

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.

139.0 THE BOOK OF MORMON AS A MESOAMERICAN CODEX. By John L. Sorenson, professor of anthropology and sociology at Brigham Young University. A paper read at the Twenty-third Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures and Allied Fields, held at Brigham Young University on October 20, 1973.

#### INTRODUCTION

The Latter-day Saints have for many years virtually ignored evidence that the source of the text published as the Book of Mormon was broadly similar to the class of ancient documents from Mesoamerica termed codices. If the Book of Mormon original was in this form, the text may reveal the fact. The purpose of this paper is to examine some features of the Book of Mormon text as they seem to relate to the texts of Mesoamerican codices.

Mormons have tended to begin scholarly examination of the content of the Book of Mormon from the point of view of the Old Testament and the statement in the Book of Mormon that the volume had been written in "reformed Egyptian" characters. A modest body of scholarship, developed over the last century, has shown that some elements of the Book of Mormon text are illuminated substantially by considering them in this light. Three contributions stand out: Sidney B. Sperry's *Our Book of Mormon*,<sup>1</sup> Hugh Nibley's series of writings beginning with *Lehi in the Desert*,<sup>2</sup> and John Welch's work on chiasmus in the nuclear Old World and in the Book of Mormon.<sup>3</sup> They demonstrate to the minds of most reasonable observers that the Book of Mormon indeed includes Near Eastern elements which cannot be explained on the basis of Joseph Smith's setting in New York in the late 1820's. Perhaps because this relationship has been documented to a degree, Mormons have acted as though the Book could have no other context than a Near Eastern one, despite its own claim to be set for the most part in ancient America. Despite some com-

parisons of specific aspects of the Book of Mormon with ancient America, no one has succeeded in showing convincingly that it fits essentially in that context. The Book of Mormon remains, as far as almost all Latter-day Saints are concerned, a religious volume which they treat as an adjunct of the Bible, with little concept of its having any other specific cultural setting. Thus, for example, at the Hill Cumorah pageant in New York State, costuming and accoutrements are mostly ancient Near Eastern, while staging is in a non-specific "Indian" manner derived from nowhere in particular although hinting at Middle America. The lack of specificity in these matters seems of no concern to the producers.

Inasmuch as we LDS distributors of the Book present it as a religious volume with evangelical significance, it comes as no surprise that scholars, consequently, have never seriously considered the possibility that it is a document from ancient times.

Some twenty years ago in one of these symposia. I observed that when one compared the characteristics given by Julian Steward<sup>4</sup> for Nuclear America, by which he meant the central civilization area of the western hemisphere, to the cultural characteristics indicated in the Book of Mormon as occurring among the peoples it describes, broad agreement is found.<sup>5</sup> Later I prepared a lengthy manuscript and gave a lecture series, the transcript of which was published,<sup>6</sup> which showed that much cultural description in the Book of Mormon plausibly fits the Mesoamerican scene. Previous and subsequent scholarly activity by other LDS students has shown, in addition, that certain specific cultural features mentioned in the Book of Mormon did occur in ancient

American cultures, particularly in the area of central and southern Mexico and northern Central America which is termed Mesoamerica among scholars. Despite these leads it appears that few, Mormon or not, have been able to see how the Book of Mormon could fit into scholarly concerns. Nor have Latter-day Saints detected that this volume which they consider to have valuable religious content might benefit from being read in the light of ancient Mesoamerican cultural patterns, if that was indeed the area from which it derived.

#### THE CODEX FORM OF THE ORIGINAL TEXT

In its published format, the Book of Mormon has been made as much like the Bible as possible, from the division into chapters and verses for proof-text citation to the anglicization of names (such as "Jesus Christ," an anglicized version coming through the Greek from a Semitic term), to the book form of the volume itself. These results of the publishing process, which have been brought about for thoroughly pragmatic reasons, obscure whatever may have been the form of the original text.

Joseph Smith and his associates described the source of the Book of Mormon as a set of sheets of thin-hammered metal "having the appearance of gold." These were fastened together by metal rings so that the individual sheets or plates could be turned like pages. As far as I know, only one source describes the appearance of the engraved writing on the original plates of the Book of Mormon. Martin Harris, a supporter of Joseph Smith, carried a copy of a portion of the record to New York City where he sought assurance from Professor Charles Anthon, a classics professor at Columbia University, that the writing was authentically ancient. Some years after this event, Anthon described in letters to anti-Mormon writers what he recalled of the writing on the paper submitted to him:

It consisted of all kinds of singular characters disposed in columns. Greek and Hebrew letters, crosses and flourishes (and) Roman letters inverted or placed sideways were arranged and placed in perpendicular columns, and the whole ended in a rude delineation of a circle, divided into various compartments, arched with various strange marks and evidently copied after the Mexican calendar by Humboldt, but copied in such a way as not to betray the source whence it was derived.

On a later occasion Anthon said:

The characters were arranged in columns, like the Chinese mode of writing, and pre-

sented the most singular medley that I ever beheld. Greek, Hebrew and all sorts of letters, more or less distorted, either through unskilfulness or from actual design, were intermingled with sundry delineations of half moons, stars, and other natural objects, and the whole ended in a rude representation of the Mexican zodiac.<sup>7</sup>

Various versions have been published of a surviving fragment of what Anthon saw.<sup>8</sup> Upon comparing them, one is led to suspect that the quality of copying left something to be desired; the characters as we see them in the "Anthon transcript" are very cursive and somewhat crude. Invariably the rows of characters of this fragment are printed oriented horizontally. No Mormon student apparently ever took Anthon seriously in his statement that they were vertical, although his is the only eyewitness account. (Both Harris and Anthon reported that Harris had shown the same copy of the characters to Professor Samuel Mitchell of New York. A search of Mitchell's writings might produce a further characterization of what Harris had with him.) If Anthon's recollections were accurate, we are led to suppose the following characteristics of the source document for the Book of Mormon which Joseph Smith had in his possession:

1. The symbols consisted of pictures of heavenly bodies, "other natural objects," individual "letters," some of which resembled Old World writing symbols known to Anthon, and various "crosses and flourishes."
2. These symbols were arranged in vertical columns.
3. At one end of the columns appeared a circle, divided into compartments and "arched with various strange marks." This feature was somewhat similar to the "Mexican calendar" or "Mexican zodiac."

