman times and was completely unknown before about 600 B.C. On the Ter Fragment No. 1 the name of the work appears twice, in column 1, line 5 and in column 2, line 7. Its name again appears on Fragment No. 2 (the smaller of the two fragments) in column 1, line 4. In ancient times it was called the Shait en Sensen, or Book of Breathings. The essence of the religious philosophy behind its contents was the restoration of life and breath to the dead. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri—A Translation and Preliminary Survey of the Ta-shert-Min and Ter Papyri*, by Dee Jay Nelson, Salt Lake City, 1968, page 36)

On pages 40 and 41 of the same book, we find these statements:

This piece is clearly a part of the same papyrus as the other unillustrated fragment. It is a part of the Ptolemaic text known as the Shait en Sensen or Book of Breathings. This fact is established by the appearance of the name of the book in column 1, line 4.

1. This papyrus is a traditional copy of the Shait en Sensen, Book of Breathings and is of a **late origin**. It most probably was written in the Ptolemaic Period (after 332 B.C.). Both Fragments are damaged to the extent of at least half of their original area. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, pages 40-41)

It is interesting to note that Dee Jay Nelson and Grant Heward did their work independent of each other, yet they both concluded that the fragment of papyrus that has been identified as the source of the Book of Abraham is in reality a part of the "Book of Breathings."

In the last *Messenger* we included a rendition by Grant Heward of a portion of the papyri. Mr. Heward's rendition showed that it was a "spell for making the transformation into a swallow." Dee Jay Nelson came to the same conclusion. His translation begins: "Spell for transforming one's self into the form of a swallow" (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, page 16).

One portion of Mr. Nelson's book that is very interesting is his translation and comments concerning the fragment of papyrus which is reproduced as Facsimile No. 1 in the Book of Abraham. Joseph Smith claimed that this was a representation of an idolatrous priest trying to sacrifice Abraham on an altar. Dee Jay Nelson, however, shows that it is in reality the god Anubis preparing a mummified body:

This fragment bears the original vignette from which the cut for Facsimile No. 1 in the *Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham was made. It is badly damaged. . . . On the backing paper the missing part of the body and arms of the person on the bier and the shoulder and head of the standing figure have been crudely sketched in. This was presumably done by Joseph Smith or certainly by some individual in the Nineteenth Century. . . .

This scene is intimately familiar to me. I have seen it many times. As a matter of fact, in one temple alone, located at Denderah, thirty seven miles north of Luxor are twenty nine wall bas-reliefs representing Osiris lying upon a lion-headed bier which exactly resembles the one on this papyrus fragment. Five of these even show him with one leg raised above the bed. Two of them also show a jackal-headed god standing near the foot of the bier (behind it) facing the head. One of these has the following similarities. I should say, precise equivalents:

1. The bier has a lions head and an upturned tail.
2. A person is lying on the bier, face up.
3. The hands of the reclining person are held above his face, palms downward (the sign of grief).
4. The reclining figure has his right leg somewhat elevated.
5. A dark figure stands near the foot of the bier facing the head of the couch.
6. A hawk-headed bird (ba) hovers over the reclining figure.

This scene of Anubis embalming Osiris is often seen in copies of the Shait en Sensen, Book of Breathings. An example is the Book of Breathings Papyrus of Kerasher now in the British Museum. . . .

Summary concerning the Ter Papyrus Fragment No. 3

1. This fragment bears the original illustration from which the cut for Facsimile No. 1, *Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham was made. Its identification is undeniable.
2. The fragment is badly damaged.
3. This vignette is typical of scenes from the Shait en Sensen, Book of Breathings, showing Osiris lying dead upon his funeral bier in the process of being embalmed by the jackal-headed god, Anubis.
4. The illustration is of the type popular in the Ptolemaic Period after 332 B.C. The corrupt hieroglyphic text is also typical of this era.
5. The hieroglyphic bookhand characters used in the vertical columns are poorly formed, sometimes written backwards and a basic and often unusual spelling is used.
6. The fragmentary text names the gods Min, Khensu, Anubis and Osiris. It also states that the hawk hovering over the head of Osiris is the ba or soul. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, pages 41-43 and 45)

We do not have room here to include Dee Jay Nelson's translation of the text, but his summary should be sufficient to convince the reader that the scene has nothing to do with Abraham.

