

Published several times a year by THE SOCIETY FOR EARLY HISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, for the dissemination among its members of information on new discoveries in archaeology throwing light on the origins of civilization in the Old and New Worlds, on the earliest periods of recorded history in the two hemispheres, and on the important historical claims of the Hebrew-Christian and Latter-day Saint scriptures; also news of the Society and its members and of the B.Y.U. department of archaeology and anthropology, of which the Society is an affiliated organization. Included are papers read at the Society's and Department's annual symposia on the archaeology of the Scriptures. All views expressed in this newsletter are those of the author of the contribution in which they appear and not necessarily those of Brigham Young University or the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Subscription is by membership in the Society, which also includes subscription to other publications.

117.0 WHICH IS THE WAY? A REPLY TO DEE F. GREEN, "BOOK OF MORMON ARCHAEOLOGY: THE MYTHS AND THE ALTERNATIVES." By M. Wells Jakeman. A paper read at the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures and Allied Fields, held at Brigham Young University on October 18, 1969.

A major part of the Book of Mormon is a remarkable account of certain ancient civilized peoples of the New World—their origins (deriving them from certain ancient civilized peoples of the Old World); their growth in population and settlements, with indication of their particular area and period in the New World and the approximate location of many of their settlements; the principal figures, events, and developments (often closely dated) in their political and religious history; many of their customs and other cultural traits; and finally, the downfall of their civilizations.

There are several reasons why study of this extensive historical narrative of the Book of Mormon is important. Lack of space, however, prevents our going into them here.

In any case most study of the historical part of the Book, as to the paramount question of its authenticity, must necessarily be made in the light of *the indications of independent data* as to the history of its area and period in the New World. These are chiefly (a) historical statements in early native and Spanish writings from Mexico and Central America not published or known until after 1830, the year of publication of the Book of Mormon; and (b) archaeological findings which have resulted from excavations dating also after 1830. We may refer to such study, therefore, as the "historic-archaeological" approach to the Book of Mormon, or briefly as "Book of Mormon archaeology." (The latter designation, a somewhat narrower term, may be defined as study of the historical narrative of the Book of Mormon in the

light of modern archaeological findings; cf. the field of biblical archaeology, which is study of the historical narrative of the Bible in the light of modern archaeological findings.)

As a matter of fact, this historic-archaeological approach to the Mormon scripture, or Book of Mormon archaeology, has been regarded as a legitimate field of study by LDS writers from the beginning. Indeed it appears that the Mormon prophet Joseph Smith himself, the original publisher and first student of the Book of Mormon, was the first to suggest such a study. In an issue of the journal *Times and Seasons* of which he was editor, Joseph Smith (or another writer with his approval) concluded from a certain passage in the Book of Mormon that the division of the Book's area in the New World referred to as the "land southward," in which was located one of its more important cities named Zarahemla, was the part of the American continent now called Central America; and then went on to propose the identification of this city Zarahemla with the ruins of a certain ancient "Maya" city then-recently discovered in Central America.¹

A number of LDS writers after Joseph Smith and into the twentieth century took up this kind of study of the Book of Mormon. The same approach was recognized as one of the interests of the Department of Archaeology of Brigham Young University at its founding in 1946, and has remained an important part of its program from that time. (This is in accordance with the wishes of many LDS scholars and educators. For example the late Dr. John A. Widtsoe, a member

of the board of trustees of Brigham Young University, stated that one of the four fields of teaching and research "which are especially prominent in the Restored Gospel of Jesus Christ" and should therefore be emphasized at BYU is "American archaeology to substantiate the claims of the Book of Mormon."²) From its founding in 1949 the Society for Early Historic Archaeology, an affiliate organization of the Department of Archaeology (now Anthropology and Archaeology), has carried on in the latter's behalf most of this work in Book of Mormon archaeology, along with some work in the related field of biblical archaeology.³ A number of LDS writers outside the Department and the Society have also, over the past three decades, adopted the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon.

To most people now working or interested in Book of Mormon archaeology, there is no question of the correctness of this approach. Five considerations lead to this conclusion. These were detailed by the writer in a paper⁴ read at the Eighteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures, held at BYU, October 12, 1968. Here we can only briefly list them.

