

seeking for this, we find some things not mentioned by our critics.

The offering table has its significance in hieroglyphic writing, as both a "phonogram," or indicator of sound not spelled in letters, and as an "ideogram," or sign indicating an idea, independent of words, or in connection with spelled words. Its phonographic significance, as given by modern Egyptologists, is either HAU-T or HAWT, in which the A indicates a breathing similar to the Hebrew ALEPH, the first sign of the alphabet, which may indicate, not only "a" but also any other vowel or semi-vowel whatever, according to pointing or usage. Champollion's grammar transliterates this sign with EIEBT. As an ideogram this figure signifies the "Orient," the "East."

The flowers shown upon the table closely resemble those shown in the conventional cluster, which constitutes the familiar ideogram for Lower Egypt.

We have, therefore, a figure closely suggesting an association of Egypt with some word or name indicated by a combination of ALEPH and a labial consonant (B or V), or else with the

Orient, from which, in relation to Egypt, Abraham had come. The use of "AB," "AV," "IB," or "IV," to indicate Abraham is quite analogous to the use of the familiar tri-grammator IHS (Greek for IES) to indicate the name "Jesus;" in both cases the first syllable denotes the full name. In the latter case the example is only one of a general run of instances in which proper names and other words are abbreviated in Greek manuscripts.

Considered hieroglyphically, therefore, there is no doubt but what the "lotus-crowned standard" may be interpreted to signify "Egypt and the Orient," or "Egypt and Ib (rain), Iv (rain), or Ab (ram)," quite as clearly and certainly as it connotes the actual use to which it was devoted.

In view of the points above noted, it seems safe to say that the assertion made by one of our critics to the effect that "Smith . . . has misinterpreted the significance of every one figure" stands now with burden of proof shifted to the shoulders of those who reject him, both as a prophet of God and even as a man of ordinary honesty.

Comments on the Spaulding Pamphlet*

BY JOHN A. WIDTSOE, A. M., PH. D.

Rt. Rev. F. S. Spaulding, D.D., Salt Lake City, Utah.

My Dear Dr. Spaulding—The pressure of official work has made it very difficult to find the time necessary to keep my promise to give you my opinion of your book, "Joseph Smith, Jr., As a Translator." I have, however, read the work several times and have given the matter with which it deals considerable thought. In the hour at my disposal I can only suggest some of the many thoughts that have come as I have followed your argument against the correctness of Joseph Smith's interpretation of the hieroglyphics printed in the Pearl of Great Price.

I may as well say at once that I am

not convinced. Your argument has disappointed me, for I had hoped to find in your book an investigation that would be worthy of the steel of "Mormonism." Instead, I have come to the conclusion that you have only begun the inquiry, which you announce has been concluded.

Do not misunderstand me. You have given your word that you are sincere in this inquiry. That is enough. The apparent unfairness on some of your pages can well be charged to the aberrations of vision which beset every person who takes sides on any question.

Your title page is splendid. "Joseph Smith, Jr., as a Translator. An Inquiry

* From the *Deseret News* of Jan. 11, 1913.

Conducted by Rt. Rev. F. S. Spalding, D.D., Bishop of Utah, with the kind assistance of capable scholars." It is full of promise. Especially do I like the word "inquiry" in the sub-title, which undoubtedly you are using in the scientific sense. The word is one which has become hallowed in the history of science. The great masters who laid the foundations of systematic knowledge were wont to entitle the reports of their classical investigations, patiently and exhaustively carried on for years, "An Inquiry" into this, that, or some other, natural phenomenon. It is with a feeling akin to reverence that I peruse any "inquiry" made by a learned man "assisted by capable scholars." "Mormonism" has had so few inquiries made into it in an unprejudiced, truly scientific spirit, that the few that have been made should receive respectful attention.

Your dedication is equally good—"To my many Mormon friends—who are as honest searchers after the truth as he hopes he is himself—this book is dedicated by the Author." The "Mormon" has been so persistently viewed through the eyes of narrow clerical prejudice, that it feels good to have a leader of the cloth give "Mormons" credit for being at least as honest as are other people. I am a "Mormon" because I honestly believe "Mormonism" to be true. There are some hundreds of thousands who are equally honest in their belief. Your admission of this fact puts us on a footing of equality in the inquiry, the results of which you are submitting to the world. I thank you for the gracious words.