Speaking of all the papyrus fragments turned over to the Mormon Church by the Metropolitan Museum, Mr. Nelson states:

The Ta-shert-Min Papyrus (10 fragments) is a copy of a typical late period funeral text known as the Per em Heru or Book of the Dead and the Ter Papyrus is a copy of the Shait en Sensen or Book of Breathings. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, page 5)

Thus it appears that the Book of Abraham has no historical basis and that it is a work of Joseph Smith's imagination.

The reader will remember that Grant Heward was excommunicated from the Mormon Church for criticizing the "Book of Abraham." We do not feel, however, that they will excommunicate Mr. Nelson because he is a nationally known explorer naturalist. He is a member of the Adventurers Club and has given lectures on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In 1957 he was invited by Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion to make the first motion picture of the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is very unlikely that the Mormon leaders will excommunicate such a man.

*The Joseph Smith Papyri—A Translation and Preliminary Survey of the Ta-shert-Min and Ter Papyri*, is a 48-page booklet which is filled with important information concerning the Mormon Papyri. We highly recommend it. The prices are: 75¢ each — 3 for \$2.00 — 5 for \$3.00 — 10 for \$4.50.

---

## DR. NIBLEY EVADES THE ISSUE

The *Improvement Era*, April, 1968, contains a short article by Dr. Hugh Nibley tries to discredit our last issue of the *Messenger* and attempts to explain why he has wasted four issues of the *Improvement Era* criticizing Bishop Spalding's pamphlet and has not dealt with "the new problems" regarding the papyri:

The first draft of this series of articles was written some years before the Church came into possession of the recently acquired papyri, and had already been slated to appear in the *Era* when big news broke. They were never meant as an examination of the new evidence, though they do provide a necessary approach to it. Since **the new problems** could not be dealt with instantly, and the preliminary material was already at hand, it was decided to release the historical background material while working on the other. . . .

The critics of the *Pearl of Great Price*, like those of the Book of Mormon, have always had a weakness for instant solutions. As soon as anyone starts putting a long equation on the blackboard or begins to demonstrate the steps in the solution of an involved problem these students cry out, "Never mind all that—you are just stalling; give us the answer!" They would prefer to have the teacher say, "Students, I am a mathematician, and the answer is zero because I say so. Class dismissed." This has been the ingratiating method of the *Pearl of Great Price* critics from the beginning. . . .

As an example of how complicated the issues can become, we call attention to the March 1968 issue of a privately but widely circulated news sheet, "The Salt Lake City Messenger," announcing in characteristically sensational headlines "The Fall of the Book of Abraham." At last!

The publishers of the news sheet were kind enough to provide the reader with a demonstration of their Egyptology at work, in the form of a transcription and translation by a Mr. Heward of a section of one of the LDS papyri. The picture of a swallow on the fragment makes it possible for even the **ranked amateur like this writer** to spot at once the corresponding passage in Budge's much-publicized translation as Chapter 86 of the Book of the Dead. The student who takes the pains to compare Budge's translation of Ani, Mr. Heward's **purported translation** of the LDS fragment, and the LDS fragment itself will soon discover that Mr. H. is **not** translating the LDS fragment at all, but simply paraphrasing Budge. The papyrus of Ani and the LDS fragment are much alike, but they are far from identical, and **whenever the two differ it is the text of Budge that Mr. H. translates**, in the language of Budge, and **not** the LDS manuscript, which he claims to be reading. **Space will not allow here the presentation of the many passages** in the translation in which this is glaringly apparent.

This is another example of a principle that has been only too fully illustrated in *Pearl of Great Price* criticism, namely, that it is easy to fool the public on matters of which the public knows nothing. No one is more eager than this writer to get out of the critical Slough of Despond and start discussing the wonderful discoveries that are now casting a strange new light on the Book of Abraham. But **before** we can do that, we must deal with a lot of preliminary questions that others have raised.—H.N. (*Improvement Era*, April, 1968, pages 65-66)

Before we say anything about Dr. Nibley's accusation against Grant Heward, we should point out that he has side-stepped the main issue. Our argument that the Book of Abraham has fallen was based primarily upon the fact that the original fragment of papyrus from which Joseph Smith "translated" the Book of Abraham has been located (see photograph in the *Salt Lake City Messenger*, issue 17, page 1). The translation concerning the swallow of course provides evidence that Joseph Smith did not have the writings of Abraham or Joseph of Egypt since it is a part of the Book of the Dead, but the main issue is that the original papyrus fragment which Joseph Smith used as the basis of the Book of Abraham has been located. Our contention is that this fragment is part of the Egyptian "Book of Breathings" and has nothing to do with Abraham. Now, unless Dr. Nibley can translate this fragment and prove that it contains the writings of Abraham as they appear in the *Pearl of Great Price*, then the Book of Abraham is a spurious translation. We do not believe that Dr. Nibley can do this, and we feel certain that this is the reason he has side-stepped the real issue.