1. The Book of Mormon is a serious narrative of past times (i.e. one which is not trivial or nonsensical), and provides possible solutions to important historical problems; in other words, it merits the respectful attention of scholars.
2. Its account of ancient America, though disputed, has not yet been disproved, i.e. is not already known to be in conflict with modern archaeological findings.
3. It is an independent or original narrative, not derived from any other known account (at least in its major part) or based upon any known archaeological report. Consequently its comparative study with other accounts, and with modern archaeological findings, constitutes an objective test of its accuracy or authenticity.
4. It postulates the survival of sufficient remains of the peoples it tells about, to make possible its testing by the means of archaeology.
5. It is also sufficiently specific and detailed to make possible a *conclusive* test by independent historical and archaeological data, i.e. an extensive checking as to its general accuracy which will settle the question of its authenticity. (It gives numerous references to various peoples, cities, and persons by name; to particular events,

with indication of place and time; and to many distinguishing characteristics of its two successive civilizations—cultural traits such as types of implements, kinds of clothing, types of buildings, social customs, religious beliefs, etc. In fact, there is much more such information given in this account than found in some ancient accounts of the Old World whose authenticity has already been established by archaeological checking.)

In the proper method of Book of Mormon archaeology, research begins of course with study of the historical text of the Book of Mormon itself, i.e. study of its geography, chronology, and so on; and then moves to comparative study of independent historical statements and modern archaeological findings. For a full understanding of the Book of Mormon account, specifically as to the racial and cultural traits and languages of its peoples, the *initial text study* must be accompanied by investigation of the antecedents of these peoples in the Old World (according to the Book of Mormon, in the Near Eastern area of the Old World, hence investigations in biblical and other ancient Near Eastern history and in Near Eastern archaeology, philology, and anthropology). And for a full scientific test of the Book of Mormon account, the *comparative study* must include (1) comparisons of the account with modern archaeological findings in the Near East, checking its claims as to the cultural traits of its ancient Near Eastern colonists of the New World; (2) comparisons of the account with independent historical statements in early native and Spanish writings of the New World, and with modern archaeological findings in *this* hemisphere, further checking its story of ancient transoceanic colonists from the Near East, and also—and especially—checking its numerous claims as to the history of its particular area and period in the New World; and finally (3) comparisons of the racial and cultural traits and languages of the ancient civilized peoples of the New World as known from archaeology, anthropology, and early writings of philology, with the traits and languages of the ancient civilized peoples of the Near East as similarly known, still further checking the account's basic claim that the ancient civilized peoples of the New World originated, at least in part, in transoceanic colonies from the Near East.

In the second or most important of these three fields of comparative study,⁵ data must be included which will check the account's claims not only as to specific traits of the peoples of its area and period and as to general developments of population and culture history (as interpreted with the help of anthropology and environmental studies), but also as to names and

events of ethnopolitical history. Note, moreover, that a fair test in this field requires that most of the independent data relate to the actual area and period of the Book of Mormon peoples in the New World, insofar as these can be determined in the initial text study. And finally, for the entire comparative test to have an affirmative result, a large number of correspondences must be established in *each* field, some of which must be arbitrary or unexpected, in order to rule out the possibility of coincidence.

With the *correctness* of the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon accepted by most LDS writers and supported by the five considerations we have mentioned, and with its *proper method of pursuit* now clear, there seems to be no reason why it should not some day result in a scientific decision as to the authenticity of the Book of Mormon account of ancient America.

Nevertheless, in recent years some LDS writers have rejected this approach, or denied the existence of a legitimate field of Book of Mormon archaeology. And they have indicated their determined opposition to the program of teaching and research in this field carried on in the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology of BYU and by the Society for Early Historic Archaeology.

ANOTHER ATTACK ON THE HISTORIC-ARCHAEOLOGICAL APPROACH

The latest published statement of this position is an article in this year's (1969) summer issue of the journal *Dialogue*, entitled "Book of Mormon Archaeology: The Myths and the Alternatives," and authored by Dee F. Green, a former student in the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology of BYU and now an assistant professor of anthropology at Weber State College, Ogden, Utah.

This is, in the first place, a flat rejection of the traditional historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon (in Prof. Green's terminology the "geographical-historical" approach); and Book of Mormon archaeology is pronounced "largely useless, even a delusion," in fact a "myth."