The thing in your dedication which especially appeals to me, however, is the statement that you and we, in this investigation, are searchers after truth, thereby confirming the opinion derived from the title page, that this inquiry is in reality an honest search after truth—that it is to be thoroughly scientific. Such inquiries are welcomed by the Latter-day Saints; their system of belief must stand every honest test of truth. To you and to me, truth is indeed "the sum of existence." Before truth we stand with shoes removed and heads uncovered.

The very first words in the text of the book explain why the inquiry must be an honest search after truth. "If the Book of Mormon is true, it is next to the Bible, the most important book in the world." You later explain that, according to your method of thinking, if Joseph Smith interpreted the Egyptian hieroglyphics in the Pearl of Great Price correctly, the Book of Mormon must be true; if incorrectly, must be false. With such an important matter at stake, the inquiry certainly must be an honest search, a thoroughly scientific investigation, for if the translation is wrong, it means the salvation from gross error of the half million souls in the "Mormon" Church; if right, the doubling of the holy books of all Christendom.

THE ESSENTIAL QUESTION.

I shall not consider at all the question whether your claim that one error in "Mormonism" makes the whole erroneous. Some of my fellow-believers have already expressed themselves vigorously on that point. The essential question is: Did or did not Joseph Smith translate the hieroglyphics in the Pearl of Great Price correctly? A fact is to be established. After that has been done it may be time to discuss the application of the fact. As I understand your book, that was the impelling motive in the inquiry.

I confess that your purpose thus clearly shown appealed to me immensely. To have a trained, capable mind apply itself with all the resources of the age, to a thoroughly scientific examination of a point in "Mormonism," put on edge my expectant appetite. Why did you not carry out your purpose? Can not a man carry to the end an inquiry concerning "Mormonism?" Instead of passing a direct opinion on the book, let me express it indirectly, in the form of some questions which I ask in all sincerity "as an honest searcher after truth," and in the hope that you may be persuaded to continue the inquiry.

Why did you secure opinions from eight men? Why not from eighty? This is not a matter which has been examined and re-examined until settled be-

yond dispute. As I remember I have heard you say that you are not an Egyptologist; neither am I. If, therefore, we are to rest our decided opinions concerning Egyptology upon the opinions of others, we should certainly follow the statistical procedure and reduce the probable error by bringing in all the possible witnesses. True, there is not an abundance of persons who claim the ability to read Egyptian hieroglyphics, but certainly many scores are found in the countries of the world. You have certainly used the statistical method in a most unscientific manner.

I note with regret, also, an element of haste in your important inquiry. It was impossible to secure evidence from Dr. Lythgoe because he was in Egypt. Mails pass regularly between Utah and Egypt every few weeks. In my own little correspondence I receive occasional letters from diverse places in Egypt, and we both have friends who go from Utah to Egypt and back in a few weeks. Haste is unscientific; the masters of "inquiry" take their time; what matters a year or two, if spent in the interest of truth? Since you decided to begin your inquiry by asking opinions, you greatly violated the scientific method by asking only eight—especially since the matter rested largely on individual interpretations of long-past days.

More surprising still is the fact that you assume that the answers of eight experts would settle this tremendously important question: The method of ipse dixit, "I have said it, therefore it is true," is not scientific. No reputable man of science uses it. If a layman desires some information on agricultural chemistry he may put a question to me and to other specialists, and if he have sufficient confidence in our soundness may govern his practices accordingly. Similarly, if a layman desires information concerning socialism he may apply to you and other expert students of the subject, and may make your views his own. However, the layman who thus secures information by the easy method of asking of convenient experts a few questions does

not write a book on agricultural chemistry or socialism. That is done, or should be done, only by the man who has by independent research made himself a specialist on the subject. Yet that is precisely what you have done in the matter of Joseph Smith's translation of the Egyptian hieroglyphics. The method of the layman has been used by you in reaching conclusions of the specialists. In an inquiry defined as an honest search after truth, conclusions resting on such a method have no value. You have forgotten, in a scientific inquiry, to assure yourself that your data are correct. If a man of science should do such a thing he would soon acquire the title of pseudo-scientist. Why did you, a man trained in the learning of the day, adopt an unscientific method in a scientific inquiry? Do you carry such reverence for authority into all matter—say into the higher criticism of the Bible? I assure you that "Mormons," so frequently charged with slavish obedience to authority, establish their faith quite otherwise.

ACCEPTS DISCORDANT VIEWS.

