

10,000,000 MORMONS ?

The Mormon Church leaders now claim that the church has almost 3,000,000 members, and they predict that if they continue to grow at the same rate they will have 10,000,000 members by 2000 A.D. (*Deseret News*, Church Section, October 21, 1967, page 1)

One Mormon wrote: "As a Mormon I am impressed with the tremendous growth of the Church. I understand that our membership will soon reach 3 million. I note with interest that while most other churches are floundering and drifting, the Mormon Church seems to be on course and as a result is a very successful religion. By 1975 we will probably be one of the five largest churches in America. As far as I know, the only problems the Church has are those associated with rapid growth."

Is All Well in Zion?

While the growth of the Mormon Church has been rather impressive, we do not feel that this makes them "on course" or shows that there are no problems except those associated with rapid growth. Actually, there are very serious problems which the Mormon leaders must face if they continue to send missionaries throughout the world. The LDS missionary is supposed to tell each prospective convert that God has spoken from heaven and restored the true Church of Christ to the earth. After this he proceeds to tell the contact that his church is false. In fact, the handbook used by the missionary tells him that the contact must reach this conclusion: "There was a complete apostasy and my church is false" (*A Uniform System for Teaching Investigators*, published by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, August 1961, page 9).

If God had actually spoken from heaven and established the Mormon Church, we would not object to this attack upon the contact's religion, but there is convincing evidence that no such revelation has been given.

In fact, the very revelations upon which the LDS Church is based, i.e., the Book of Mormon, *Pearl of Great Price*, and the *Doctrine and Covenants*, can now be shown to be man-made.

Plagiarism

The Book of Mormon was supposed to have been translated from ancient gold plates by Joseph Smith, yet we have found that it quotes from the *Westminster Confession* which was not written until 1646 A.D. (see our *Case Against Mormonism*, vol. 2, pages 71-73). We have also shown a number of parallels between the Book of Mormon and the *Wayne Sentinel*, a newspaper in Joseph Smith's area. On pages 107-108 of our *Case*, vol. 2, we show that a statement which was supposed to have been made by Lehi almost 600 years before the time of Christ, quotes from the works of William Shakespeare, who was not born until 1564 A.D. Below is a comparison of the statement in the Book of Mormon with the words of Shakespeare:

2 Nephi 1:14

... from whence no traveler can return;

Shakespeare

... from whose bourn no traveller returns . . . (*Hamlet*, Act 3, Scene 1, as quoted in *Commentary on the Book of Mormon*, vol. 1, page 237)

The Mormon apologist Sidney B. Sperry, made this comment:

In fairness to critics, and in anticipation of future discussions of the problem, we wish to call attention to a particular word used in the quotations by both Lehi and Shakespeare, . . .

The word we have in mind is "traveller." It stands out like a sore thumb as far as Lehi is concerned. . . .

We are led to the conclusion that the only word that Joseph Smith might have put into Lehi's mouth from Shakespeare, assuming he was exposed to the lines from *Hamlet*, is "traveller." (*The Problems of the Book of Mormon*, 1964, pages 128-129)

Even though Dr. Sperry admits that the word "traveller" might have been "put into Lehi's mouth from Shakespeare," he states that it "would be very difficult to prove that Joseph Smith was familiar with the works of Shakespeare; it would be especially difficult to prove that he was acquainted with the Bard's work at the time he made his translation of the Book of Mormon" (*Problems of the Book of Mormon*, page 124).

Although we have shown that "Shakespeare's works, 10 vols." were sold at the Wayne Bookstore in Joseph Smith's neighborhood (*Wayne Sentinel*, January 26, 1825), we now have a much better idea of where Joseph Smith might have found these words. In 1825 Josiah Priest published a book in Albany, N.Y., entitled *The Wonders of Nature and Providence Displayed*. Rev. Wesley P. Walters has sent us a photograph of an original copy of this book containing a sticker showing that it belonged to the "Manchester Library." This is very interesting because, according to Joseph Smith's own story, he lived in "Manchester" (*Pearl of Great Price*, Joseph Smith 2:3). Mr. Walters also found that library records show that this book was checked out by a number of people during the year 1827. Therefore it was well known in the area of Palmyra and Manchester.