Now, concerning the accusation against Grant Heward: Dr. Nibley states that "whenever" the LDS fragment and the papyrus of Ani differ Mr. Heward follows "the text of Budge." This accusation is certainly untrue, for if Mr. Heward had only followed the text given by Budge he would not have been aware of the fact that there are two persons mentioned in the first part of the spell. E. A. Wallis Budge gives this rendering of the first part of the chapter as it appears in the papyrus of Ani:

The Osiris Ani, whose word is truth, saith:—I am a swallow, [I am] a swallow. (*The Book of the Dead, The Hieroglyphic Transcript of the Papyrus of Ani, the Translation into English and an Introduction* by E. A. Wallis Budge, New York, 1960, page 521)

Grant Heward, however, renders the first part of the LDS fragment as follows:

The Osiris daughter Min, justified, born to Neshonsu, justified, says: I am a swallow, I am a swallow. (*Salt Lake City Messenger*, issue no. 17, page 4)

Dee Jay Nelson—who we must remember did his work independent of Grant Heward—gives this rendering to the LDS fragment:

To be said by Osiris Ta-shert-Min, who is true of work, daughter of Nes-Khensu, who is true of word.

I am a swallow, I am a swallow. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, page 16)

It should be obvious from this that Dr. Nibley's accusation is without foundation. Notice that Dr. Nibley claims that he could furnish "many" passages to prove that Mr. Heward was not reading the LDS fragment, yet he states that he does "not" have room to include them in his article. We feel that if Dr. Nibley is going to make such a serious charge he should furnish his own translation of the fragment and point out the places where Grant Heward is in error.

## IS DR. NIBLEY QUALIFIED?

In a letter to the editor of the *Deseret News*, Julian R. Durham stated:

There has been some comment regarding the recently discovered Book of Abraham papyri, that the Church submit them to the foremost scholars in the field of Egyptology. . . .

Today the papyri are in the hands of **one of the best qualified Egyptologists in the world**, Hugh Nibley, a foremost church scholar who has demonstrated on an intellectual basis the capabilities of Joseph Smith in language studies. (*Deseret News*, December 27, 1967)

There are a number of reasons why we seriously doubt that Dr. Nibley is "one of the best qualified Egyptologists in the world." To begin with, Dr. Nibley has only given us a very small "demonstration" of his "Egyptology at work." It appears in the *Brigham Young University Studies*, Winter, 1968:

This fragment, which has been badly fitted together like some of the others, belongs to the same roll as the other hieratic papyri, as is apparent from recurring elements of the owner's name, that appears a number of times in full in the other fragments. . . . Which may be "translated" as something like "The Osiris daughter of Min, true of word (or justified, deceased, triumphant, etc., i.e. tested and found true and faithful), declared blessed (as a dead person, the word being written merely by a stroke, since the proper hieroglyph was considered magically dangerous), belonging to Khons (or in the company of Khons, the moon-god), justified." Or, simply as a name something like Taimin Mutninesikhonsu.

Dr. Nibley's work is used in a short article in the *Improvement Era*:

The writings on the recently recovered fragments show that all of these Book of the Dead papyri belonged to the lady Taimin Mutninesikhonsu. (*Improvement Era*, February 1968, page 40)

Dee Jay Nelson makes this statement concerning Dr. Nibley's work:

