



Type: Magazine Article

Scientists Not Always Correct

Author(s): Richard W. Young

Source: *Improvement Era*, Vol. 16, No. 5 (March 1913), pp. 460–466

Published by: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints

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. WIDTSOE.

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.

concerning the dear old atomic theory, upon which we of an older generation were brought up, that "the atomic theory has been of priceless value to chemists, but it has more than once happened in the history of science that a hypothesis, after having been useful in the discovery and the co-ordination of knowledge, has been abandoned and replaced by one more in harmony with later discoveries."

It would have been scientific sacrilege not to have had implicit confidence in the physicians of fifty years ago, and yet they did not have the slightest conception that the world was filled with microscopic germs, the chief sources of disease, and their annihilation the chief hope for prevention and cure. Our helpful friends, the doctors, formerly starved where now they feed, the typhoid patient, and back a century or two ago bled patients for nearly every disease—a practice not only discarded but now held to be indefensible, even murderous.

This and many more instances, modern, medieval and ancient, might be cited as a sufficient justification of the caution and hesitancy with which religion accepts the conclusions of science. The Christian Churches will not accept the scientific dictum that there is no personal God; nor any theory of evolution which eliminates the creative act; nor the scientific denial of miracles, including the immaculate conception and that great central fact of Christianity, the resurrection of the body of our Savior; nor philosophical deductions as to the plan of salvation; nor expert historical opinion as to the authenticity of the books of Moses or Daniel or the four gospels (though clergymen here and there may be converts to higher criticism), etc., etc.

I scarcely believe that either Catholics or Protestants would be willing to submit their respective claims to the determination of historians, and conceive that the Church of England would not be willing to go out of business upon the adverse determination of eight or ten historians who might be called upon to examine the claims of that church to unbroken apostolic

succession; and I further venture the suspicion that Bishop Spalding would not be willing to yield acquiescence to disinterested scholars respecting every tenet of his faith. It was with such considerations in mind that I suggested, in other words, at the beginning of this communication that perhaps the reverend bishop might not be willing to have measured to Christianity in general or to himself with what measure he meted to us.

Bishop Spalding asseverates, that inasmuch as thinking and authoritative scholars declare that Joseph Smith translated certain hieroglyphics incorrectly, "no thoughtful man can be asked to accept the Book of Mormon, but, on the other hand, honesty will require him, with whatever personal regret, to repudiate it and the whole body of belief, which has been built upon it and the reputation its publication gave to its author."

Despite the cocksureness of Bishop Spalding, I cannot, because of the considerations above mentioned and others noted below, with such thoughtfulness and honesty as I possess, accept the bishop's conclusions.

However, in the controversy at issue, we Latter-day Saints are not compelled to rely entirely, as we may in consistency, upon the aforesaid and other general considerations, but we feel that we may urge special objections to the evidences offered by the bishop in support of his case, I shall not attempt to point out the discrepancies among the scholars cited by Bishop Spalding—that has been done by Elder B. H. Roberts and others—further than to call attention to the fact that these discrepancies are quite numerous and involve such diametrically conflicting translations as the version, on the one hand, by Petrie and Peters that plate No. 1 represents Anubis or an embalmer preparing a body for burial, and, on the other hand, the statement of Breasted and Deveria that the plate represents Osiris rising from the dead. The jury palpably disagrees and the indictment must either be dismissed or the defendants be granted a new trial—surely the arbitrary conten-

tion that every honest and thoughtful man must vote for conviction, under such circumstances, finds no analogy in law or logic.

Being quite curious to ascertain just why these students of Egyptology differ among themselves, I consulted the latest edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica, and in the article on Egypt, page 58, found a statement prepared by an Oxford professor, and presumably a student of the Rev. Prof. Sayce, which seems to furnish a complete explanation of these discrepancies, and at the same time to deprive Bishop Spalding's savants of the title to absolute and incontestable verity which he ascribes to them.

This is the statement (the capitals being mine):

"At present Egyptologists depend on Heinrich Bruegsch's admirable but somewhat antiquated WORTERBUCH and on Levi's useful but entirely uncritical VOCABULIARO. . . . Apart from their philological interest, as giving the state of a remarkable language during a period of several thousand years, the grammatical studies of the last quarter of the nineteenth century and afterwards are BEGINNING to bear fruit in regard to the exact interpretation of historical documents on Egyptian monuments and papyri. Not long ago, the supposed meaning of these was extracted chiefly by brilliant guessing, and the published translations of even the best scholars could carry no guarantee of more than approximate exactitude, where the sense depended at all on correct recognition of the syntax. Now the translator proceeds in Egyptian with SOME OF THE SURENESS with which he would deal with Latin or Greek. The meaning of many words may be still unknown, and MANY CONSTRUCTIONS ARE STILL OBSCURE; but at least he can distinguish fairly between a correct text and a corrupt text. Egyptian writing lent itself only too easily to misunderstanding, and the writings of one period were but half intelligible to the learned scribes of another. The mistaken reading of the old inscriptions by the