In an attempt to support this position he makes two claims. *First*, he argues that it is justified because "no Book of Mormon location is known with reference to modern geography," and that therefore there is no geographic connection between the Book of Mormon statements and archaeological data which would make possible research in Book of Mormon archaeology. But he overlooks the fact that in the first and second fields of comparative study in Book of Mormon archaeology (see above) the problem of Book of Mormon geography is not a factor. And he also overlooks the

fact—one admitted to some degree by himself in his article—that on the basis of internal evidence the part of the New World known to archaeologists and anthropologists as Mesoamerica (the ancient high-culture area of central and southern Mexico and northern Central America) is now accepted by most LDS archaeologists as the area of the Book of Mormon history and civilizations. In other words, there is possible a *general* archaeological checking of the Book of Mormon account also in the third field of comparative study, on the basis of this common geographic ground in Mesoamerica for such study (as well as on the basis of the undisputed identification of the *period* of the Book of Mormon history and civilizations in this area as largely that of the so-called Preclassic period of archaeologists, specifically the period from the third millennium BC to the fourth century AD). That is, there is possible some general archaeology of the Book of Mormon which can be very important for its claims respecting the history of its particular area and period in the New World, and which some day may lead us to the location of its specific sites in that area. (Indeed the eventual archaeological identification of specific Book of Mormon sites must be considered one of the exciting possibilities of Book of Mormon archaeology, in view of the great success of the field of biblical archaeology in locating specific biblical sites.)

Second, Prof. Green argues that the "geographical-historical" (i.e. historic-archaeological) approach must be abandoned because it has been "largely sterile" of results—because "twenty years of such an approach have left us empty-handed." This of course—as he admits—is a matter of opinion. But in order to make this claim, he is obliged to ignore nearly all of the many important discoveries which have been made in Book of Mormon archaeology, especially in recent years and in many cases reported in publications of the archaeology department of BYU and the SEHA—not only discoveries of culture-trait correspondences between the Book of Mormon peoples specifically and the ancient peoples of the Near East according to findings of modern Near Eastern archaeology (see above, the first field of comparative study), but also discoveries of correspondences between the Book of Mormon story of Near Eastern migrations to the New World and independent literary and archaeological data from this hemisphere, and in both the culture history and the ethnopolitical history of the Book of Mormon area and period in the New World (see above, the second field of comparative study), as well as discoveries of trait-correspondences between the ancient peoples of the New World known to archaeology and those of the Near East (see above, the third field of comparative study). He ~~does~~ take

note, however, of one of the discoveries in the second field, reported at some length in publications of the SEHA—a striking correspondence which has been found between the well-known Lehi tree-of-life episode in the Book of Mormon (an incident in one of the Book's Near Eastern migrations to the New World) and an ancient tree-of-life episode portrayed on a stone monument unearthed some time ago at the ruined city of Izapa in southern Chiapas, Mexico. (This sculpture or monument, known as Stela 5, Izapa, pictures an ancient event in which six persons—an old bearded man and an old woman, probably his wife, and four young men, probably their sons—engaged in a discussion apparently concerning the “tree of life” of ancient American [as well as ancient Old World] religion and art, which is represented in the center of the composition, with two winged figures standing facing it on either side as in ancient Near Eastern representations of the symbolic tree. It also shows one of the four young men apparently inscribing on a tablet or plate what was being said in the discussion; and depicts a river of water coming by the tree, and a narrow double line—i.e. a path?—coming straight to it.) The resemblance of this ancient tree-of-life scene on the Izapa monument to the Lehi episode in the Book of Mormon cannot be denied. Nevertheless, Prof. Green warns his readers against “Jakeman's Lehi Tree of Life Stone,” and dismisses it with a few contemptuous remarks.⁶

