

After examining 'The Pearl of Great Price,' by Joseph Smith, Salt Lake City, Utah, The Deseret News, 1907, and in particular the three fac-similes, Nos. 1, 2 and 3, I am convinced that the following are facts:

1. That the author of the notes on the three fac-similes had before him Egyptian inscriptions, either on papyrus or some other material, or else fac-similes of such inscriptions. Compare, for example, No. 2 with the fac-similes of similar hypocephali in W. M. F. Petrie's Abydos, Pt. 1, 1902, Plate LXXVI, LXXVII, and LXXIX, in which are sections exactly corresponding to sections in this fac-simile (No. 2).

2. That the author either knew Hebrew or had some means of arriving at, at least, an elementary knowledge of that language. Compare for example, the transliteration and translation רַקִּיעַ in No. 1, note 12, although the transliteration 'Rankeeyang' is far from accurate.

3. That the author knew neither the Egyptian language nor the meaning of the most commonplace Egyptian figures; neither did any of those, whether human or Divine, who may have helped him in his interpretation, have any such knowledge. By comparing his notes on fac-similes Nos. 1, 2 and 3 with any elementary book on Egyptian language and religion, and especially by comparing the notes on No. 2 with the explanation of the above named plate on page 49 ff. of the work of Petrie already named (the explanation is by A. E. Weigall, Chapter V), this becomes unquestionably evident.

In general, it may be remarked that his explanations from a scientific and scholarly standpoint are absurd. Compare No. 1, note 1: No. 2, notes 4, 8, etc.; No. 3, notes 2, 4, 5. The word 'Jah-oh-eh' in note 1 of No. 2, which he calls an Egyptian word (!) is his faulty transliteration of the Hebrew יְהוָה. If Abraham wrote anything while he was in Egypt, it would most likely have been written in the Cuneiform, as that was the lingua franca of his day and his own native language.

Many proofs of the correctness of the above three conclusive points may be offered if desired. A criticism in his explanations could be made, but the explanatory notes to his fac-similes cannot be taken seriously by any scholar, as they seem to be undoubtedly the work of pure imagination.

Rev. Prof. C. A. B. Mercer, Ph. D.,
Western Theological Seminary,
Custodian Hibbard Collection,
Egyptian Reproductions.