The interesting thing about this book is that it contains a story which quotes the words of Shakespeare. In quoting these words, however, they are in the wrong order, and this makes the end of the quotation almost identical to that in the Book of Mormon.

2 Nephi 1:14

... from whence no traveler can return:

Wonders of Nature

... from whence no traveller returns. (*The Wonders of Nature and Providence Displayed*, 1825, page 469)

Special Offer!

ENDS - March 31, 1969

Case Against Mormonism — vol. 1, 2 & 3

Reg. \$10.85 — SPECIAL — \$8.95

This special price includes the beautiful vinyl loose-leaf binder which will hold all three volumes. We have completed 46 pages of volume 3 and will mail out the remaining pages as soon as they are printed. All of our readers should have this work.

Dr. Kenneth Kantzer, Dean of Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, has written a review of the first two volumes of this work. In this review he stated:

These books represent no ordinary polemic against Mormonism. This is the definitive, fully-documented, utterly-devastating case against the divine authority and truthfulness of the foundational documents upon which the Mormon religion is based. Every evangelical pastor should have these books in his library and every intelligent lay Christian should know about them and refer to them . . . Gerald and Sandra Tanner have placed the alleged revelations of Joseph Smith and his followers under a clear penetrating light of detailed, accurate documented historical research. The result is to destroy completely the pretenses to divine authority made by Joseph Smith and to show how these works bear unmistakable evidence of merely human authorship derived from many sources, replete with uncontrovertible errors, and characterized by ridiculously false claims. . . . It is difficult to see how the Mormon church can survive the devastating destruction of its foundations as presented in these volumes. Certainly for any Christian, disturbed by Mormon claims, these works are utterly convincing. (*Evangelical Beacon*, Minneapolis, Minn., vol. 42, no. 1, October 8, 1968, page 7)

NEW BOOK — A Translation & Study of Facsimile No. 3 by Dee Jay Nelson. Mr. Nelson has devoted a great deal of time to Facsimile No. 3 in the Book of Abraham. He realizes that he could be excommunicated from the Mormon Church, but he feels that the truth must be made known. This pamphlet contains many drawings. Price: 75¢

Because of this quotation we feel that there must be a relationship between these two books, and this is strengthened by a number of other important parallels. The Book of Mormon teaches that the Indians are the descendants of a group of Hebrews who came to America. *The Wonders of Nature and Providence, Displayed* (published five years before the Book of Mormon) contains “proofs that the Indians of North America are lineally descended from the ancient Hebrews” (*Wonders*, page 297).

Josiah Priest’s book contains a great deal of information about the Indians. It is interesting to note that Josiah Priest’s book speaks of the “isthmus of Darien” and uses the words “narrow neck of land.” These same words are found in the Book of Mormon. Below is a comparison:

Ether 10:20

... the **narrow neck of land**, by the place where the sea divides the land

Wonders of Nature

... a narrow neck of land is interposed between two vast oceans. (page 598)

There are other important parallels which we hope to present in our work, *The Case Against Mormonism*. ■

Temple Ceremonies

In past issues of the *Messenger* we have shown that the anti-Negro doctrine comes from the Book of Abraham, and that the translation of the papyri by Egyptologists has destroyed the basis of this doctrine. The translation of the papyri may have other serious effects upon the doctrines of the Mormon Church. The Mormon writer Hyrum L. Andrus, for instance, claims that Joseph Smith obtained “essential elements” of the LDS Temple Ceremony from the papyri:

Evidence indicates that Joseph Smith obtained the essential covenants, keywords, etc., of **the temple ceremony from the writings of Abraham**. (See Facsimile No. 2 figures 3 and 8.) ... Having obtained essential elements of **this ceremony from the writings of Abraham**, he then organized them into a formal ceremony. ... (*God, Man and the Universe*, 1968, page 334)

Now that it is plain that the papyri were nothing but pagan documents, Mormons must look elsewhere for the origin of these ceremonies. We feel that at least part of the Temple Ceremony came from Freemasonry.