When the seven rows of characters in the fullest remaining copy of the Anthon Transcript are examined for possible parallels among Mesoamerican writing symbols, nothing striking appears. In the first place only the Maya system is well enough known to allow a reasonable comparison. There is reason to suppose that if parallels were found, they would more likely be with the writing of areas north and west of the Maya, such as the Izapanoid of Vera Cruz, or the Zapotec, Nuiñe, or Teotihuacan systems, but all these are little known. Some of the characters in the existing transcript may have represented "natural objects" including animals. Note the process shown in Father Landa's so-called alphabet of

Maya glyphs from Yucatan wherein complex characters are greatly simplified when drawn by the hand of a person who did not understand the system.<sup>9</sup> An active imagination could see some parallels between the Anthon Transcript characters and certain Maya glyphs, but of course such random, perhaps strained, comparisons are of little value. Yet several examples of possible bar-and-dot numerals (such as the Maya and their neighbors used) can be picked out of the Anthon material. (Robert F. Smith has pointed out to me in a personal communication that a system of bar-and-dot numerals was in use in Egypt for the specific purpose of recording volumes, particularly of grain (cf. Al. 11:3-19).

The Book of Mormon text reports it to have been written, in the words of its final custodian in the 4th century A.D., in "characters which are called among us the reformed Egyptian, being handed down and altered by us, according to our manner of speech." Furthermore, the Nephite writers in the Book of Mormon complain of their frustration at the ambiguity which the character system forced upon them.<sup>10</sup> Clearly enough they were not using Egyptian glyphs as such, but a variant system which operated on similar principles with the addition of unique symbols. Durbin's classification of the world's writing systems puts the Mesoamerican systems in the same general category as Egyptian.<sup>11</sup> The operational principles being essentially the same in the two systems, addition or substitution of new characters could result in a series of transitions to a symbol system "reformed" in comparison with the old because the characters would be unreadable to persons not specifically instructed in their meaning. If the original Book of Mormon text was written in codex form using a glyph system on Mesoamerican principles, as Anthon hints, it could reasonably have been termed a reformed or modified Egyptian system if any significant portion of it had had Egyptian derivation.

David Kelly has concluded that details of the calendrical and other esoteric knowledge of the Mesoamerican peoples are so similar to those of the Old World civilizations, particularly India, that an actual migration of at least one expert in such matters must have taken place from the Old World to Mesoamerica in the first centuries B.C.<sup>12</sup> This of course would also explain the common presence in Mesoamerica and the Old World of such concepts as place-value notation and a zero point in numeration. But beyond such esoterica, there lies a huge body of shared features which can be plausibly explained only by some kind of cultural movement between the Old World ecumenical civilization and Mesoamerica involving much more than a single individual.<sup>13</sup> The growing body of evidence in support of such a view is exemplified by recent papers on astronomically-tied ritual which some have recently proposed to have spread

from the Eurasian heartland to Mesoamerica.<sup>14</sup> Taken together, these data open up the plausibility that an Old World glyphic system could have reached Mesoamerica and been used there in a modified form.

Nothing we know about the possible codex form of the original Book of Mormon text can be considered compelling, yet based on Anthon's descriptions of what was shown him, we can conclude that it is possible that a codex was involved.

### THE CODEX STYLE

An adequate analysis of style in the Book of Mormon is rendered difficult because of the unknown degree to which it may have been transformed or shaped by the hand of the translator, Joseph Smith. We do know, however, that the pyramidal, reflexive style feature known as chiasmus in studies of the literature of the ancient Semitic and East Mediterranean world shows through in the translated Book of Mormon with remarkable clarity despite whatever the translator did. Welch's recent detection of this feature after other Mormons had overlooked it for 140 years suggests that more stylistic study can and should be done. We also know that the Book of Mormon abounds in the simpler two-line parallelism which characterizes much of the Psalms and other Old Testament poetic literature.

J. Eric Thompson long ago noted this same structure in Maya texts, which derive in part from ancient Maya codices. Edmonson's recent re-translation of the Popol Vuh from highland Guatemala is full of the same feature. In fact, he believes that the poetic couplet was the standard form in which sacred texts were phrased among the highland Maya.<sup>15</sup> Whether full chiasmatic structure is also to be found in Mesoamerican literature remains to be seen. Thompson has said (private communication) that while he has not noted the chiasmus form, having hitherto been unaware of its existence, the Chilam Balam texts from Yucatan have some sections which might approach it.

### THE CODEX CONTENT

In general terms we could expect a Mesoamerican codex to be either an annal of major events affecting a ruling lineage or a system for predicting good or ill. The Book of Mormon is an account of a lineage of priest-rulers who dominated a portion of a theocratic society for upwards of a millennium. Latter-day Saint readers generally err in supposing that it is the story of an entire society, but an examination of what the Book is silent about quickly convinces the analyst that its scope is the much more limited one of recounting events mostly significant for a particular lineage (cf. Jac. 1:2-3, 10-14:

Om. 12-17; Mos. 17:2; 25:1-3; 3 Ne. 5:20; Mor. 1:5).

Many of the Mesoamerican codices were also divinatory handbooks. The Book of Mormon is in no sense a divination tool, but it is heavily concerned with prophecy, whose intent is similar. In short, the general nature of the content of the volume is in agreement with what we expect in a Mesoamerican codex.

Geographical and chronological characterizations in the Book of Mormon are highly involved and too lengthy to do more than summarize here. Inductive analysis of the statements in it in regard to geography has led most Mormon scholars who have examined the subject in detail to locate the territory where events of the account took place in Mesoamerica. Joseph Smith himself apparently came to the same conclusion before his martyrdom. In time, the account spans in summary form the whole period from the third millennium B.C. to the fourth century A.D., but much the greatest detail concerns the first two centuries B.C. and the fourth century A.D., that is, part of the Late Preclassic and beginning Classic archaeological periods in Mesoamerica. Depending on the space-time correlations one makes between the account and the external world, the entire general-event structure and many specific features can be correlated with what is known at this time about Mesoamerican culture history.

Time and space limitations preclude my examining at this time the entire range of content of the Book of Mormon as it might relate to Mesoamerica. The main substance of this paper will, therefore, concentrate on symbolic and conceptual features, and some social characteristics, which are the domains in which we could expect the fullest information, given the nature of the Book.

A list of cultural traits is presented which could be found without surprise in a translated Mesoamerican document of codex form. As phrased, these elements are also found in the Book of Mormon or else are attributable to the ancient Near Eastern cultural background which it claims for itself. Most of the elements cited are directly documented in the Book of Mormon. The others are well-known to students of the ancient Near East as features of the symbolism and culture of that area in times preceding 600 B.C., the approximate beginning date of the Book of Mormon record. Including the Near Eastern features is logical in light of the repeated, explicit claims of the Book of Mormon record to have derived from the mainstream of Israelite ritual and symbolism (cf. 1 Ne. 1:1-2; chs. 4-6; 17:22-32; chs. 19, 22; 2 Ne. 4:14-16; 5:16; 6:1-5; 25:1-6; Jac. 2:23; Mos. 1:3-7; Al. 13:14-19; 3 Ne. 20:24-45; chs. 22-24). Moreover the elements of Near Eastern symbolism cited are known by scholars to occur in cultural complexes along with those elements for which there is specific docu-

mentation in the Book of Mormon. How integral the symbolism in the Book of Mormon is with that of the ancient Near East has also been documented in full scholarly fashion by Hugh Nibley in some of his major works.