On page 40 of the February 1968 issue of the *Improvement Era* is a brief article describing color photographs of the new papyrus fragments. The article names the beneficiary for whom one of the papyri was written. She is called, "the lady Taimin Mutninesikhonsu." I presume that this name was supplied by Dr. Hugh Nibley. It is incorrect. . . . Dr. Nibley, whom I know to be a skilled and capable scholar, has inadvertently combined the names of the beneficiary of the papyrus and her mother. . . . Taimin Mutninesikhonsu is a transliteration combining the name Ta-shert-Min with the connecting phrase meaning "daughter of," mes en and Nes-Khensu (the mother's name). This error was quite natural, particularly considering that the connecting phrase, mes en is abbreviated whenever it appears in the Ta-shert-Min Papyrus. Ta-shert-Min and Nes-Khensu are the correct transliterations. I have been substantiated in my transliteration by several of the world's most renowned Egyptian philologist (mentioned by name in the introduction to this study) though in small variations even they did not agree exactly. One rendered the names Tai-shery-Min and Nes-Khonsu and another transliterated them Ta-shert-Men and Nes-Khensu. I find no argument with either. Both scholars were examining poor hand-copied versions of the names which appear in one of Joseph Smith, Jr.'s notebooks (done in the 1830's).

---

## Everyone Welcome!

We are now holding a Bible study in our home at 1350 S. West Temple, every Thursday evening at 8:00 pm. Everyone is welcome. This is not connected with any particular group or church. Attendance is open to everyone. ■

---

## A PERSONAL GOD?

To all those who will send us their address and zip code we will send a FREE COPY of *Is There a Personal God?* This is a 56-page pamphlet by Jerald Tanner. ■

---

The so-called Metropolitan Papyrus Fragments came to my attention several months after I consulted with these experts and serve to substantiate my original findings. (*The Joseph Smith Papyri*, page 48)

The reader will note that Grant Heward recognized that the papyri mentioned both the daughter and one of her parents. If Mr. Heward is “the rankest amateur” and only followed the translation of Budge, how was he able to recognize the two names?

We feel that since Dr. Nibley combined the two names into one, he cannot be considered “one of the best qualified Egyptologists in the world.”

There is another fact that should be considered in this matter: Dr. Nibley has had photographs of the original papyri for about two years. We have a copy of a letter from an Egyptologist which is dated August 27, 1967. In this letter we find the following statement:

In the summer of 1966, Prof. Nibley showed me enlargements of the photographs; they had been obtained by a third party and passed on to Prof. Nibley, who was evidently interested in purchasing the papyri, which included the embalming scene reproduced (with many imaginative restorations since the original is badly damaged in the PGP [Pearl of Great Price]) . . . there is no question that they are late (probably Roman Period) MSS of the Book of the Dead and similar funerary literature, and Prof. Nibley, who had already had the time to study the photographs, had identified several chapters of the BD [Book of the Dead] . . .

Now, if Dr. Nibley is “one of the best qualified Egyptologists in the world,” why has he not completed a translation of all the papyri. He has had two years to work on it. Dee Jay Nelson completed his “Translation and Preliminary Survey” in less than two months. Grant Heward also did his work on the text concerning the swallow in less than two months. Dr. Nibley, however, has had the papyri for about two years and has given us nothing but the name Taimin Mutninesikhonsu, which is in reality two separate names. In the February, 1968, issue of the *Improvement Era* we find this statement:

With our readers, the staff of the *Improvement Era* will be looking forward with eager anticipation to additional developments in this fascinating story, and to the unfolding of the meaning of the hieroglyphics and illustrations on these valuable manuscripts as they are given by Dr. Nibley in his articles.

The March issue of the *Improvement Era* appeared, but Dr. Nibley chose to still remain silent concerning the meaning of the Egyptian writing. It is in this issue that we find the statement:

The first draft of this series of articles was written some years before the Church came into possession of the recently acquired papyri, . . . Since the new problems could not be dealt with **instantly**, and the preliminary material was already at hand, it was decided to release the historical background material while working on the other. . . . The critics of the *Pearl of Great Price* . . . have always had a weakness for instant solutions. (*Improvement Era*, April, 1968, page 65)

Dr. Nibley’s attempt to explain why he has not unfolded the meaning of the “hieroglyphics and illustrations” may satisfy those who do not know the facts concerning this matter, but those who are aware that he has had photographs of the papyri for about two years find his explanation rather ridiculous.

In a letter dated February 8, 1968, Dr. Nibley claims that he has translated some of the papyrus:

The papyri are not difficult to translate, and two of my professors at Chicago have agreed to translate them. Last month in the presence of witnesses I made a translation of some of the papyrus which has been duly dated and notarized, so that when my betters (and they are infinitely my betters) come out with their translation you can see whether I am totally inept or only nearly so. (Letter dated February 8, 1968)

We do not feel that “one of the best qualified Egyptologists in the world” would follow such a procedure. Instead of having his translation “dated and notarized” Dr. Nibley should have published it in the *Improvement Era*.