priests at Abydos (table of Abydos), when attempting to record the names of the kings of the first dynasty, on the walls of the temple of Seti I., are now admitted on all sides; and no palaeographer, whether his field be Greek, Latin, Arabic, Persian or any other class of Mss., will be surprised to hear that the EGYPTIAN PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS ABOUND IN CORRUPTIONS AND MISTAKES. The translator of today, can, if he wishes, mark where certainty ends and mere conjecture begins, and it is to be hoped that advantage will be taken more widely of this new power. THE EGYPTOLOGIST WHO HAS LONG LIVED IN THE REALM OF CONJECTURE IS TOO PRONE TO CONSIDER ANY SERIES OF GUESSES GOOD ENOUGH TO SERVE AS A TRANSLATION AND FORGETS TO INSERT THE NOTES OF INTERROGATION WHICH WOULD WARN WORKERS IN OTHER FIELDS FROM IMPLICIT TRUST."

And so the cat is out of the bag! The studies of the past are now "beginning to bear fruit in regard to the exact interpretation of historical documents on Egyptian monuments and papyri;" brilliant guessing has been the rule of the past and the Egyptian translator now proceeds "with some of the sureness with which he would deal with Latin or Greek;" "many constructions are still obscure;" "the writings of one period were but half intelligible to the learned scribes of another;" "Egyptian papyri and inscriptions abound in corruptions and mistakes;" and the Egyptologist "is too prone to consider any series of guesses good enough to serve as a translation." Really, are not trifles, light as air, held by the Reverend Bishop to be more strong than proofs of holy writ?

In passing, it may not be malapropos to the contention that Joseph Smith must be rejected because he is repudiated by the scholars, to refer to the fourth verse of the eighth chapter of St. Matthew, wherein Jesus said, "Show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded"—the reference being to Leviticus. But the scholarship

of higher criticism proclaims that Leviticus was not written by Moses, nor until centuries after his time. Christ's statement was unqualified; he did not say "as Moses is believed to have written" or "as is contained within the writings ascribed to Moses," etc., but uses the words "that Moses commanded." And in view of this flat controversy between Christ and the scholars, one shudders at the sentence that must be imposed upon Christ and Christian pretensions.

There is another thought respecting this controversy, that seems to be germane—a consideration that permits us to assume that Dr. Spalding's jury is right, and, if you will, even unanimous, in the interpretation of the papyri submitted, namely that Abraham, in seeking to represent the attempt of the priest of Elkenah to offer up Abraham as a sacrifice, and, again, in seeking to represent the occasion that Pharaoh politely permitted Abraham to sit upon the Egyptian throne, would not violate the analogies by substantially copying scenes familiar to the populace of his day and in employing the images of Egyptian deities—even though such scenes and images might be used to represent meanings quite different from their ordinary significations.

Orators, poets, and painters, in their appeals to the public, have ever employed the simile, the metaphor, the idealistic and the symbolical. Figures of speech and conventionalities of a like character in painting have never failed to add interest and conviction "to an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative." We talk to children in the language of childhood and appeal to the aborigine in the picturesque imagery of nature. Benjamin West, the American who became president of the Royal academy, in his "Death of Wolfe," introduced figures with modern costumes and thus became the first of English painters to abandon classical draperies in historical paintings—and one can imagine how conclusive would be the unanimous testimony of such a flood of paintings, if recovered from a perished civilization, that the great men of England, as late as the eighteenth century,

were garbed in the habiliments of ancient Rome.

In 1911 I visited the Vatican in Rome, and there, in the Sistine Chapel, beheld Michael Angelo's great conception of the "Last Judgment," the central figure of which being the Great Judge. Upstairs, somewhere in that wilderness of rooms, I saw Raphael's impressive picture of the Eternal Father. These pictures are found in the palace, the very home, of the Roman Pontiff. Let it be supposed that these and innumerable other representations of God in human form, were recovered by Macauley's New Zealander, or by some other representative of a civilization yet to be born, from the ruins of the Vatican or other ruins of the present age and submitted to the Sayces and Petries of his day, in order to ascertain the Roman Catholic conception of the personality of God—can we doubt that the unanimous verdict would be that the Roman church held that God was in the express physical image of man; and this, despite the protestations of the truly initiated that these figures were merely symbolical and were employed by the artist to enable them to appeal to their generations in a language that would be understood.

And so—is it more unreasonable or inexplicable that Abraham should employ the figures of the Conopic jars to depict certain of the Gods represented by him, or Osiris, or of Seti, or what not, to represent himself or the idolatrous priest, than for Angelo to copy the face of a Roman peasant or Raphael that of a "Bavarian Toy Maker" to represent a spiritual essence, a divinity without body or parts.