The references to the literature are necessarily incomplete, but representative. Readers may wish to search standard sources (such as the works of Thompson and Coe on Mesoamerica and Albright on Palestine) for a broader introduction to the scholarly literature. Additional documentation for both areas can also be located in my article in the 1971 volume *Man Across the Sea*. The citations from the Book of Mormon may be unfamiliar even to Mormons, few of whom have read the text in this light. The often cryptic symbolic language there must, of course, be read in the same fashion as the equally cryptic reflections of Near Eastern thought and cosmology found in the Old Testament. Scholars like Albright<sup>16</sup> have shown that the Old Testament fits into the stylistic and cultural context of the ancient Near East in the same fashion I here propose for the Book of Mormon in relation to Mesoamerica. In both cases the casual reader does not detect this contextual fit, but study in depth shows the degree of fit convincingly. Ultimately we cannot understand either document in its full sense without knowing both text and context.

*Some Ancient Mesoamerican Cultural Traits  
according to both the Book of Mormon (or its Near  
Eastern background) and the Mesoamerican sources,  
thus establishing their partial similarity.*

The cosmos was considered to be formed in layered fashion with multiple realms above, the earth's surface between, and one or more underworlds.<sup>17</sup> Elevations were contact points with the upper layers; caves and water holes connected with the lower world.<sup>18</sup> The area beneath was one of death, darkness, and unpleasantness.<sup>19</sup> A paradise provided a painless postmortal existence for some of the dead.<sup>20</sup> A hell provided punishment for others.<sup>21</sup> A lion (jaguar in Mesoamerica) was a deity of the night and the underworld and represented the sun in its night aspect.<sup>22</sup> The lion was feared, respected, and envied.<sup>23</sup>

Beneath the surface was thought to be primal water which might flow forth above ground on certain occasions from special points.<sup>24</sup> Subterranean water was usually connoted evilly, but may also be "pure" or "sacred."<sup>25</sup> A monster (earth monster, crocodile, leviathan) inhabited these waters.<sup>26</sup> The back of the monster supported or was the earth layer.<sup>27</sup> The symbol of an overflowing vase whose stream divided into two or four streams was connected with the idea of the waters flowing forth; this symbol was also linked with the Milky Way which was conceived as a stream.<sup>28</sup> In legendary times a catastrophic flood took place which de-

stroyed all but a handful of the people.<sup>29</sup> The history of the world was divided into a series of ages each bounded by a major catastrophe.<sup>30</sup>

Mountains were holy places, the home of a god or gods, whose names(s) often included the term mountain.<sup>31</sup> The dead ancestors and/or gods periodically assembled on a sacred mountain where they determined the destiny of mankind for a coming period.<sup>32</sup> A fenced haven on or in a mountain was provided for blessed spirits.<sup>33</sup> Either real hills or mountains or artificial elevations were contact points where men communicated with deity, made offerings, received visitations, erected a dwelling for him, buried the dead, etc.<sup>34</sup> Ascending such a mountain or mound symbolized ascent to heaven.<sup>35</sup>

Honoring the ancestors was extremely important.<sup>36</sup> The patrilineage principle was central to kinship organization.<sup>37</sup> Ancestors were honored by deferential burial, often in a tomb which might be re-used for lineage members.<sup>38</sup> Memorial stelae were erected near elevations and/or tombs.<sup>39</sup> The stelae might be aligned for astronomical purposes.<sup>40</sup> Just seven lineages were considered to be primary in the origin story of the people.<sup>41</sup> (The number seven is of course sacred.<sup>42</sup>) Mounds for memorial and worship purposes were periodically enlarged and refurbished.<sup>43</sup>

Mountains and their artificial representations (mounds) were connected to the idea of a god who lived on or visited elevations and who controlled the rain, clouds, and lightning.<sup>44</sup>

Water holes, lakes, moist caves and similar spots were sacred because of their presumed connection with the waters beneath the earth.<sup>45</sup> Serpents or other reptilian creatures were associated conceptually with water places.<sup>46</sup>

A beneficent god was pictured as a serpent who was flying or elevated.<sup>47</sup> This being had power over rain and drouth and thus fertility.<sup>48</sup>

The world was conceived as divided into four quarters, and each major direction was tied to a symbolic color.<sup>49</sup> Prime orientation was to the east as though an observer faced that direction. South was then termed "on the right" while north was "the left."<sup>50</sup> The north sector was considered cursed, foreboding, unlucky.<sup>51</sup>

Orientation to the sun's rising in the east is ritually significant.<sup>52</sup> The wheel was associated with the sun, and wheeled model or toy figures may have been connected with the sun symbolically.<sup>53</sup> Ritual centers were known as "the navel of the world." Periodic ritual assemblies of worshippers took place at such sacred spots.<sup>54</sup>

A calendar system was well-developed and utilized a 400-year unit as well as a 360-day year count for dealing with long periods of time.<sup>55</sup> The lunar month and seven-day sacred period were also in use.<sup>56</sup> The days and

months were numbered, and the number titles themselves were sacred or the days were deified.<sup>57</sup> Astronomy was developed and stellar symbolism rich.<sup>58</sup>

The writing system was largely glyphic, that is ideographic, which resulted in economy of space and effort in writing but also led to considerable ambiguity in interpretation.<sup>59</sup> Consequently literacy was limited mainly to priests and other upper-class personnel.<sup>60</sup> Most records dealt with sacred matters, although secular purposes were also served.<sup>61</sup> Paper books were employed.<sup>62</sup>

A healing, blessing god who was at once a savior and culture hero was prominent. Having departed under striking circumstances, he promised to return at some indefinite time.<sup>63</sup>

Illness was considered to be a product of sin; healing resulted from removing the effects of the transgression through confession.<sup>64</sup> A form of baptism was known and practiced,<sup>65</sup> as was circumcision.<sup>66</sup> Extensive sacrifice was central in the ritual complex, including burnt offerings of animals.<sup>67</sup> Human sacrifice was also known,<sup>68</sup> and cannibalism and self-mutilation likewise were ritual elements.<sup>69</sup> Burial of sacrifices (particularly infants) beneath the foundation of structures<sup>70</sup> and the taking of human trophies also occurred.<sup>71</sup> Other ritual elements included the sacred meal and fasting.<sup>72</sup>