Although the temple ceremonies are secret, several exposes have been printed. *Temple Mormonism, Its Evolution, Ritual and Meaning*, published in 1931, is supposed to be one of the most accurate accounts.

When we compared the temple ritual with the Masonic ceremony we were astonished by the similarities. For instance, the “five points of fellowship” are almost identical. In the Mormon ceremony we find the following:

The **five points of fellowship** are given by putting **the inside of the right foot to the inside of the Lord’s, the inside of your knee to his, laying your breast close to his, your left hands on each other’s backs, and each one putting his mouth to the other’s ear**, in which position the Lord whispers:

Lord—“This is the sign of the token:

“Health to the navel, **marrow in the bones**, ...” (*Temple Mormonism*, page 22)

In his book, *Freemasonry Exposed*, Capt. William Morgan gave this information concerning the “five points of fellowship” in the Masonic Lodge:

He (the candidate) is raised on what is called the **five points of fellowship**, which are foot to foot, knee to knee, breast to breast, hand to back and mouth to ear. This is done by putting **the inside of your right foot to the inside of the right foot of the person to whom you are going to give the word, the inside of your knee to his, laying your right breast against his, your left hands on the back of each other, and your mouths to each other’s right ear** (in which position alone you are permitted to give the word), and **whisper the word Mahha-bone** ... He is also told that Mahhah-bone signifies **marrow in the bone**. (*Freemasonry Exposed*, page 84)

William Morgan’s book was first published in Batavia, N.Y., in 1827. We know that it was a very popular book, and that the Mormon Apostle Heber C. Kimball had a copy. Although Joseph Smith was probably familiar with this book, the connection between Mormonism and Masonry is even closer than this, for Joseph himself joined the Masonic Lodge in Nauvoo

in 1842. We find the following in Joseph Smith’s *History* under the date of March 15, 1842:

In the evening **I received the first degree in Freemasonry** in the Nauvoo Lodge, assembled in my general business office. (*History of the Church*, vol. 4, page 551)

The next day Joseph Smith stated:

I was with the Masonic Lodge and rose to the sublime degree. (*History of the Church*, vol. 4, page 552)

Less than two months later, May 4, 1842, Joseph Smith introduced the temple ceremonies, and according to his own statement, it was in the same room “where the Masonic fraternity meet occasionally”:

I spent the day in ... my general business office, or lodge room (that is **where the Masonic fraternity meet occasionally**, for want of a better place) in council with ... Patriarch Hyrum Smith, ... and President Brigham Young and Elders Heber C. Kimball and Willard Richards, instructing them in the principles and order of the Priesthood, attending to **washings, anointings, endowments** and the communication of keys pertaining to the Aaronic Priesthood, and so on to the highest order of the Melchisedek Priesthood, ... (*History of the Church*, vol. 5, pages 1-2)

Some Mormon writers have admitted that there are similarities between the temple ceremony and the Masonic ritual. E. Cecil McGavin stated:

It is evident that **the Masonic ritual embraces a few features that resemble the rudimental ceremonies of the Temple Endowment**, yet these few points of similarity are largely restricted to the rituals pertaining to the Aaronic priesthood. (*Mormonism and Masonry*, page 197)

We feel that there are more than just a “few points of similarity,” and we hope to document these parallels in the next chapter of our work, *The Mormon Kingdom*. Also, we plan to print the Mormon temple ceremony and show some of the important changes that have been made in it through the years. We want to bring the ceremony right up to date. One couple who has been through the temple about fifty times has helped us and another man who has been through over a hundred times has agreed to help.

The Mormon Kingdom, vol. 1 (which will have the information concerning the temple ceremony) usually sells for \$4.95, but if it is ordered before March 31, 1969, the price will be only \$4.45 (this includes a top quality vinyl loose-leaf binder. One hundred and four pages are already printed, and the rest will be mailed out as soon as they are printed.) — Special Prices: \$4.45 — 2 for \$8.05 — 4 for \$13.45. ■

Lord Blesses Papyri Work

In a letter, dated September 15, 1968, the Mormon Egyptologist Dee Jay Nelson wrote:

Does it not impress you that the fact against the Book of Abraham are coming one on the heels of another? I believe that God has decided that the time is right that these untruths (Book of Abraham) be unmasked (in this decade). Do you not also think that God is blessing us greatly by giving us this chance to serve His purposes!