Indeed he strives throughout his article to prejudice his readers against everything written by those who have adopted the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon, and especially against the Department of Archaeology of BYU (before it became the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology) and the Society for Early Historic Archaeology, which he holds most guilty of promoting what he considers the “delusion” and “myth” of Book of Mormon archaeology. He writes in one place, for example, that “titles on books full of archaeological half-truths, dilettanti on the peripheries of American archaeology calling themselves Book of Mormon archaeologists regardless of their education, and a Department of Archaeology at BYU devoted to the production of Book of Mormon archaeologists do not insure that Book of Mormon archaeology really exists.” (In response to this loud warning, we point out that it does not bring Prof. Green any closer than before to refuting the logical basis and method of the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon as previously summarized in this paper. We also feel that his judgment against LDS writers in this field is much too sweeping. And we deny, from long first-hand knowledge, that the Department of Archaeology at BYU was ever “devoted to the

production of Book of Mormon archaeologists”; in fact it could not do this, for there are extremely few positions open for such archaeologists.)

He also asserts that “everything the archaeology department did” when he was a student at BYU “had to be ‘scripturally’ related.” This is an even more surprising statement. Actually only *two* of 18 to 30 courses offered by the Department, when Prof. Green was a student, dealt with “scriptural” archaeology (“Historic Near-Eastern and Biblical Archaeology” and “Ancient Civilizations of America” or “Early History of Middle America”—an introduction to Book of Mormon archaeology, or study of the disputed Book of Mormon account of ancient Mesoamerica in the light of the early native and Spanish chronicles and modern archaeological findings); while such courses as “Prehistoric Archaeology of the Old World” and “Classical and Christian Archaeology” could not even remotely be brought into relation with the Book of Mormon branch of scriptural archaeology. Furthermore, most of the work with students in the graduate program for the master's degree in archaeology, including guidance of research and thesis writing, was then—as now—in the division of *prehistoric* or anthropology-related archaeology, especially prehistoric Utah and Southwestern, and completely devoid of any connection with the archaeology of the Scriptures, which is a field of *historic* (history- or text-related) archaeology.

In his effort to establish the claim that nothing of significance has so far resulted from the program in Book of Mormon archaeology at BYU, Prof. Green directs his attack especially upon the writer, his chief villain. Lack of space prevents a full response to this part of his article, but since it is clearly meant to discredit the writer in the eyes of scholars and students, some reply here seems justified. (No opportunity was given to make a reply where it would have counted most, namely in the same issue of the journal *Dialogue* in which Prof. Green's attack appeared. Though the latter was published as one of three articles which the editors of *Dialogue* billed as a “roundtable” on New World archaeology for Latter-day Saints, neither the writer nor anyone else specializing in the field under attack, namely Book of Mormon archaeology, was invited to participate, which would have made this “roundtable” a real one, i.e. a true dialogue.)

One of his charges is that “while most LDS archaeologists agree very broadly with Jakeman in identifying Mesoamerica as the region in which Book of Mormon events most likely transpired, attempts to arrive at closer identification have been hampered by Jakeman's failure to publish his long-awaited geography of the Book of Mormon.” The implication of this is

that Jakeman is the one to blame for the lack of progress in one of the endeavors of Book of Mormon archaeology. This failure to publish the geography, however, is not intentional on the writer's part (there have been major obstacles to its printing, which cannot be gone into here). Incidentally, in making this charge Prof. Green seems to have momentarily forgotten that he has already rejected the "geographical-historical" approach to the Book of Mormon.

Another failure of the writer in the field of Book of Mormon archaeology, according to our critic, is an "abortive attempt to identify the Book of Mormon city Bountiful." This is a premature judgment. The project of archaeological identification referred to has never been terminated; for a number of ancient sites in the district fixed upon (on the basis of references in the Book of Mormon itself and confirmatory and supplementary data in the early historical accounts from Mesoamerica) are still good candidates for this identification.⁷

One more charge must be answered here. In a long footnote our critic asserts that our drawing of the ancient tree-of-life sculpture which we have identified as actually a portrayal of the Lehi tree-of-life episode recounted in the Book of Mormon (see above), and which was used in our chief publication on this sculpture, is not accurate. The fact is that no claim has been made by the writer that this drawing is *completely* accurate. Even the drawings made by the "unbiased draftsmen" Prof. Green mentions—insinuating that the writer was biased when he made his drawing—are not completely accurate. Indeed total accuracy in the reproduction of this sculpture is not possible, because of the weathering and other damage it has suffered, causing dimming and even obliteration of some details. Nevertheless the drawing made by the writer agrees essentially with the photograph published by Dr. Matthew W. Stirling (the Smithsonian archaeologist who first discovered and studied many of the monuments of Izapa), which was obtained by Dr. Stirling in 1941 before some of the weathering and other damage to this sculpture had occurred (cf. Newsletter, 110.0, p. 2). And since our own interpretation was published, minor corrections in our drawing reproduction have been made, based on a first-hand study of the sculpture by the writer at the site of Izapa; also on a second early, unpublished photograph by Dr. Stirling which was given by him to the writer; as well as on several excellent close-up photographs of details of the sculpture by Dr. Ross T. Christensen (Newsletter, 83.12).