It is yet more surprising to note that you accept the answers, obtained by the faulty methods of the layman, in the face of the patent fact that they do not agree. Your attention has already been called to the disagreement of the jury. It can not be denied except by speciousness, and I believe you will not do it. A layman, receiving from experts discordant answers to the same question, would simply be confused and lay the matter by with the thought that where the doctors disagree there is no help for him. A scientific inquirer, however, an honest searcher after truth, would not lose heart, but would set to work to discover why there was disagreement, whether it was apparent or real, and if possible would dig out the truth. Why did not you do this? Many books have been written on Egyptology, by men living and dead. Why were they not examined to harmonize, if possible, the discordant answers? The museums on both sides of the water, as we have both seen, are filled with papyri found

with mummies that might have been examined to secure the counterparts of Joseph Smith's "hieroglyphics."

Out of your own mouth is the statement that this inquiry is in importance next only to one concerning the truthfulness of the Bible, yet you dare draw a final conclusion from an inquiry so loosely conducted that I can hardly believe that you, with your training, were really in charge. You remember, no doubt, the accuracy, the painful accuracy, with which the facts of science are established. If the relative weight of an atom of hydrogen is to be determined, a dozen men, in several countries, labor for years, with errors so small as to make a speck of dust look as large as a hill. The methods of the higher critics—I speak of the big work—are based upon the accurate study of minute differences and similarities.

The earnestly scientific method of higher criticism is, after all, the chief reasons why the questionable conclusions of the study have received such wide acceptance among scholarly men of your type. Yet in your own higher criticism of Joseph Smith's powers as a translator, north and south have apparently pointed in one direction.

Did you not notice in the letters received by you that some of the scholars were unable to read the characters surrounding the main picture, while one declares them to be the usual funeral inscriptions? Did you not know that M. Deveria seemed able to decipher many of them? As a scientific investigator, why did you not satisfy yourself and us on this point? The prints from the original wood cuts may be obtained from *The Times and Seasons*, numerous copies of which are available. Did you examine these? If you did not, and there is no evidence in your book that you did, you violated the method of science, and have discredited your conclusions.

Moreover, I must ask you what you would have us believe from the testimonial letters which are the only evidence for your argument. For instance, one of the "capable scholars" declares that the scene in Fig. 1 depicts the embalmer preparing the dead

body for mummification. It is agreed that this scene occurs with thousands of funeral papyri. Do you ask us to believe that this representation was made with trouble and expense simply to perpetuate the method of embalming? That is, is it only a sort of record whereby embalmers of future years might acquire the *modus operandi* of the business? If so, it appears to me to be fearfully misleading. No self-respecting corpse should look so tremendously alive; and no clever embalmer should hold his knife so high in evident surprise. The notion of course is preposterous. The scene, naturally, is symbolical, as are the other figures in question. What do they symbolize—in essence? What hope, fear, conviction, made it necessary to place these representations with the dead? Who is Osiris, from the beginning, by the method of scientific inquiry? What is the place of Osiris in the theological system of ancient Egypt? Whence was the conception of Osiris, and how did it change through the years? Who and what were Isis and Horus and all the other gods of Egypt? Not by name and relationship, but as expressing the Egyptian's vision of the known and the unknown, the past, the present and the hereafter? What is the mighty symbolism of the writings of the dwellers by the Nile, the shakers and the makers of the empires of old? Did you go into all this in your honest search after a truth second only to the truth of the Bible? Your correspondents point out the shell of the thing, and hardly that. To them, Fig. 1 is of the embalmer at work, or of Osiris rising from the dead; Fig. 2, a magical disk; Fig. 3, the dead person appearing before Osiris or something similar, with not a word of explanation. Joseph Smith attempts the interpretation of the symbolical meaning, and if his translation of the hieroglyphics is read in connection with the Book of Abraham, a consistent beginning of explaining the whole symbolical system of Egypt is made. Why did you not examine the literature of this subject

when you undertook this fundamentally important inquiry.

INQUIRY SHOWN TO BE LOOSE.

In science, similarities are as important as differences. Why is not a word of comment offered on the striking similarities between Joseph Smith's version and those of your correspondents, which have been publicly pointed out to you? Again, the inquiry is shown to have been of the loosest scientific nature.