It is interesting to note, that the translations which Dr. Nibley’s professors at Chicago are working on were not requested by Dr. Nibley or the Church leaders. It was the editors of *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* (a publication that is not controlled by the Mormon Church) who requested the translations.

From the evidence given above it appears that Dr. Nibley is not really qualified to deal with the papyri, and the Mormon leaders made a serious mistake when they turned the whole matter over to him.

## THE MOMENT OF TRUTH

Dr. Hugh Nibley has made this statement:

. . . a few faded and tattered little scraps of papyrus may serve to remind the Latter-day Saints of how sadly they have neglected serious education. . . . Not only has our image suffered by such tragic neglect, but now in the moment of truth the Mormons have to face the world unprepared, after having been given a hundred year’s fair warning. (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Winter, 1968, pages 171-172)

It appears that Dr. Nibley himself is unprepared and that he has no real answers to give his people. We have shown that the original papyrus fragment Joseph Smith used as the basis for the Book of Abraham has been identified and that this fragment is in reality a part of the Egyptian “Book of Breathings.” It contains nothing concerning Abraham or his religion, and it cannot be used to support the anti-Negro doctrine. Truly, this is the moment of truth for the Mormon people. Stewart L. Udall, who is Secretary of the Interior, has made this statement concerning the anti-Negro doctrine:

We Mormons cannot escape persistent, painful inquiries into the sources and grounds of this belief. . . . This issue must be resolved . . . It must be resolved because we are wrong and it is past the time when we should have seen the right. A failure to act here is sure to demean our faith, damage the minds and morals of our youth, and undermine the integrity of our Christian ethic. (*Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Summer, 1967, pages 5-6)

Stewart L. Udall’s words might be applied with equal force to the Book of Abraham which is the real source of the anti-Negro doctrine.

We plan to deal at great length with the Book of Abraham in our work, *The Case Against Mormonism*. This work will contain photographs and vital material concerning the fragments of papyrus which have been turned over to the Mormon Church. We feel that this will be our most important work and we hope that all of our customers will order it. We have completed 112 pages of vol. 2 (dealing with the Book of Mormon) and will mail out the remaining pages concerning the Book of Abraham as they are printed. The regular price for volumes one and two (which includes a beautiful vinyl loose-leaf binder) is \$7.90. At the present time, however, we are having a special which we are extending until May 31, 1968. If the two volumes are ordered before that day the price is only \$6.95. We only have a limited number of binders with printing on the outside, and the ones we order in the future will probably not have this printing because the price has been raised. ■

---

## \* \* NEW BOOKS \* \*

---

**The Joseph Smith Papyri — A Translation & Preliminary Survey**, by Dee Jay Nelson. A 48-page booklet which contains a translation and vital information concerning the Mormon Papyri. This work proves that the papyri have absolutely nothing to do with Abraham. Although this booklet is written in a very scientific and unemotional manner, the *Deseret News* would not allow it to be advertized. We highly recommend this booklet. Price: 75¢ — 3 for \$2.00 — 5 for \$3.00 — 10 for \$4.50.

**The Mormon Papyri Question**, by Jerald and Sandra Tanner. A 32-page pamphlet dealing with the recent discovery of the Mormon papyri. Proves that Joseph Smith was not able to translate Egyptian and that the Book of Abraham was a work of his own imagination. What the Mormon leaders claimed were the writings of Abraham and Joseph in Egypt turn out to be nothing but parts of Egyptian funerary texts. Very revealing. Price: 50¢ — 3 for \$1.00 — 10 for \$3.00 — 20 for \$5.00.

**The Negro in Mormon Theology**, by Jerald and Sandra Tanner. A 58-page pamphlet. Most important material which appeared in *Joseph Smith’s Curse Upon the Negro* is included in this pamphlet. Also contains new material. Alvin R. Dyer’s speech, which was “not” meant for the investigator, is printed in full. Price: 50¢ — 3 for \$1.00 — 10 for \$3.00 — 20 for \$5.00.

**New Light on Mormon Origins From The Palmyra (N.Y.) Revival**, by Rev. Wesley P. Walters. A devastating blow to the First Vision story. One of the best works on Mormonism. A 26-page pamphlet. Price: 15¢ — 7 for \$1.00 — 15 for \$2.00

---