(Prof. Green, in his attempt to discredit the writer's interpretation of Stela 5, Izapa, also mentions the plaster reproduction of this sculpture in the BYU archaeology museum, and states that it "has been

altered by Jakeman after his interpretation." The impression this statement will make on some readers is that the writer did, indeed, dishonestly alter the cast of the sculpture for some ulterior purpose. The facts are that the cast was not altered insofar as any change in the features, but only that their background was somewhat lowered by scraping in order to give them more prominence, as found necessary for the benefit of viewers because of the very low relief of the sculpture.)

Green's "Better Way"

Assuming that he has disposed of the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon with these various claims, Prof. Green next proposes that a much better way of studying the Book of Mormon account of ancient America in the light of modern science is what he calls the "anthropological" approach. His main argument in behalf of this procedure seems to be that the only significant areas of comparison, in his view, are those in culture traits and culture history, and that these are exclusively the business of anthropology. Clearly he has forgotten or fails to realize that these areas of comparison have long been recognized as parts of the historic-archaeological approach (see previously, in our summary of the three fields of comparative study in the proper method of Book of Mormon archaeology); and that the comparative study of *ancient* culture traits and developments (as involved here) has always been a common undertaking of archaeology—naturally, since our knowledge of such traits and developments depends mostly on archaeological data.⁸ (In fact the main purpose of archaeology, as an historical science, is the investigation of the human past through the evidence of material remains—especially the *early cultural history* of mankind, including unique [as well as recurrent] events and developments.)

Prof. Green's proposal appears to stem from his concept of archaeology—*all* archaeology—as merely "a sub-discipline of anthropology." This is a view held by only a few archaeologists. Actually the great majority consider only the division of "*prehistoric*" archaeology as related to the science of anthropology,⁹ with the other main division, "*historic*"—the archaeological study of periods of recorded history (and of indirectly recorded protohistory) in conjunction with the written records or purported records of those periods—allied instead to the discipline of history *sensu stricto* or documentary history.¹⁰

Moreover, the aim of anthropology is very different from that of scientific study of the Book of Mormon. The aim of anthropology as a social science (it is also a biological science) is the discovery of the

common elements in the cultures of all peoples—especially present-day primitive or illiterate peoples—or the regularities of human group behavior. But the primary aim of scientific study of the Book of Mormon is—or should be—the determination of the authenticity of his historical narrative. Such study is therefore a subject mainly of external checking by independent historical data, mostly archaeological findings; i.e., a subject of historic or text-related and more particularly *text-centered* archaeology, a kind of archaeology not related to anthropology¹¹ but to documentary history. (This is not to say that anthropology is not also involved in the scientific study of the historical narrative of the Book of Mormon as to its authenticity. But that discipline enters into it only as an aid in the interpretation of the archaeological and other historical data; see previously in our discussion of the proper method of Book of Mormon archaeology.)

We must comment, finally, on the emphasis Prof. Green places, in his proposed “anthropological” approach to the Book of Mormon, on comparisons in the area of culture traits between the ancient civilized peoples of the New World and those of the Near East, checking the basic claim of the Book of Mormon that the ancient civilized peoples of the New World originated, at least in part, in transoceanic colonies from the Near East. Actually such comparisons have long been a part of the historic-archaeological approach (the third field of comparative study, in the proper method of Book of Mormon archaeology). But for scientific authentication of the Book of Mormon account, similarities between the ancient American and ancient Near Eastern civilizations are not enough. These can be explained more easily in other ways than by bringing the Book of Mormon into the picture, with its miracles and other troublesome claims. Thus *all* such similarities which are not merely accidental can be explained as the result of migrations to the New World of *non-Book of Mormon* groups from the same Near Eastern peoples from which the Book of Mormon groups are indicated to have come. And many such corresponding culture traits are already known or will surely be found—to have characterized other Near Eastern peoples besides those ancestral to the peoples of the Book of Mormon. In fact a *Phoenician* colonization of the New World, first seriously proposed by Zelia Nuttall and recently again by other scholars including Cyrus Gordon, would explain most if not all the Near Eastern similarities that have so far been noted. (Cf. Newsletter, 111.0, 116.4.)