Priests, prophets, and seers were so numerous and powerful as to constitute a virtual theocracy, at least at times.<sup>73</sup> Ceremony and ritual were of very great importance, and cults of great complexity were widespread and powerful.<sup>74</sup> Among the paraphernalia of priestly activity were oracle stones.<sup>75</sup>

Ceremonial activity was carried on at temples and a variety of shrines and other minor worship sites.<sup>76</sup> Temples were constructed on the principle of progressively more sacred inner precincts<sup>77</sup> and direction alignments.<sup>78</sup> Altars were used and included a stepped form, the terraced layers of which are symbolic of the layers of the cosmos.<sup>79</sup> Incense burners, with or without horns,<sup>80</sup> were in use, along with idols and small figurines whose purpose is not precisely known.<sup>81</sup> Witchcraft and sorcery were well-developed, and demons or malevolent spirits were objects of belief.<sup>82</sup>

Composite human-animal sacred creatures, such as winged quadrupeds, were part of the symbol system.<sup>83</sup> Also important was the tree, particularly as the tree of life with its valued fruit.<sup>84</sup> Various peoples were considered to have derived from or been symbolized by trees.<sup>85</sup>

Social relationships were notably characterized by strong vengeance-tinged rivalry between ethnic and/or cultic groups.<sup>86</sup> Violent ritual destruction periodically occurred.<sup>87</sup> The folk, however, tended to take a passive stance in such affairs although pressed by their lead-

ers.<sup>88</sup> Class differences could be strong, but tended to break down to folk homogeneity from time to time.<sup>89</sup>

Ambitious hierarchs "seeking a fortune" by exploiting the peasantry periodically surged to prominence.<sup>90</sup> Trade and markets were closely tied to the development of social hierarchies.<sup>91</sup>

Incipient urbanism was present, but the ceremonial center was much more characteristic than the densely-inhabited city.<sup>92</sup> Palisaded fortifications, seasonal raiding rather than major campaigns, war chief-sacred dual leadership, cacique-led military units of 10,000, unit flags, certain armaments, and other specific warfare patterns were present.<sup>93</sup>

The features presented above are not all that might be pointed out. Had I the time and assistance, these could be phrased more felicitously and documented much more fully. A much larger number of other features could also be laid out, often in the form of additional complexes. What is given seems sufficient for the purposes of this paper, which is to show that important features of the Book of Mormon relate to Mesoamerican codices.

The congruence this paper has sketched between Book of Mormon-described cultural patterns and those of Mesoamerica seem to me sufficient to do two things. First, it should impel scholars to a careful examination of the Book of Mormon as a source of information on Mesoamerica which they are unlikely to find anywhere else. Honest scholars will not be put off by anachronisms or cultural anomalies (as they may appear) in the Book anymore than they are by hard-to-accept elements in a native document such as the Popol Vuh. The presence in an ancient text of concepts and symbols which the scholar does not personally believe is hardly reason not to take the text seriously as a data source when it is seen to fit a pattern as an authentic document.

The second point is that Mormons are going to have to examine in a new light the volume many of them had thought they were familiar with. They can now gain new light by reading and studying it in the light of its ancient Mesoamerican setting.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>*Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Stevens and Wallis, 1947).

<sup>2</sup>*Lehi in the Desert, and the World of the Jaredites* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1952); *An Approach to the Book of Mor-*

*mon* (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1957); *Since Cumorah* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1967).

<sup>3</sup>John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon," *BYU Studies*, 10(1969), 69-84; A Study Relating Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon to Chiasmus in the Old Testament, Ugaritic Epics, Homer, and Selected Greek and Latin Authors. M.A. thesis, BYU, 1970.

<sup>4</sup>Julian H. Steward, "South American Cultures: An Interpretative Summary," in *Handbook of South American Indians*, Vol. 5. *Smithsonian Institution*, Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin No. 143 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1949), 699-772.

<sup>5</sup>"Nuclear America and the Book of Mormon," *UAS Newsletter*, No. 4 (1952), 2.

<sup>6</sup>*The World of the Book of Mormon* (Provo, Utah: BYU Adult Education and Extension Services, 1955).

<sup>7</sup>B. H. Roberts, *New Witnesses for God. II. The Book of Mormon*, Vol. 2 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1926), 95-100; *A Comprehensive History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Century I*, (Vol. 1 (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1930), 100-107.

<sup>8</sup>E.g., Roberts, *Comprehensive History* plate opposite p. 106; *The Prophet* (a New York newspaper), 21 December 1844.

<sup>9</sup>A. M. Tozzer, editor, "Landa's Relación de las Cosas de Yucatan. A Translation," *Harvard University, Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Papers*, Vol. 18 (Cambridge: Peabody Museum, 1941), 170.

<sup>10</sup>Ether 12:24-25; cf. Mosiah 1:3-6, and also J. Eric Thompson's characterization of the Maya system which sounds very similar: "Both space considerations and ritualistic associations militated against precision in writing; and, in addition, the great use of rebus writing . . . influenced the texts so that the reader had to have a good background of mythology and folklore to comprehend the texts." "Maya Hieroglyphic Writing," in *Handbook of Middle American Indians, Vol. 3, Archaeology of Southern Mesoamerica*, Part 2, ed. by Gordon R. Willey (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1965), 646.

<sup>11</sup>Marshall Durbin, "Linguistics and Writing Systems," *Estudios de Cultura Maya*, 7(1968), 54. C.F. & E.M. Voegelin, "Typological classification of systems with included, excluded and self-sufficient alphabets," *Anthropological Linguistics* 3(1961), 78, with Eth. 12:24-25 on possible bases for Jaredite - Nephite differences in writing capability.

<sup>12</sup>David H. Kelley, "The Nine Lords of the Night," *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility* No. 16 (1972), 53-68; and private communications.

<sup>13</sup>"The Significance of an Apparent Relationship between the Ancient Near East and Mesoamerica," in Carroll L. Riley and others, editors, *Man Across the Sea, Problems of Pre-Columbian Contacts* (Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1971), 219-241.

<sup>14</sup>See Elizabeth Chesley Baity, "Archaeoastronomy and Ethnoastronomy So Far," *Current Anthropology*, 14(1973), 389-449.

<sup>15</sup>Munro S. Edmonson, "The Book of Counsel: The Popol Vuh" of the Quiche Maya of Guatemala," *Tulane University, Middle American Research Institute Publication* 35 (New Orleans: MARI, 1971), xi-xiii.

<sup>16</sup>William F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. A Historical Analysis of Two Contrasting Faiths* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968).