In yet another way does it seem to me that you have grossly forgotten the method of science in your study of the "Mormon" Prophet's power of translating Egyptian hieroglyphics. You are an earnest follower of many of the higher critics. Your views of the Bible are not those of the majority. The evidences upon which you base many of your views are of the internal kind. The tricks of phrase and the kind of imagery are means whereby information concerning authorship and date of composition is obtained. Why was not this method employed in your study of Joseph Smith as translator? The hieroglyphics in question were merely incidents in the longer translation of the Book of Abraham. Why was not this book carefully examined for evidences to establish or overthrow the claim to genuineness of the translation of the hieroglyphics? A complete scientific inquiry would not fail to employ all the means by which modern man ascertains truth, especially of a matter second only to one in importance to the followers of Christ. The omission of this test makes your book appear still more unscientific.

Why did you so carefully avoid any reference to the history of Egypt in its relation to semitic influences? You must have noticed the possibility of comparing the words of the Book of Abraham with the views of many leading scholars? Did you note the absurdity of the remark of one of your scholars concerning "Joseph Smith's monotheistic Abraham," in view of the doctrines actually set forth in the Book of Abraham? To omit any reference

to this great subject is anything but scientific, if truth is desired.

Since the Book of Abraham is not used at all in your argument, and since you decided to institute an inquiry which should be an honest search for truth, why did you prejudice your jury by sending to them the Pearl of Great Price, as is evident from several of the replies? According to the method of science, every precaution should be taken to prevent the element of prejudice from entering the observations sought. "Mormonism," thanks to the efforts of sundry members of the Christian clergy, is not a popular system of theology. Egyptologists, even the most eminent, are men of flesh and blood, and subject to the common passions of the race. Why did you not, in this day of photo-engraving, spend the dollar or two necessary to secure cuts freed from the context of the Pearl of Great Price? It was not at all necessary, in a scientific inquiry, to let the jury know the source of the hieroglyphics; the question at issue was simply the meaning of them. The prejudicing of your witnesses, accidental as I hope it to have been, was distinctly unscientific, and reduces greatly the value of the testimony.

The letters themselves, with one or two exceptions bear evidence of having been thrown off lightly. They are the letters hastily though courteously dispatched, to correspondents of sufficient importance, by busy men who are anxious to get back to their work. It was not to be expected that these men, with only a most passing interest in Joseph Smith, should do more. It was your investigation, not theirs. Meanwhile, not one of the letters is a thoroughgoing statement concerning the questions which you asked, and which, peculiarly enough in a scientific inquiry, you do not print. Your correspondents give their offhand opinions, no more. I am fairly sure that none of them, were the facts set before him, would justify you in so unscientific a use as you have made of their letters in this book, even concerning so unpopular a subject as is "Mormonism."

THE ATTITUDE OF THE JUDGES.

May I ask you further, why, in an inquiry to be characterized by an honest search after truth, you did not call attention to the doubtful value of some of the opinions received as evidenced by the manifest prejudice and ill temper of the authors? Do you think Dr. Sayce was helping you in your honest search after truth when he opened his letter with the words, "It is difficult to deal seriously with Joseph Smith's impudent fraud?" Was he in a frame of mind to render impartial judgment on the subject? The spirit of this opening sentence is not scientific, and evidently it had not been impressed upon Dr. Sayce that this inquiry was an honest search after the truth of one of the most vital matters before civilized man. I assure you that the authors of your letters were not half so much amused at "Joseph Smith's impudent fraud," as I was at the introduction of such opinions as the foundations of an important conclusion, into a book professedly embodying the history and findings of the scientific inquiry by a man liberally trained in the learning of the day.

The evening is closing. There are many other thoughts that have occurred to me, but which must be left unwritten. I can only repeat that I am unconvinced; and that your book, as an honest search after truth by one competent to conduct such an inquiry, is extraordinarily unscientific. It is not worthy of you. Your plan is excellent, but your method so loose and incomplete that your conclusion is unwarranted. You, yourself, would be the last to accept for yourself any conclusion based upon so rickety a method and so attenuated an evidence as are found in your book on Joseph Smith, Jr., as a translator. Why did you perpetrate it upon your "Mormon" friends?