In other words, for a conclusive determination of the authenticity of the Book of Mormon account, comparisons must also and especially be made in the areas of *the specific claims of that account itself*.

Now such comparisons are the main order of business in the historic-archaeological approach to the Book of Mormon (see previously, the first and second fields of comparative study in the proper method of this approach). Especially important are comparisons in the area of names and events of Book of Mormon and Mesoamerican ethnopolitical history. Prof. Green, at the end of his article, excludes comparisons in this area from his limited “anthropological” approach, and ridicules the emphasis placed on them by the writer and others who follow the historic-archaeological. But correspondences in names of ethnopolitical history (i.e. names of peoples, settlements, or important persons of the same region or locality and same period) or in events of such history (migrations of peoples, foundings or conquests of cities, accessions of rulers, etc., in the same region or locality and of the same time, *and mayhap also of the same name*), are generally conceded to be among the most arbitrary or significant that can be established in a field of historical research.

When all is said, however, the final decision as to which way of study of the historical narrative of the Book of Mormon is the better or the best¹²—will be determined, of course, by their results. In a fuller discussion of the historic-archaeological approach, expected to be published in the winter issue of the journal *Brigham Young University Studies*, a listing will be made of some of the important results which have already been achieved over the years by this traditional and more comprehensive way of study of the Book of Mormon account.

NOTES

¹ *Times and Seasons*, Vol. III, No. 23 (October 1, 1842), p. 927.

² *In a Sunlit Land*, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1952, pp. 95-96.

³ For a discussion of this program of scriptural and especially Book of Mormon archaeology in the Department of Archaeology and the Society for Early Historic Archaeology see Ross T. Christensen, *Some Views on Archaeology and its Role at Brigham Young University* (University Archaeological Society [now the Society for Early Historic Archaeology], Miscellaneous Papers, No. 19), Provo, Utah, 1960.

⁴ “The Rationale of Book of Mormon Archaeology.” (See Newsletter, 109.1.)

⁵ The most important, since almost all the numerous historical claims of the Book of Mormon relate to the history of its peoples after the departure of their original groups from the Near East, and particularly after their settlement of the New World.

⁶ Scornful comments borrowed from another LDS writer opposed to Book of Mormon archaeology, and which reveal that Prof. Green himself does not seem to have read the SEHA publication detailing the Book of Mormon correspondences of Stela 5; and which also reveal that this other writer he follows here could not have read the publication with any care, since each of the assertions can be totally refuted from its pages, as will be seen in a later publication of the SEHA now in preparation.

⁷ See also in Ross T. Christensen, ed., *Progress in Archaeology: an Anthology* (Society for Early Historic Archaeology, Special Publications, No. 4), Provo, Utah, 1963, pp. 177-191.

⁸ Occasionally interpreted, however, with the help of established written history, philology, or anthropology.

⁹ Practically all European and other Old World as well as many American archaeologists. Most American archaeologists in the field of Americanist archaeology or native New World studies, however, and most American anthropologists, regard prehistoric archaeology as actually a branch of anthropology. (In this prehistoric division archaeology is still primarily an historical science but it also has an important secondary aim, that of a social or behavioral science, in fact the same aim as anthropology, and the interpretation of its data for this purpose requires the help of anthropology.)

¹⁰ Because the Department of Archaeology at BYU, when Prof. Green was a student there (which was before it became a department of *anthropology* as well as archaeology), was structured on the rationale that archaeology was a discipline distinct from anthropology, no curriculum in anthropology was offered. Consequently his complaint, at one point in his article, that his training in *anthropology* at BYU was inadequate, is unfairly made against the Department of Archaeology. At that time, incidentally, some courses in anthropology were taught at BYU in a Department of Sociology and Anthropology. He should therefore, instead, have leveled this charge against the-then anthropology section of that department.

