

ever, be willing to have it declared wholly wrong because of a very small number of errors. (Exists there a religious body who would?) No just and impartial judge would require it of them. They themselves do not look upon it as being faultless. It has come from God through human hands. They claim that it came as a revelation of God to man, and that here and there within it there are probably the finger prints of mortality. If man, the medium through which it came, had been perfect, the religion would have been perfect. The Latter-day Saints do claim, however, that "Mormonism" is the most nearly perfect religion upon the face of the earth, far from excepting that espoused by the writer of the pamphlet under question.

The reader is now asked to imagine the publication of a pamphlet bearing the title "Napoleon Bonaparte, as a General; an Inquiry." The first pages told of the sincerity of the general and the devotion of his followers. It also spoke of their fairness and integrity. And near the close of the argument

the author stated that if it could be shown that Napoleon had made a mistake in one battle all other claims relating to his generalship would thereby be destroyed. To the pamphlet were appended the statements of a number of competent officers to the effect that Napoleon had made a mistake at Waterloo. The author then called upon all men to repudiate Napoleon not only at Waterloo but elsewhere, and finally branded all who would not do so as ignorant and dishonest.

Reader, what would be the nature of the reception of this pamphlet? Would the reasoning of its author convince mankind that Napoleon was not a general in any sense of the term and should be repudiated, or would the author of the pamphlet be regarded with some degree of pity and quickly forgotten?

(Note: The present writer is by no means convinced that Joseph Smith incorrectly translated the Book of Abraham. An article dealing with this phase of the subject will follow later.)

Scholars Disagree.

BY JUNIUS F. WELLS

[On December 19 the following appeared in the *Deseret News*, which the author has permitted the ERA to reprint.—THE EDITORS.]

Editor *Deseret News*:

Dear Sir—I read with deep interest the editorial review in Tuesday's paper of Bishop Spalding's treatise upon the cuts of the original drawings of the Book of Abraham and was particularly pleased with your wise and clever comments upon the discrepancies and differences of the world's eminent savants in their respective interpretations of the Egyptian hieroglyphics and hypocephali that have been so variously and learnedly deciphered by them.

It reminded me of an inquiry I had the opportunity of instituting while in London in 1903. Through the favor of Hon. James W. Barclay, M.P., a publicist of considerable note and friend of many of England's foremost inves-

tigators in the field of archaeological research, and who took a keen interest in the matter, I had the Pearl of Great Price, containing these cuts and Joseph Smith, the Prophet's interpretation of them sent first to Sir Flinders Petrie, who, however, being away from London, could not then be reached, and secondly to Dr. Henry Woodward, F.R.S., who, after examining it himself, passed it on to the very celebrated Dr. E. A. W. Budge, head of the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities of the British Museum for many years; the author of a voluminous History of Egypt; of the Dictionary of the Book of the Dead, and of numerous works upon the language, religion, poetry and

mysticism of ancient Egypt and Assyria. I also, having cards of introduction, presented the Pearl of Great Price personally at the museum to Dr. Lloyd, keeper of Assyrian antiquities. He, however, merely glanced at the engravings and, observing that the characters were Egyptian, told me to take it in to Dr. Budge. As the latter was not in his office, I was not able to have the pleasure of a personal interview.

The purpose of this inquiry was to secure the opinion of those learned in ancient Egyptian writings of the genuineness and meaning of these cuts. In response I received letters written by Drs. Woodward and Budge. Mr. Barclay's comment after reading them and handing them to me was that there appeared to be room enough in the difference of their interpretations to admit Joseph Smith's to at least an equal footing with them.

These letters are as follows:

129 Beaufort St.,
Chelsea, S. W.
October 10, 1903.

My dear Mr. Barclay:

Papyri and the literature thereof are all at Bloomsbury, so I have sent your request on to my friend, Dr. Ernest A. T. W. Budge, keeper of Egyptian, and Assyrian antiquities, to reply to and I hope he will do so. Savigny wrote the account of the first Napoleon's Egyptian campaign and in it are papyri (drawn) before the year 1870. I think all Smith's drawings are very bad copies of early genuine papyri engravings which he must have seen somewhere. His interpretations are of course all rubbish! Abraham being sacrificed by Elkanah is an embalmer, knife in hand, preparing to disembowel a dead body to embalm it! and the gods are a row of mummypots.

HENRY WOODWARD.

Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities,

British Museum,
London, W. C.

No. 4272 9.10.03

My dear Sir:—

No. 1 is an imitation of the scene from the Book of The Dead in which Anubis stands by the side of the deceased on his bier. The interpretation is bosh.

No. 2 is from one of the hypocephali. I should say copied from the late Dr. Birch's papers. The interpretation is likewise bosh.

No. 3 is adoration of Osiris by some

deceased person. It is a falsified copy.

The letter press is as idiotic as the pictures, and it is clearly based on the Bible and some of the Old Test. Apocryphal histories.