We feel that we would be very ungrateful if we did not acknowledge the hand of God in this work, for he has blessed it in a wonderful way. We are able to testify that God “is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us” (Ephesians 3:20).

Dee Jay Nelson has completed another pamphlet concerning the Book of Abraham. It is entitled, *A Translation and Study of Facsimile No. 3 in the Book of Abraham*. On page 26 of this study, Dee Jay Nelson states: “... Joseph Smith’s explanation attached to Facsimile No. 3 is almost totally incorrect.” On page 5 of the same pamphlet, we find this statement by Mr. Nelson:

I am, per consequence, torn between two philosophic extremes ... what I have been urged to believe as an Elder of my church and what I have been urged to believe as an Egyptologist. **There is no reconciling the two!**

If Joseph Smith, Jr. correctly interpreted the *Pearl of Great Price* illustrations we must conclude that the science of Egyptology is based upon fallacies and Egyptian philology is erroneous. I take exception to Joseph Smith’s interpretation of this Facsimile. It does not conform with the mass of archaeological evidence nor with the laboriously established principles of Egyptology.

This is a very interesting study, and we feel that all of our readers should have a copy to be well informed about the controversy concerning the Book of Abraham. The normal price for this pamphlet will be 75¢, but if it is ordered before March 31, 1969, the price will be only 67¢ — 3 for \$1.80 — 5 for \$2.70 — 10 for \$4.05. ■

Amazing Progress

In February, 1968, we began printing material concerning the papyri which were given to the Mormon Church by the Metropolitan Museum. Since that time we have made a great deal of progress. In fact, an article by Dr. Hugh Nibley which was recently published in the *Brigham Young University Studies* clearly reveals the progress we have made. As most of our readers know, Dr. Nibley was appointed by the Church leaders to defend the Book of Abraham, yet he has been unable to handle the job and now appears to be in a rather serious predicament.

In the *Messenger* for March, 1968, we demonstrated that one of the fragments of papyrus which the Metropolitan Museum gave to the Church — i.e., the “Small ‘Sensen’ text (unillustrated)” was the fragment Joseph Smith “translated” the Book of Abraham from. Dr. Nibley admitted that this fragment supplied “the symbols for the Book of Abraham,” but he was unable to explain how Joseph Smith derived the text of the Book of Abraham from it. The fragment was translated by qualified Egyptologists and found to be part of a pagan text known as the “Book of Breathings.” Dr. Nibley did not contest this, and in a speech delivered at the University of Utah, May 20, 1968, he stated:

By what process could the Book of Abraham have been squeezed out of a few brief signs? Nobody has told us yet. Was Joseph Smith really translating the papyri? If so, it was not in any way known to Egyptology.

Dr. Nibley’s recent article in the *Brigham Young University Studies* shows that he is no closer to finding an answer to this problem than he was on May 20, 1968. In this article he states:

We still suspect that **there is a relationship** between the two documents, but **we don’t know what it is**.

On October 12, 1968, two graduate students in Near Eastern studies at the University of Utah, R. Crapo and J. A. Tvednes, presented an interesting hypothesis to explain the relationship between the Breathing Certificate and the Book of Abraham . . . it seems that the idea is that if one takes the actual meaning of the hieratic signs in the order in which they occur, they can be roughly matched up with certain general themes of the Book of Abraham which occur in the same order . . . **This would make the “Sen-Sen” papyrus a sort of prompter’s sheet.** True, the document tells a connected and consistent story, but then it would have to do that in order to serve as an effective aid to memory by itself being easily memorized.

Far-fetched as it may seem, there are many ancient examples of this sort of thing, the best-known of which is the alphabet itself . . . The classic example of a work which condenses the meaning of whole chapters into a single letter is the *Sefer Yetzirah*, . . .