You declare that the subject is of highest importance to all Christendom; nevertheless you proceed to base your conclusions on the opinions of eight scholars, when scores are available; you show an unscientific haste to get into print; you accept without question

the authority of these men; you ignore the radical differences in their opinions; you fail to make the necessary minute comparisons and bibliographical researches; you virtually deny the symbolical meaning of all Egyptian funeral inscriptions; you refrain from mentioning the striking similarities between Joseph Smith's translation and your eight opinions; you disregard the possible internal evidences of the Book of Abraham in support of the prophet's translation; you are silent on the whole vital matter of Egypt and Abraham; you have prejudiced your witnesses, though probably unintentionally; your eight letters are not in the remotest sense studies of the matter under consideration; you have accepted at their face value letters that are clearly prejudiced and ill tempered. Were it not that you have said otherwise, I should be tempted to say from the internal evidences of the book, that you prejudiced the case and wrote the conclusion before the investigation began.

These changes should be made in the next edition of the book. On the title page should be added the words "The Plan and a Preliminary Study." On pages 18 and 19, all words that convey a conclusion should be eliminated. At the end it should be stated that the inquiry is being vigorously and scientifically continued.

EVIDENCE OF PROPHET'S INSPIRATION.

I trust you will receive this letter in the spirit in which it is sent. You want to know the truth; so do I. We want frankness in criticism. Continue the investigation in accordance with the methods of science, with which you are so thoroughly familiar. Final results may come slowly if the inquiry is carried on intensively, but as you have yourself explained, it is quite worth while.

Finally, permit me to say that, as a young man, I gave long and careful study to the books of Moses and Abraham, as found in the Pearl of Great Price, came out of the study with a conviction that they were splendid evidences of the divinity of the work

of the Prophet Joseph Smith. Time has not altered this view. Your book has set me investigating the question concerning the accuracy of the translation of the hieroglyphics incidentally inserted with the Book of Abraham. As far as I have gone in the study, I have been happy to find that the evidence is wonderfully in favor of Joseph Smith's translation. I shall continue the study in my occasional spare moments. To me it is not a vital thing in "Mormonism," but it is interesting, and I am grateful to you for calling my attention

to it again. I have no fear of the outcome when Joseph Smith is subjected to scientific study—but the study must be an "honest search after truth."

With best wishes, very sincerely yours,
JOHN A. WIDTSON.

P. S.—I may send a copy of this letter for publication to the editor of *The Deseret News*, so that if it is published it may serve as an answer to a number of people who have asked for my views of your book.

Scientists Not Always Correct*

BY JUDGE RICHARD W. YOUNG.

Salt Lake City, Utah, Jan 10, 1913.
Editor *Deseret News*:

The Right Rev. F. S. Spalding's willingness to sacrifice "Mormonism" upon the altar of scholarship is reminiscent of Artemas Ward's willingness to sacrifice his wife's relations on the altar of patriotism.

I do not venture this comparison flippantly, but with a sincere conviction that neither of the churches of Christendom, including the great organization of which Bishop Spalding is a distinguished member, is willing to submit to the determination of scholars the authenticity of its claims or the validity of any basic fact of its creed. I am not ignorant that in the conflict between science and theology victory has usually perched upon the banners of the scientists; nor do I forget that the path along which science has proceeded forth out of primitive darkness into present-day light is strewn with the skeletons of theories once deemed imperishable and of fictions once regarded as facts—and no one is so blind as not to be able to see that the pathway of science extends onward and upward into realms of positive knowledge, whose brightness will cause the tallow dips of today's speculations to pale into relative insignificance. And it is because of such considerations as these that the

churches now are and ever have been unwilling to yield unreserved credence to every decree of science, the instant it is formulated.

The sciences of astronomy, chemistry, geology, zoology, medicine—in fact, all—have frequently discarded theories to adopt new ones. The Ptolemaic theory that the earth was the center of the universe very ingeniously explained nearly all of the phenomena of the heavens; and this theory was unquestioned for more than 1,500 years prior to the time of Copernicus. It was said that "the wise are witnesses that the heavens revolve in the space of 24 hours," and Copernicus was described as a fool who "wishes to reverse the entire science of astronomy"—but Copernicus was right and the world, scientific as well as religious, was wrong.

Scientists once held that there were but four elements, fire, earth, air and water; but when I went to school chemistry taught as an ultimate and incontestable fact that matter was divided into some 60 odd distinct elements. It seems incredible that this theory has perished, and that "the tendency of all recent discoveries has been to emphasize the truth of the conception of a common basis of matter of all kinds." (*Ency. Brit.*) The same eminent authority tells us

*From the *Deseret News*, January 11, 1913. Published in the ERA by permission of the Author.