I shall not contend that my religious beliefs have been free from uncertainties—uncertainties, however, quite as great, even greater, in respect of the fundamental conceptions of Christianity as in respect of tenets peculiar to "Mormonism;" and I find some support in the conviction that the difficulties thus besetting me are no greater than those besetting the great body of Christians, including perhaps the author of

"Joseph Smith as a Translator." But objections to Christianity in general, though often difficult or impossible to explain, become negligible to the devout Christian when viewed in conjunction with the innumerable and obvious evidences of the truth of Christianity; and so to the converted Latter-day Saint, the objections contained within the Bishop's brochure, though involving some puzzling facts, sink into relative insignificance when viewed in the light of the splendid truths proclaimed by and through Joseph Smith, Jr.—truths, as we believe, vindicating God from the aspersions of theological error and ennobling mankind as the possessor of embryotic divinity.

"Truth," says Bacon, "is the daughter of time," and we feel that in respect of the objections now considered we can afford to await the vindication of the years. Such partial vindication has already come to the Book of Mormon through the discovery of the great ruins of Central and South America, the fossil horse, etc., and in the opinion of a government expert, given in one of the reports of the Bureau of Ethnology that the mammoth ranged over certain parts of America as late as 1,500 years ago.

Yours respectfully,
RICHARD W. YOUNG.

A facsimile from the Book of Abraham



CUT NO. 1. EXPLANATION OF ABOVE.

Fig. 1. The Angel of the Lord. 2. Abraham fastened upon an altar. 3, the idolatrous priest of Elkenah, attempting to offer up Abraham as a sacrifice.

4. The Altar for sacrifice by the idolatrous priests, standing before the gods of Elkenah, Libnah, Mahmackrah, Korash, and Pharaoh. 5, the idolatrous god of Elkenah. 6, The idolatrous god of Libnah. 7, The idolatrous god of Mahmackrah. 8, The idolatrous god of Korash. 9, The idolatrous god of Pharaoh. 10, Abraham in Egypt. 11, Designed to represent the pillars of heaven, as understood by the Egyptians. 12, Raukeyang, signifying expanse, or the firmament over our heads; but in this case, in relation to this subject, the Egyptians meant it to signify Shaumau, to be high, or the heavens, answering to the Hebrew word Shaumahyeen.

A facsimile from the Book of Abraham



CUT NO. 2. EXPLANATION OF THE FOREGOING CUT.

Fig. 1. Kolob, signifying the first creation, nearest to the celestial, or residence of God. First in government, the last pertaining to the measurement of time. The measurement according to celestial time, which celestial time signifies one day to a cubit. One day in Kolob is equal to a thousand years, according to the measurement of this earth, which is called by the Egyptians Jah-oh-eh.

Fig. 2. Stands next to Kolob, called by the Egyptians Oliblish, which is the next grand governing creation near to the celestial or the place where God resides; holding the key of power also, pertaining to other planets; as revealed from God to Abraham, as he offered sacrifice upon an altar, which he had built unto the Lord.

Fig. 3. Is made to represent God sitting upon his throne, clothed with power and authority; with a crown of eternal light upon his head; representing also the grand Key-Words of the Holy Priesthood, as revealed to Adam in the Garden of Eden, as also to Seth, Noah, Melchisedeck, Abraham, and all to whom the priesthood was revealed.

Fig. 4. Answers to the Hebrew word Raukeyyang, signifying expanse, or the firmament of the heavens; also a numerical figure, in Egyptian signifying 1,000; answering to the measuring of the time of Oliblish, which is equal with Kolob in its revolution and in its measuring of time.

Fig. 5. Is called in Egyptian Enish-go-on-dosh; this is one of the governing planets also, and is said by the Egyptians to be the sun, and to borrow its light from Kolob through the medium of Kae-e-vanrash, which is the grand key, or, in other words, the governing power, which governs 15 other fixed planets or stars, as also Floeese or the moon, the earth and the sun in their annual revolutions. This planet receives its power through the medium of Kli-fios-is-es, or Hah-ko-kau-beam, the stars represented by numbers 22 and 23, receiving light from the revolutions of Kolob.

Fig. 6. Represents the earth in its four quarters.

Fig. 7. Represents God sitting upon his throne revealing through the heavens the grand Key-Words of the Priesthood; as also, the sign of the Holy Ghost unto Abraham, in the form of a dove.

Fig. 8. Contains writing that cannot be revealed unto the world; but is to be had in the holy temple of God.

Fig. 9. Ought not to be revealed at the present time.

Fig. 10. Also.

Fig. 11. Also. If the world can find out these numbers, so let it be. Amen.

Figs. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 will be given in the own due time of the Lord.

The above translation is given as far as we have any right to give at the present time.

A facsimile from the Book of Abraham



CUT NO. 3. EXPLANATION OF THE ABOVE CUT.

1. Abraham sitting upon Pharaoh's throne, by the politeness of the king, with a crown upon his head, representing the Priesthood, as emblematical of the grand Presidency in Heaven; with the sceptre of justice and judgment in his hand.

2. King Pharaoh, whose name is given in the characters above his head.

3. Signifies Abraham in Egypt; referring to Abraham, as given in the ninth number of the Times and Seasons. (Also as given in the first facsimile of this book.)

4. Prince of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, as written above the hand.

5. Shulem, one of the king's principal waiters, as represented by the characters above his hand.

6. Olimlah, a slave belonging to the prince.

Abraham is reasoning upon the principles of astronomy, in the king's court.