The condensing of matter on **prompting sheets** is a very old practice, . . . the famous Stele C14 in the Louvre “consists of sentences which read like the headings of chapters,” though they also make a connected text. We could, and in time probably will, furnish many examples of this sort of thing. In a preliminary statement in *Dialogue* it was suggested that the hieratic symbols placed over against the long sections of the Book of Abraham might be viewed not as texts but as topic headings. **We still don’t know what the connection is**, but one thing is certain—that **the relationship between the two texts was never meant to be that of a direct translation.** (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Autumn 1968, pages 101-102)

Dr. Nibley’s statement that the papyrus may have only been “a sort of prompter’s sheet” is certainly not in harmony with the statements of Joseph Smith concerning the papyrus and the translation. He stated:

. . . I commenced **the translation** of some of the characters or hieroglyphics, and much to our joy found that one of the rolls **contained the writings of Abraham**, . . . (*History of the Church*, vol. 2, page 236)

Joseph Smith did claim that he made a direct translation of the papyrus, and in his history it is called “**a correct translation**” (*History of the Church*, vol. 2, page 352).

Dr. Nibley does not inspire much confidence in Joseph Smith’s work as a translator, for he states:

. . . Joseph Smith has made it clear that his inspiration is **by no means bound to any ancient text**, but is free to take wings at any time. (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Autumn 1968, page 71)

Since the Mormon leaders cannot show any connection between the meaning of the “Sensen” papyrus and the text of the Book of Abraham, they should admit that the Book of Abraham is a work of Joseph Smith’s imagination. It should no longer be considered as scripture, and the anti-Negro doctrine contained in its pages should be rejected. Naomi Woodbury, a Mormon who has studied Egyptology, made this statement in a letter to the editor of *Dialogue: A Journal of Thought*:

Let us not lose sight of what I think is the primary importance of this papyri find. **It can free us from our dilemma about excluding Negroes from the Priesthood.** Perhaps our Father in Heaven intended the papyri to come to light now for just this purpose. I have shared the growing concern in the Church about this exclusion. (*Dialogue*, Autumn 1968, page 8)

Abraham’s Drawings?

When Joseph Smith printed the Book of Abraham he included three facsimiles which were supposed to have been drawn by Abraham. Although Egyptologists claimed that these were drawings from Egyptian funerary papyri, Mormon writers have defended them. William E. Berrett wrote:

The translation made by Joseph Smith, **and facsimiles of some of the engravings, remain as one of the greatest contributions to the field of religion** . . .

No prophet ever gave to the world a stronger challenge of his divine calling than did Joseph Smith in his publication of the Book of Abraham. (*The Restored Church*, page 144)

Anti-Mormon writers not only claimed that these drawings were pagan, but they also stated that the Mormons had falsified them before publication. Now that some of the original papyri have been located, both charges have been established.

Dr. Nibley tried to defend the facsimiles, but he has now found himself in a serious dilemma. In the Improvement Era for September 1968, Dr. Nibley claimed that “evidence that Facsimile 1 has been honestly reproduced is found in an . . . old portrait of Lucy Mack Smith, . . .” He claimed that the drawing showed the “**original papyrus hanging on the wall**,” and that it “**matches our printed reproductions, and not the proposed restoration.**”

Dr. Nibley’s photograph of it was very unclear, but Wesley P. Walters located the original portrait in Chicago, Illinois. The original proves beyond all doubt that it shows the printed facsimile and not the original papyrus. It even has the figure numbers that were added by Rueben Hedlock who made the engraving for the printed cut. Dr. Nibley now admits that he “overlooked” the numbers, and that it was only “after the article went to press” that he got his first good look at the picture. In a dialogue between himself and the opposition, Dr. Nibley states:

They: Speaking of naive suggestions, when you used that portrait of Lucy Mack Smith to guarantee the integrity of Facsimile No. 1 “before it was damaged,” why didn’t you call attention to the numbers indicating some of the figures in the pictures? The numbers weren’t part of the original papyrus, you know.