Note #	The Mesoamerican codices (or Mesoamerican archaeology)	The Book of Mormon	The Near Eastern background of The Book of Mormon
17	Man Across the Sea, 227. (Hereafter MAS.)	Plural "heavens:" 1 Ne.1:8; Al.18:30; especially Al.1:15. Below: 1 Ne.12:16; 8:32; 14:3; 2 Ne.24:9; Moro.8:14; Mos.13:12.	MAS 227.
18	MAS 227; Tozzer, <u>Landa's Relacion</u> , index under "cenots."	1 Ne.12:16.	Roland de Vaux, <u>Ancient Israel</u> (London: McGraw-Hill, 1961, 277-8. (Hereafter DAI.))
19	J. E. S. Thompson, "Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: Introduction," <u>Carnegie Inst. of Washington Publ.</u> 589 (Washington: CIW, 1950) 72.	See notes 17, 18, esp. 1 Ne.12:16. Cf. Al.26:3; Mos.27:29.	Albright, <u>Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan</u> , 184. (Hereafter YGC.)
20	MAS 239.	2 Ne.9:13; Al.40:12,14; 4 Ne.14; Moro.10:34.	MAS 239.
21	MAS 239.	1 Ne.12:16; 15:29; 2 Ne.9:10,12; Al.5:6; 54:7.	MAS 239.
22	MAS 235.		MAS 235.
23	MAS 235; M. Covarrubias, <u>Mexico South</u> (N.Y.: Knopf, 1947), 76-79.	Mos.20:10; 2 Ne.15:29; Al.14:29; 3 Ne.20:16; Morm.5:24.	MAS 235; YGC 121-3 (perhaps linked to ancestral ghosts, p. 142).
24	MAS 227; Thompson, "Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: Introduction," 72.	Eth.2:2; 3 Ne.12:16; 15:27; 17:29; Mos.13:12; 1 Ne.20:21; He.12:16; 3 Ne.22:9; 4 Ne.1:9.	MAS 227; YGC 92-3,97,184-5,201,27.
25	See note 24. J. E. S. Thompson, <u>Maya History and Religion</u> (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971), 184. (Hereafter MHR.)	1 Ne.12:16; 15:27; Mos.18:5; 23:4; Moro.7:11; Eth.6:7; 1 Ne.11:25; Al.42:27.	See note 24.
26	See note 24.	Monster: 2 Ne.9:10,19,26. Dragon(s): 2 Ne.23:22; 8:9; Mos.20:11; Al.43:44.	See note 24; H. Wallace, "Leviathan & the Beast in Revelation," in G. E. Wright, ed., <u>The Biblical Archaeologist Reader</u> , (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961, 290-299.
27	Thompson, "Maya Hieroglyphic Writing: Introduction," 72.		W. F. Albright, "The High Place," <u>Supplements to Vetus Testamentum</u> (Leiden: Brill, 1957), 150,256.
28	MAS 235.		MAS 235; YGC 201,95.
29	Tozzer, " <u>Landa</u> ," 136; MAS 239.	Al.10:22; 3 Ne.22:9; Eth.6:7.	MAS 239.
30	See note 29.	Fire: Jac.6:3; 2 Ne.30:10; 26:4; 3 Ne.26:3; Morm.5:23. Wind and quake: 3 Ne.8:5-18; 2 Ne.26:2-10. Water: see note 29.	
31	MAS 227; E. C. Vogt, <u>Yucatan. A Maya Community in the Highlands of Chiapas</u> (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1969), 577-8,594-600. (Hereafter VZ.)	2 Ne.18:18; 20:12; 24:13; 27:3; 12:3; 21:9; 21:11; 24:25; Eth.3:1; 4:1.	Albright, "The High Place;" YGC 21-27; DAI 179-281.
32	MAS 227; VZ 594-600.	2 Ne.24:15. (Cf. DAI 279).	See note 31.
33	See note 32 ("corral").	1 Ne.15:15; 22:25; 2 Ne.9:2; Al.5:39; 3 Ne.15:17; Mos.18:8 ("fold"). Cf. He.3:28.	Cf. note 31.
34	MAS 227-229; VZ 595.	1 Ne.11:1; 17:7; 2 Ne.4:25; Al.31:13-23; 1:15; 26:29; 32:4; He.7:10,14.	MAS 227-229.
35	MAS 228; VZ 600.	1 Ne.24:13; 2 Ne.12:3. See note 34.	See note 34.
36	VZ 595; MHR 314-316.	1 Ne.5:14,16; 19:2; Om.18; WdM.1:4; En.14; Al.37:17; He.3:30; etc.	YGC 142-3,204.
37	VZ 591-3.	See note 36. Mos.21:9-10; Al.2:25; 10:2-3,7, 11; 17:21; 3 Ne.6:27; 7:4,6; Eth.3:17; Mos.4:4; Al.28:5,11,12; 3 Ne.7:2,14.	
38	MAS 229; VZ 595.	Al.19:1,5; 1 Ne.19:10; 24:20; He.9:10,11.	MAS 229-230; Albright, "The High Place."
39	MAS 231.	Om. 20-22.	MAS 231; Albright, "The High Place," 146-152.
40	MAS 231.		MAS 231.
41	Edmonson, "Popol Vuh," 170.	Jac.2:24; 4 Ne.36-38.	C. H. Gordon, "His Name is 'One,'" <u>Journal Near East Studies</u> , 29 (1970), 198.
42	MAS 235, etc.	2 Ne.21:15; 3 Ne.4:4; Mos.25:23. See also note 41.	MAS 235.
43	Well known.		DAI 282-285.
44	MAS 235.	See notes 31 and 48. Cf. Mos.12:21; 15:15-18.	MAS 235; YGC 124,143,92.
45	See note 18.	Mos.18:5-16; 25:18; Al.5:5; 3 Ne.19:10-5,36.	DAI 277.
46	MAS 234-235. See notes 13 and 26.	Eth.9:30-35; 10:19. Cf. 1 Ne.12:16-17 with 2 Ne.2:18; 9:10. Also 2 Ne.25:20 and Mos.16:3. See note 26.	YGC 184,191,201. See notes 13 and 26.
47	E. Florescano, "La serpiente emplumada," <u>Cuadernos Americanos</u> 133 (Mar-Apr. 1964), 121-166; M. Leon-Portilla, "Quetzalcoatl: espiritualismo del Mexico antiguo," <u>Cuad. Amer.</u> 105, No.4 (1959), 127-159.	1 Ne.17:41; 2 Ne.24:29; 25:13,20; Al.35:19-21; He.8:13-16.	MAS 234; Numbers 21:6-9; 2 Kings 18:4; John 3:14; article "Nehushtan" in <u>Encyclopaedia Judaica</u> .
48	MAS 234-235; VZ 602.	Al.10:22-23; 34:19-25; He.12:2; 10:6-7; Jac. 4:6; Eth.9:28-35.	YGC 92,124; MAS 234-235.
49	D. H. Kelley & R. Berlin, "The 819-day Count and Color Direction Symbolism among the Classic Maya," <u>Tulane Univ. MARI Publ.</u> 26 (New Orleans: Tulane, MARI, 1970); MAS 228.	1 Ne.19:16; 22:25; 3 Ne.5:24,26; 16:5; Eth.13:11.	MAS 228; S. H. Weingarten, "Yam Suf--Yam Ha'adon," <u>Serch Mikra</u> 48 (1971), 100-4.
50	MAS 228		Weingarten, "Yam Suf."
51	Edmonson, "Popol Vuh," 36,178.	Mos.8:8; Al.22:30-31; He.3:5-6; 3 Ne.5:24; 8:12; cf. Mos.26:24.	See note 50.
52	VZ 602; MHR 196; MAS 228.	Cf. 2 Ne.5:16 with MAS 228 references on temple orientation.	MAS 228.