I return the book and the letters herewith.

I am,

Yours very truly,

E. A. W. BUDGE.

Dr. Henry Woodward, F. R. S.

I forwarded all the correspondence to President F. M. Lyman, then at Liverpool, for his perusal and comment, and take pleasure in quoting from his reply:

42 Islington, Liverpool,
October 16, 1903.

I fully endorse your estimate of the findings of Doctors Budge and Woodward, I hope Mr. Barclay observes that the learned Doctors are as adverse to each other as they are to the Prophet. They concede that the characters are copies of genuine originals even if they are poorly executed. They can be read by them. This in favor of the candor of the Prophet. Now we have three readings and two must stand condemned for rendering a corpse with eyes open and limbs raised up.

Of the three readings there can be only one correct. The learned readings must be wrong, and the Prophet's may be right. It has this merit, it is reasonable, which cannot be said of the others. It is most fortunate that you obtained the two readings.

Preserve the documents and let them go home and they will be profitable to us.

At President Lyman's request Elder Joseph J. Cannon, his assistant in the Liverpool office, also wrote me in part as follows:

Liverpool, Eng.,
Oct. 16, 1903.

President Lyman suggested my writing you regarding the letters from Doctor's Woodward and Budge.

We were very much struck by their unity in declaring the Prophet's interpretation bosh, rubbish, and the extremely wide difference between their own interpretations.

Dr. Woodward says: "Abraham being sacrificed by Elkanah is an embalmer knife in hand preparing to disembowel a dead body to embalm it!"

Dr. Budge says: "No. 1 is an imitation of the scene from the Book of the Dead in which Anubis stands by the side of the deceased on his bier."

Anubis was the deity, according to Egyptian mythology, that escorted the spirits of the departed to their abiding place. With this divergence of

opinion among the learned, we think it not unreasonable to accept the Prophet's views. As you remarked, the reclining figure looks anything but like a corpse.

Dr. W. writes "the gods are a row of mummy-pots!" That may be, but the sacred mummy-pots would themselves be objects of adoration, and the top, at least, is formed into characteristic shapes. Their difference of form indicates that they represent something.

Dr. Budge thinks that No. 2 is from the late Dr. Birch's papers. I could find none of Dr. Birch's early writings in the public library here. I found a list of them, however, and they might be examined at the British Museum.

As this inquiry with its responses from Egyptologists of eminence quite

equal to those Bishop Spalding quotes, antedates the latter's inquiry by ten or a dozen years, it at least serves to show that we have not been lax, nor afraid to learn from whatever light the wisdom of the world might throw upon the illustrations of the Book of Abraham and their translation by the Prophet Joseph.

Believing the above might prove of interest to your readers and that it should find the permanence of publication, I take pleasure in submitting it for your use and comment.

Respectfully,

JUNIUS F. WELLS,
Salt Lake City, 19th December, 1912.

Bishop Spalding's Jumps in the Logical Process

BY JOHN HENRY EVANS, OF THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' UNIVERSITY

"In almost every act of our perceiving faculties," says John Stuart Mill, "observation and inference are intimately blended. What we are said to observe is usually a compound result of which one-tenth may be observation and the remaining nine-tenths inference."

If we substitute the word "fact" for the word "observation" in this passage, we shall have a most accurate description of the logical process involved in the pamphlet on "Joseph Smith, Jr., As A Translator," by Bishop F. S. Spalding, of the Utah Episcopal church. Fact and inference are here so "intimately blended" that special attention to this phase of the question is needed before one can appreciate the numerous errors in the reasoning process. And so I shall undertake in this brief article to point out where links are missing in the bishop's chain of reasoning.

Bishop Spalding submits to eight Egyptologists the three fac-similes in the Book of Abraham with explanations by the Prophet Joseph Smith, for the purpose of getting their opinions as to whether they were translated correctly. The scholars answer substantially that they were not correctly translated. That is the fact. What is the inference drawn

from the fact? That the Book of Abraham as a whole was not translated correctly! Is this leap in the logical process warranted?

For the benefit of those who are afraid of the scholars, let me say that this leap is not made by the eight learned men. They tell us only that the figures submitted to them were not translated correctly. Before they would be warranted in saying that the entire Book of Abraham was not properly translated, they would have to examine the original papyrus, or a copy of it, from which the Book of Abraham was translated. The inference therefore is wholly the bishop's, so that we are not here bucking the scholarship of the special scholar but rather the logic of the logician; and nobody has a corner on reasoning. Now, as a matter of fact, the hieroglyphics submitted to the scholars constitute less than one-seventh of the Book of Abraham and that only an accompaniment of the text. The question therefore, becomes, "Is any one justified in drawing a conclusion respecting an entire manuscript from a statement which was made with respect only to a very small part of that manuscript?"

The scholars are practically agreed