We: **We completely overlooked the numbers until after the article went to press. Only then did we get our first good look at the picture. So you win a point.** We now assume that the artists consulted the Hedlock reproduction. (*BYU Studies*, Autumn 1968, page 82)

On page 98-99 of the same article we find the following:

They (by letter): You admit that the sketch of Facsimile No. 1 in the Lucy Mack Smith portrait has the Hedlock numbers on it; yet you think it significant that it may indicate the actual state of preservation of the papyrus at the time the portrait was made. How do you reconcile the two propositions?

We: Well, naturally that artist would not keep his model sitting and suffering while he sketched in the little picture on the wall; **with plenty of Hedlock reproductions going around he could easily fill in that part** at his leisure—so he did. But at the same time he made an undeniable effort to indicate that the framed thing on the wall really was the original. Better photographs accent the wrinkling and the frame, and it still remains unthinkable that the old lady should have displayed a mere printed copy—the only “original” Hedlock would be a wood-block!

Even though Dr. Nibley now admits that the printed reproduction was “consulted” he still maintains that the portrait furnishes evidence concerning the state of the papyrus:

... in examining the portrait closely we discovered something of importance that is not discernible in the *Improvement Era* reproduction, something that is **not** in the Hedlock drawing. The artist has drawn a jagged line right across the top of the facsimile, cutting off the top both of the priest’s head and of the bird’s head but leaving the rest, including the knife in the priest’s hand untouched. The areas above the jagged line is of a slightly lighter shade than that below, and in the original may be of a different color. It seems to mark the limit of the papyrus, i.e., of the damage to the thing, at some time **after** the Mormons had acquired it. It is nearly all there. In other things also the painter of Mrs. Smith’s portrait departs from the Hedlock engraving.

They: What about the wrinkling? It seems to us that some of the wrinkles supposedly in the papyrus extend right out beyond and include the picture frame.

We: The paint could have run where the artists made extra heavy vertical markings (providing he used water colors), or else the wrinkles could belong to the big portrait itself, of which we have only a photograph. But the picture frame is clearly a frame, closely resembling the one in which other papyri are still mounted, and **most of the wrinkling** is definitely confined within its borders as if it really belonged to the papyri. (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Autumn 1968, pages 82-85)

It is hard to believe that Dr. Nibley would continue to try to see things in this portrait, especially after he had to admit that it contains the figure numbers from the printed facsimile. Wesley P. Walters has written a letter to Dr. Nibley which he has given us permission to quote. In this letter we find these statements:

I was surprised to see you still drawing conclusions from the Lucy Smith portrait, and yet you have never seen the original.

I have seen the original water color and can assure you that none of the points you have been making on the basis of poor photographs are correct. The wrinkles are not painted-in wrinkles, but wrinkles in the paper on which the entire painting was made. This can be seen from the enclosed photo, . . .

There is no painted-in line across the top as you try to indicate in your article. The color close-up enclosed should make this clear. What makes it appear to be a line in the photo you reproduced is partly due to the way the shadows made by the wrinkles in the paper fall. It is also due partly to the contrasty nature of the print which over-emphasized the streaky nature of the painting itself. As a person who did water colors all through high school and college, I can assure you that it is extremely difficult to get the color to flow evenly without settling more densely in at least one or two areas. This is the type of thing that has occurred in the area above the head of the reclining figure. This same type of spottiness occurs over the entire background behind Lucy Smith.

If you would make the effort to see the original in Chicago, I believe that even you would be convinced. It would at least save you the necessity of making retractions and would be far more fitting to one’s posture as a scholar. (Letter dated January 23, 1968)

In *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought*, Summer 1968, pages 92-98 evidence was presented which showed that the original of Facsimile No. 2 was damaged when Joseph Smith worked with it and that he made false restorations from the Book of the Dead and the Book of Breathings papyri which he had in his possession Dr. Nibley, however, maintained that Facsimile No. 2 had not been falsified:

Then too, we must recognize that there are sections of hieroglyphic text in Facsimile 2 that present-day Egyptologists read without too much trouble: since these legible portions are found to be correct and conventional Egyptian, it is perfectly plain that **nobody has falsified or jumbled them, as was charged.** That is to say, whenever the text can be checked, **everything is found to be in order.** (*Improvement Era*, September, 1968, page 74)

We were, of course, very disturbed to find that Dr. Nibley would deny these false restorations in the face of documented proof. We republished evidence in our last issue of the *Messenger* and were able to distribute thousands of copies. It seems that truth has prevailed, for Dr. Nibley now admits that “restorations” were made in Facsimile No. 2:

(4) The **Hedlock engraving** when compared with an early sketch showing parts of Facsimile No. 2 **to be missing shows definite signs of attempted restoration.**

(5) The restoration was not as extensive as the other sketch would indicate, and no clear instances of such have been demonstrated on Facsimile No. 1.

(6) **The restorations** on Facsimile No. 2 are limited to the **filling in of gaps**, not the alteration of existing symbols. (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Autumn 1968, page 92)

Even though Dr. Nibley now admits that restorations were made, he seems unwilling to face the implications:

They: Let’s turn to Facsimile No. 2, where we have much clearer evidence of restoration. In the Church Historian’s Office among the papers of the *EAG* is a rather well-done pen-and-ink sketch of the facsimile made by some Mormon at an early date. This, we believe, is the way the hypocephalus looked when it came into Joseph Smith’s hands; and in it there are certain parts missing and we are shown exactly what they are. Now these parts are **not** missing in the official engraving of the hypocephalus, Facsimile No. 2 which can only mean that they have been later supplied. You will notice that a large part of the inscription around the rim is missing, and this has been filled in with hieratic characters from other papyri definitely known to have been in the possession of Joseph Smith. So there you have it.

We: Since the restored portions of the rim with their crude repetitions (hardly an attempt to be subtle) are not a subject of inspired commentary, we don’t think that is too important. (*BYU Studies*, Autumn 1968, page 86-87)

Although Joseph Smith does not try to translate the writing around the rim, he states that it “will be given in the own due time of the Lord” (*Pearl of Great Price*, Book of Abraham, page 35). We feel that this matter cannot be as easily dismissed as Dr. Nibley would have us believe. To begin with, it shows that Joseph Smith knew absolutely nothing about the Egyptian language, for the portion which is added from the “Book of Breathings” is written in hieratic, whereas the writing that appears on Facsimile No. 2 is hieroglyphic writing. Also, the characters that were added into the blank area were added upside down, so that they read in the opposite direction to the rest of the text. The Mormon Egyptologist Dee Jay Nelson states: “For a Sensen (Book of Breathings) inscription to be written upon a hypocephalus is about as logical as to find part of the Koran in the New Testament” (*Joseph Smith’s “Eye of Ra,”* page 22).

We feel that this matter also reflects seriously upon Joseph Smith’s honesty. Scholars, of course, do not object to restorations in a text if they are sincere attempts to restore a missing portion. For instance, in 1961 a stone inscription was found at Caesarea. The second line was damaged, but scholars were able to read “. . . tius Pilate” (*The Biblical World*, edited by Charles E. Pfeiffer, page 156). Since Pontius Pilate had resided in Caesarea, they felt that it was reasonable to restore “Pon” to complete the name “Pontius Pilate.” This type of restoration is reasonable. In Joseph Smith’s case, however, it seems to be an attempt to deceive rather than to restore what was on the original document. No one who is honest with himself could approve of these false restorations. How can we possibly trust the rest of Joseph Smith’s Book of Abraham after seeing what he did with Facsimile No. 2?

From Dr. Nibley’s article, it would appear that he has yielded a great deal of ground. In fact, some of his statements are very similar to the ones Grant Heward was excommunicated for less than two years ago! ■



WORDS OF CHRIST:

“If you are faithful to owhat I have said, you are truly my disciples. And you will know the truth and the truth will set you free! . . . Believe me when I tell you that every man who commits sin is a slave. . . . If the Son, then, sets you free, you are really free!” (John 8:31-36) (Phillips)

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.