Note #	The Mesoamerican codices (or Mesoamerican archaeology)	The Book of Mormon	The Near Eastern background of The Book of Mormon
33	MAS 232; VZ 602; P. Lopez Valdes, "La ruada en Mesoamerica," <u>Cuadernos Americanos</u> , T. 145 (Mar-Abr 1966), 138.		MAS 232
54	MAS 227; Tozzer, "Landa," 143, 152, 159, 163, 171, etc.	Mos. 2:1-8; Al. 31:12-23; 3 Ne. 11:1; 19:1-3.	MAS 227.
55	MAS 228; S. G. Morley, <u>The Ancient Maya</u> (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1947), 265-295. (360 days plus 5 epagomenal days. Maya counted long periods by tuns, the 360, rather than 365, -day unit.)	1 Ne. 10:4; 19:8; 2 Ne. 25:19; 3 Ne. 1:1. (Nephite record allots just over "600 years" for the span in secular time from 597/6 B.C., Zedekiah's first regnal year, to 6/5 B.C., probably Christ's birth. If 600 360-day (Maya) tuns i.e. one and one-half baktuns is meant, the 591.36 sidereal years is covered quite precisely. If not, the chronology is inexplicable.)	Cf. Egyptian "year" of 360 days plus 5 epagomenal days.
56	MAS 228	Om. 21; Al. 49:1; etc. Mos. 13:18.	MAS 228
57	NHR 239; Edmonson, "Popol Vuh," xv.	Al. 10:6; 14:23; 16:1; 49:1; 52:1; 56:1, 42.	Jack Finegan, <u>Handbook of Biblical Chronology</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946); Gordon, "His Name is 'One.'"
58	Morley, <u>The Ancient Maya</u> , 304-11; Tozzer, "Landa," 132-138.	2 Ne. 26:8; 23:10; 25:3; Al. 18:30-32; 30:44; He. 12:14-15.	
59	See note 10.	See note 10. Cf. 2 Ne. 33:1; 3 Ne. 3:18.	
60	Thompson, "Maya Hieroglyphic Writing," <u>Handbook</u> , 646.	See note 59. Particularly 3 Ne. 6:12; Mos. 1:2-5; Jac. 7:4; Enos 1; Mos. 9:1; 24:1-6; 3 Ne. 5:18; Morm. 1:2.	
61	See note 60.	Mos. 24:6-7; Al. 54:1f, 15f; 56:1f; 59:1-4; 61:1f; 3 Ne. 3:1f; 5:8-9.	
62	MAS 229; note 60.	Mos. 2:8; Al. 14:8; Mos. 29:1.	
63	MAS 234, bottom five features	2 Ne. 28:2-6; 26:9; Mos. 3:5; 3 Ne. 26:13, 15.	
64	MAS 234	Al. 15:3, 5; He. 12:3; 3 Ne. 7:22; 18:28-32.	MAS 234.
65	Tozzer, "Landa," 102, 218.	2 Ne. 31:13-14; Al. 15:13; 3 Ne. 11:21-23; Morm. 7:8; Moro. 7:34; etc.	
66	J. L. Melgarejo Vivanco, <u>Totonacapan</u> . (Xalapa: Talleres Graficos del Gobierno del Estado, 1943); MAS 233.	Moro. 8:8; Jac. 4:5; Jar. 5:11; Al. 25:15; 30:3; 4 Ne. 12: etc.	MAS 233.
67	MAS 232-233.	1 Ne. 5:9; 7:22; Mos. 2:3; 3 Ne. 9:19-20.	MAS 232-233.
68	MAS 233.	Morm. 4:14-15, 21; cf. Al. 34:10-11.	MAS 233.
69	W. T. Sanders, <u>The Cultural Ecology of the Teotihuacan Valley</u> (State College, Penn.: Pennsylvania State Univ., 1965), 179; Tozzer, "Landa," 118-120; MAS 233.	Moro. 9:8, 10; cf. Al. 34:11.	MAS 233.
70	MAS 229, 233.		MAS 229, 233.
71	Tozzer, "Landa," 120, 123; etc.	Al. 44:12-15; 17:39; 18:16, 20.	
72	MAS 232; Tozzer, "Landa," 150-156; etc.	See note 67, compared with Mosaic rites. Fasting: Mos. 27:23; Al. 5:46; 17:9; 28:6; 30:2; 3 Ne. 27:1; 4 Ne. 12; etc.	
73	Morley, <u>The Ancient Maya</u> , 170-1, 174; I. Bernal, <u>The Olmec World</u> (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1969), 89.	Jar. 10-11; He. 11:18; 3 Ne. 3:19; Al. 5:16-18; Om. 12, 13, 19; Enos 23; Mos. chs. 2-4; Morm. 1:15-16; 2:1.	
74	NHR 161; etc.	Al. 21:1-11; 31:3-24; Mos. 9:12; 10:1-14; 4 Ne. 26-27; Al. 44:4-5. Note especially: the unspoken assumption of Mos. 19:24.	
75	Tozzer, "Landa," 130.	Eth. 3:23-28; Mos. 8:12, 14-19; Om. 20-22; Mos. 21:27, 28; 28:11-19; Al. 10:2; Al. 37:21-26.	
76	MAS 227; VZ 593-4.	2 Ne. 5:16; Jac. 1:17; Mos. 1:18; 11:10; 3 Ne. 11:1; He. 3:9, 14; Al. 21:11, 16; 26:29; 32:1-12; 15:17; 23:2; 16:13; 10:2.	
77	MAS 227; L. Sejourne, "El Templo Prehispanico," <u>Cuadernos Americanos</u> 149 (Nov.-Dec. 1966), 129-167.	2 Ne. 5:16; Jac. 1:17; Al. 10:2; Mos. 11:10-11; Mos. 2:1, 3, 5-6, 7-8.	Y. Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," <u>Biblical Archaeologist</u> 31 (1968), 18-27; MAS 227; DAI 274-277, 282-5, 313-319.
78	MAS 228. See note 52.	See note 52.	MAS 228; Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple." See note 52.
79	MAS 228.	See note 52. 1 Ne. 2:7; 2 Ne. 16:6; Al. 15:17.	DAI 411-12; MAS 228.
80	MAS 231; G. W. Lowe, "Desarrollo y funcion del incensario en Itapa," <u>Estudios de Cultura Maya</u> 5 (1965) 53-80.		MAS 231; cf. YGC 143-144, 233-235 on Ba'al-hamon, Lord of the Incense-burner; 4 Tamtu, the divine incense-burner. Cf. Jer. 19:13; 32:29; Hos. 4:13.
81	MAS 232; Edmonson, "Popol Vuh," 213	2 Ne. 9:37; Enos 20; Mos. 27:8-12; 11:6; Al. 1:32; 50:21; 17:15; He. 6:31; Eth. 7:23; Morm. 4:14-21.	MAS 232; cf. Gen. 31:30; Judges 17:5; Hos. 5-4; etc.
82	Tozzer, "Landa," 312, 323, 327.	Al. 1:32; He. 13:37; Morm. 2:10; 1 Ne. 11:31; 2 Ne. 18:19; 3 Ne. 7:19.	
83	For example, V. G. Norman, "Itapa sculpture. Part I. Album," <u>Papers, New World Archaeo. Foundation</u> 30 (Provo: BYU-NWAF, 1973), Plates 1, 25, 42, 37.	Six-winged seraphim: 2 Ne. 16:2-6. Cherubim: Al. 12:21; 42:2, 3.	DAI 319.
84	MAS 236-7	1 Ne. 11:25; 15:22, 28, 36; 2 Ne. 2:15; Al. 5:34, 62; 12:21, 23, 26; 32:40; 42:2-6; 32:37-43; 33:23; 34:4.	MAS 236-7; DAI 278-9.
85	MAS 237.	Jac. 5; 1 Ne. 10:12-14; Al. 26:36.	MAS 237.