¹¹ Whereas the opposite kind of historic archaeology, namely text-aided, may have the social-science aim of prehistoric archaeology and anthropology.

¹² Actually still another way, a study of the customs and habits of thought and speech of the ancient Near Eastern-derived peoples of the Book of Mormon in the light of modern Near Eastern philology, has been pursued in recent years, with some important results. Unfortunately the chief advocate of this limited "philological" approach has also, like Prof. Green, taken the extreme position that only *his* way is the legitimate one.

117.1 SYMPOSIUM DISPLAY. By Susan P. Stiles. In addition to the previously-mentioned displays at the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures (Newsletter, 116.1), Dr. Dale L. Berge, BYU assistant professor of anthropology and archaeology, also had an exhibit—a display of artifacts from his recent excavations at historical sites of the LDS church. (Reference to Dr. Berge's exhibit was omitted from the last issue of the *Newsletter and Proceedings* due to an oversight.)

Dr. Berge served as assistant field director under J. C. Harrington during excavations at Nauvoo the summers of 1968 and 1969 and personally excavated the Browning and Farr homes (cf. Newsletter, 108.8). Next summer, it is anticipated, he will become field director.

This past summer, under the sponsorship of the LDS Church Information Service, he also excavated the Peter Whitmer home, site of the organization, in 1830, of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, at old Fayette, approximately two miles south of Waterloo, New York. Dr. Richard L. Anderson, SEHA general officer, and Larry C. Porter did the advance documentary research on the site. The project was made possible through the cooperation of John S. Genung, a trustee and researcher of the Waterloo Historical Society.

117.2 FOURTEEN GRADUATE. Six Bachelor of Arts degrees in archaeology and eight Bachelor of Science degrees in anthropology were awarded by Brigham Young University in 1969.

Alejandra Alineda, Petrus Andrew de Haan, James Louis Frederick, Dick LeRoy Miller, and Keith Warren Richins earned degrees in archaeology, which were awarded at the June 4 commencement. On the same occasion Judith G. Connor, Renald Wood Farnsworth, Boyd Louis Frost, Edward Grant Jacob, Cheryl Ann Langley, Ronald Warren Moss, and Duane William Whimpey received degrees in anthropology.

At the August 21 convocation Rulon Valden Taylor received the BA degree in archaeology, while James Alan Bolt received the BS in anthropology.

117.3 TITLES ADDED TO "BLUE LIST." Two more publications are now among those that may be purchased from the Society office. These will be added to the official blue list ("Publications for Sale") the next time it is printed. They are:

1. *The Wheel in Ancient America*, by Paul R. Cheesman. Reprinted from *BYU Studies*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 185-197. A paper read in 1966 at the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures under the title, "The Use of the Wheel in the Old World and the New" (see Newsletter, 100.0). Price: 10¢ per copy to SEHA members; 25 ¢ to non-members. (Copies of this publication were distributed gratuitously to Society members in April.)

2. *Some Views on Archaeology and Its Role at Brigham Young University* (A Reprint of Four Essays from the *UAS Newsletter*), by Ross T. Christensen. *SEHA Miscellaneous Papers*, No. 19, Provo, 1960. 23 pp. Facsimile reprint, in 1969, of the 1960 edition (see Newsletter, 72.5). Price: 10¢ per copy to SEHA members; 25¢ to non-members.

117.4 MORE COPIES OF PUBLICATION FOUND. Approximately 150 additional copies of *The Sun God Moccasin Tales*, Vol. 2, *Some Flood Myths of the Indians*, by Albert B. Reagan (Provo, 1936, 32 pp.), have been found in the Society's storage area.

This title appears as No. 70 in the four-page green list, "Free Past Publications," which is mailed to each Society member as his fee is processed. However, due to a misunderstanding, this item was crossed out on all copies of the list which are currently being distributed. Members should correct this error on their own copies of the list: Item 70. "Reagan, 1936," is now available. Members may order it as one of their five "free past publications" to which they are entitled per year of membership, as explained on the green list itself (see also Newsletter, 89.4).