Note #	The Mesoamerican codices (or Mesoamerican archaeology)	The Book of Mormon	The Near Eastern background of The Book of Mormon
86	<u>Dumbarton Oaks Conference on the Olmec</u> , E. P. Benson, Editor (Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Library, 1968), 72. <u>The Bernal Diaz Chronicles</u> Garden City: Doubleday, 1956), 130.	Jac. 7:24; Enos 20; Mos. 10:17; Al. 24:2; 43:11; 60:32; He. 5:51; 3 Ne. 3:4; Moro. 1:2.	Cf. YGC 194-5.
87	See note 86.	Ether chs. 13-15; Al. 16:2,9; Morm. chs. 2-6.	
88	R. Redfield & S. Tax, "General Characteristics of Present Day Mesoamerican Indian Society," in <u>Heritage of Conquest</u> , S. Tax, ed. (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952).	Al. 47:1-3; 48:1-3; 27:2; He. 4:3; etc.; cf. He. 16:20-21.	
89	<u>Dumbarton Oaks</u> , 65-66. R. M. Carmack, "Toltec Influence on the Postclassic Culture History of Highland Guatemala," <u>Tulane Univ., Middle American Research Inst. Publ.</u> 36 (New Orleans: Tulane, MARI, 1970), 72.	Eth. 15; Om. 14-19; 3 Ne. 6:19-7:14; 4 Ne. 3.	
90	See notes 88, 89. E. Hunt, "Irrigation and the Socio-political Organization of the Cuicacatec Cacicazgos," in F. Johnson, ed. <u>The Prehistory of the Tehuacan Valley, V. 4. Chronology &amp; Irrigation</u> (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1973), 217-228.	See note 89. Al. 2:1-2; 46:1-9; ch. 47; 51:5-19; He. 1:1-15; 3 Ne. 7:9-12; Eth. chs. 8-9, etc.	
91	M.C. Webb, "The Peten Maya Decline Viewed in the Perspective of State Formation," in T. P. Culbert, ed. <u>The Classic Maya Collapse</u> (Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press, 1973), 363-404; K. V. Flannery, "The Olmec and the Valley of Oaxaca," in <u>Dumbarton Oaks</u> , 79-110.	Mos. 24:6-7; 4 Ne. 24:6, 45-6; He. 7:10 (in context of whole section); 6:7-13; Al. 4:12.	
92	W. R. Bullard, Jr. "Maya Settlement Pattern in Northeastern Peten, Guatemala," <u>American Antiquity</u> 25 (1960), 355-372.	Mos. 23:19, 20, 25, 26; Al. 53:3; 15:13-4; 50:13-4; 3 Ne. 19:1-3; Mos. 2:1-6; Al. 8:7; 60:22 (population); He. 1:18 (cf. He. 7:10), 27.	
93	E.g. R. L. Roys, "The Indian Background of Colonial Yucatan," <u>Carnegie Inst. of Washington Publ.</u> 548 (Washington: CIB, 1943), 67-9; <u>Bernal Diaz</u> 48-50, 101-7, 112-6; A. Paierm, "Notas sobre las construcciones militares y la guerra en Mesoamerica," <u>Anales. Inst. Nac. de Antro. e Historia</u> 8 (1954), 123-134; Carmack, "Toltec Influence," 80.	E.G. Al. chs. 26-7; Mos. 19:4-15; 20:7-9; Al. chs. 48-50; 3 Ne. 3:17-4:29; Morm. chs. 2-6.	

139.1 ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM GRATIFYING. By Ruth R. Christensen. The Society's Twenty-fifth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures came to a successful conclusion in the Joseph Smith Auditorium on September 25, 1976.

John M. Lundquist, doctoral candidate and graduate teaching assistant in Near Eastern Studies at the University of Michigan, presented the illustrated guest address, NEW LIGHT ON THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST FROM THE UPPER EU PHRATES VALLEY IN SYRIA. He reported the very recent finding by Italian archaeologists of 15,000 clay tablets south of Aleppo in Syria. They cover the period from 2400 to 2250 B.C., shed light on the apparent ancestors of the Israelite people, and tell of an ancient civilized kingdom before the time of Abraham. The names "Abraham," "Israel," "Ishmael," "Esau," and "Saul" appear in the tablets, thus establishing these as authentic names of that period.

A special presentation was made to Dr. M. Wells Jakeman, BYU professor emeritus of archaeology and anthropology, honoring him on his retirement—a beautiful hand-carved replica, in fine-grained limestone, of an ancient Maya sculpture of the Feathered Serpent. Dr. Meriin G. Myers, department chairman, represented BYU in recognition of nearly thirty years of service as a teacher and researcher. The gift was selected by Dr. Jakeman's former colleagues in the Department.

In addition to the guest address and the presentation of the gift, the following three papers were read on Saturday morning: Dr. Ross T. Christensen, BYU professor of archaeology and anthropology, ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE SCRIPTURES AT BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY AS SEEN AT THE TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL SYMPOSIUM; Eric Jay Olson, doctoral candidate in Near Eastern languages and civilizations at the University of Chicago, AN APPROACH TO THE BOOK OF ABRAHAM; and Bruce W. Warren, BYU assistant professor of anthropology and archaeology and doctoral candidate in anthropology at the University of Arizona, CURRENT EXCAVATIONS AT BIBLICAL SITES IN ISRAEL.

At a noon reception attended by the SEHA Board of Trustees, Research Patrons, the Symposium participants and their wives, members of the Symposium Committee, and other friends, the Departmental Faculty paid further honor to Dr. Jakeman.

Three papers were heard at the Saturday afternoon session: Dr. S. Kent Brown, BYU associate professor of ancient scripture, EXCAVATING CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN EGYPT; NAG HAMMADI, 1975 (illustrated); John A. Tvedtnes, doctoral candidate in Semitic languages at Hebrew University in Jerusalem, NEPHITE AND ISRAELITE FORTIFICATIONS (read by Dr. Jakeman); and V. Garth Norman, research associate with

the BYU-New World Archaeological Foundation, *IZAPA ARCHAEOASTRONOMY AND COSMOLOGY: ALIGNMENTS OF STRUCTURES AND MONUMENTS* (illustrated).

Total attendance on Saturday was estimated at about 200 people.

New this year was the addition of a Friday evening session in the Jesse Knight Building Annex, where the following papers were read: Terrence Kerestes, doctoral candidate in Near Eastern Studies, University of Michigan, *A NEW APPROACH TO THE UNDERSTANDING OF BIBLICAL NOMADISM* (Read by John E. Clark); Michael E. McDonald, nuclear research and development specialist at the Idaho Nuclear Engineering Laboratory, Idaho Falls, Idaho, *ROLLING UP MATTERS OF THE JOSEPH SMITH PAPYRI* (illustrated); Dr. Robert L. Chadwick, assistant professor of sociology and anthropology at East Texas State University, Commerce, Texas, *TOWARD A THEORY OF TRANS-ATLANTIC DIFFUSION* (read by Prof. Bruce W. Warren); Alexander T. Stecker, former instructor in theology and archaeology, College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Massachusetts, *THE ABDICATION OF POWER AMONG THE BIBLICAL AND BOOK OF MORMON PEOPLES*; Samuel E. Shepley, nuclear reactor engineer at Idaho Falls, Idaho, *GENETIC DRIFT AND THE BOOK OF MORMON PEOPLES*; and Charles Stuart Bagley, retired geodesist, U.S. Air Force Systems Command at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, *YUCATAN AS THE LAND OF NEPHI* (illustrated). It is estimated that about 300 people attended.

Serving as honorary chairman of the Symposium this year was M. Wells Jakeman, and as chairman, Robert W. Bass. Other members of the Symposium Committee were Ruth R. Christensen, vice-chairman; and John E. Clark; Ross T. Christensen; Fred W. Nelson, Jr.; A. Delbert Palmer; Samuel E. Shepley; Bruce W. Warren; and Daniel Brock d'Avignon.

Publicity arrangements were directed by Mr. Palmer, with the assistance of Mr. Clark, Peggy Ludtke of the BYU News Bureau, and Mr. d'Avignon. Thomas J. ("Jeff") Cottle handled audio-visual equipment.

The Symposium was again co-sponsored by the SEHA and the BYU Department of Anthropology and Archaeology. Admission was free.

Selected papers from the Symposium will appear in forthcoming issues of the *Newsletter and Proceedings of the S.E.H.A.*

**139.2 NEW VICE-PRESIDENT FOR THE SEHA.** By Ruth R. Christensen. A former symposium chairman was chosen vice-president of the SEHA at a meeting of the Society's Board of Trustees, held on June 11, 1976. Mr. A. Delbert Palmer, prominent Canadian businessman who himself has been a trustee since 1975 (Newsletter,

138.4), was elected by acclamation.

Mr. Palmer replaces the former vice-president, Dr. Ellis T. Rasmussen, who was recently appointed dean of religious instruction at BYU. He will serve the remainder of Dr. Rasmussen's term of office, which ends in 1978.

Mr. Palmer was called in 1961 to establish the Chilean Mission of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He came to BYU to continue his education, was awarded the BA degree in Latin American Studies in 1975, and is now a graduate student in the same field.

He served as chairman of the Society's Twenty-fourth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures in 1974. His wife, Mable, and he, are the parents of five children, the oldest of whom—David—is the author or co-author of papers read at the Annual Symposium in 1966 and 1974. (Newsletter, 103.61, 137.1.)

**139.3 TRUSTEES ELECTED.** By Ruth R. Christensen. Victor L. Ludlow was elected a new trustee of the SEHA at the Annual Meeting of the Society held on September 25, 1976, following the Twenty-fifth Annual Symposium on the Archaeology of the Scriptures and Allied Fields. He will serve for a one-year period as provided by the Society's Articles of Incorporation.

Mr. Ludlow, BYU assistant professor of ancient scripture, became a Life Member of the Society in 1964. He obtained the BA degree at BYU in 1968, received a Danforth Fellowship and went to Brandeis and Harvard universities pursuing Near Eastern and Judaic studies. His Ph.D. dissertation is almost complete.

In 1972 Mr. Ludlow joined the faculty at BYU. He has travelled three times to Israel, the latest of which was to direct a Semester Abroad in Jerusalem from January through June, 1976. He has read a paper at the annual Sidney B. Sperry Symposium, has published several articles in the *Ensign* magazine, has written lessons for Sunday School manuals, and has delivered lectures in the BYU Education Week and Know Your Religion series.

Mr. Ludlow's father is Dr. Daniel H. Ludlow, prominent author and lecturer, former dean of religious instruction at BYU, and director of the first BYU Semester Abroad in Jerusalem, in 1968.

Mr. Ludlow has a special interest in Jewish history, on which he teaches a course at BYU; he also works at correlating Jewish and LDS cultures. He and his wife, Virginia, are the parents of five children.

Incumbent trustees of the Society who were re-elected at the Annual Meeting to serve for an additional one-year term of office are: Robert W. Bass; Ross T. Christensen; Ruth R. Christensen; M. Wells Jakeman; Clark S. Knowlton; Fred W. Nelson, Jr.; A. Delbert Palmer; Ellis T. Rasmussen; Welby W. Ricks; and Bruce W. Warren.