

THEY LIE IN WAIT TO DECEIVE

by Robert L. & Rosemary Brown

FAIR is pleased to make this online version of Robert L. and Rosemary Brown's classic book available to you, free of charge. We are sure you will appreciate the meticulous research and documentation provided by the Browns in their books.

There are four volumes in this series. Each focuses on a different area of anti-Mormon efforts. If you enjoy this volume, be sure to check out the other volumes also available at the FAIR Web site.

Every effort has been made to ensure that this online version is of the highest quality possible, given the technological limits of online materials. Each page of the original book was scanned by dedicated volunteers and checked for accuracy and legibility.

As you are reading, you may notice that some of the smaller text is "fuzzy" or not entirely readable. This is one of those technological limits—if we had attempted to provide the highest quality download possible, the online files would have been 30 times larger and therefore unmanageable for the average Internet user. Our driving desire was to make this information available to the widest audience possible.

If you are interested in a copy of this book in a higher quality, we suggest purchasing a copy of the actual printed book. The books are not that expensive, and they are a valuable addition to any library. FAIR is the sole authorized distributor of all volumes of *They Lie In Wait To Deceive*. To order, visit our Web site:

<http://www.fair-lds.org>

Not only do you get a classic book that you can take with you (you are no longer bound to the computer), but you help to support FAIR in its mission to bring you apologetic works of unquestioned value.

We hope you enjoy this book, and pray that God will bless you as you sincerely seek His word and will.

DISTRIBUTING THIS ONLINE BOOK

You are free to forward this book to your friends or anyone you feel may benefit by the information it contains. Better still, you can direct your friends to the FAIR Web site where they can download their own copy, along with other information they may find helpful.

You are not free to post this online book on your Web site or store it in any publically accessible storage medium, such as an FTP site. You cannot include this book in any compilation or commercial work without the express written permission of FAIR.

ABOUT FAIR

The Foundation for Apologetic Information & Research (FAIR) is a non-profit organization dedicated to providing well-documented answers to criticisms of LDS doctrine, belief and practice. Seeking to assist the lay member and scholar alike to respond to intentional and well-meaning attacks on individual faith, FAIR helps publish articles and books that defend the LDS church, operates a Web site that receives thousands of visitors each day, and sponsors research projects and conferences that provide the LDS scholarly community an outlet for getting information into the hands of the average member. With a 501-C3 tax exempt status from the IRS, FAIR is funded by the generosity of its members and contributors, now grown to more than 1,000.

To learn more about FAIR, visit our Web site:

<http://www.fair-lds.org>

You can also write to us at:

FAIR
PO Box 1277
Felton CA, 95018



CHAPTER SEVEN

ANTI-MORMONS RESPOND TO THE SPAULDING THEORY — MARTIN, DAVIS, COWDREY, AND SCALES STAND ALONE



OBJECTIVES

- To prove that Walter Martin, Howard Davis, Wayne Cowdrey, & Donald Scales stand alone among anti-Mormons in their support of the Spaulding theory.
 - To prove that the claim by the three researchers that the Mormon Church switched documents on William Kaye, one of the handwriting experts, in an effort to deceive him is **false**. Jerald Tanner, professional anti-Mormon, accompanied Kaye to the LDS Archives and reported that there were no documents switched and that Kaye was pleased with his treatment by LDS Church officials.
 - To prove that the differences in handwriting between the Spaulding manuscript and the Unidentified Scribe section of the Book of Mormon are so obvious as to be readily apparent to even anti-Mormon observers.
 - To prove that the manner in which the Book of Mormon was produced (by dictation to various scribes) could **only** be accomplished through the gift and power of the Holy Ghost. Books are just not written by dictation, even today with shorthand and recorders, etc.
-

CHAPTER SEVEN
ANTI-MORMONS RESPOND
TO THE SPAULDING THEORY —
MARTIN, DAVIS, COWDREY, & SCALES STAND ALONE

Walter Martin, and Cowdrey, Davis, & Scales stand alone among the anti-Mormons in their attempt to tie the Spaulding Manuscript and the Book of Mormon together. The book by Cow,Dav,Sca, is "dedicated to Walter Martin, author, comparative religion professor, and director of Christian Research Institute. He maintained for 25 years that Solomon Spaulding was the true source of the Book of Mormon." (Quoted from the FOREWORD of WRWTBOM.) It is unfortunate that Walter Martin encouraged the three researchers into paths of false doctrine. The Spaulding theory may have been a popular argument many years ago, but it died a silent death when the original Spaulding manuscript was found in 1885 in Honolulu, Hawaii. It was then revealed to the world that there was absolutely no relationship between Spaulding's manuscript and the Book of Mormon. Today, almost all other anti-Mormons have agreed that there is no substance to the Spaulding theory. In this chapter, several anti-Mormon writers are quoted to illustrate their reasons for rejecting this theory.

Jerald and Sandra Tanner, professional anti-Mormons, wrote a booklet called **Did Spalding Write the Book of Mormon?**. The Tanners have maintained for years that it wasn't Spaulding's writings that was the basis for the Book of Mormon, but the writings of Ethan Smith, another minister of Joseph Smith's time, who wrote **Views of the Hebrews**. So, to protect their theory, they published their booklet against the Spaulding theory just before the three researchers came on the market with their book. (The three researchers sent Tanners a jackass cartoon to express their feelings.) We noticed in the Tanners booklet that they quoted several anti-Mormons and listed their reasons why they felt that Spaulding was **not** the author of the Book of Mormon. Rather than spending time covering the same ground, we will use their booklet in this chapter to show that Davis, Cowdrey, & Scales & Martin stand alone among the anti-Mormons in their support of the Spaulding theory. We have added subheadings to emphasize important points.

JERALD AND SANDRA TANNER

Authors of
Did Spalding Write the Book of Mormon?

(TANNERS—P. 4) — In our book **Mormonism — Shadow or Reality?**, page 166, we printed a photograph of the top of a page of the original Book of Mormon manuscript. This page had previously been suppressed by the Mormon Church.

**DISSIMILARITIES FOUND:
USE OF CAPITAL LETTERS AND AMPERSAND
— ATTRIBUTED TO PECULIARITIES OF
THE TIME —**

At any rate, one of the California researchers, Davis, was reading **Mormonism — Shadow or Reality?** when he ran into this photograph of the manuscript of the Book of Mormon. He had previously been examining the handwriting of Solomon Spalding (Spalding's name is spelled this way in the earliest documents) and was struck with the fact that there was a resemblance between the two writings. Subsequently, three handwriting experts were consulted and are reported to have given support to this theory.

Several months before the discovery was announced a friend of the Spalding researchers came to Sandra and I with the startling announcement that the source of the Book of Mormon had definitely been found. We were, of course, very excited and began to compare a photograph of Solomon Spalding's writing with the Book of Mormon manuscript. I noticed, however, that there were dissimilarities between the two documents. For example the manuscript written by Spalding uses capital letters where proper names are given, whereas the writer of the Book of Mormon manuscript seems to omit this in most cases. We have "nephi," "lehi," "jerusalem," and etc. Another dissimilarity is that Spalding usually uses the ampersand (&) instead of writing out the word "and." In the Book of Mormon, however, it is usually written out. Sandra pointed out that some of the similarities between the documents could be explained as peculiarities of the time period in which the documents were produced.

**TANNERS WARN RESEARCHERS TO BE CAUTIOUS
ABOUT SENSATIONAL CLAIMS**

For these reasons we cautioned this friend of the researchers that they should be very cautious in putting forth such a sensational claim. Since it was such a secret matter, none of the documents were left with us for further inspection. From our brief examination of the documents, however, we had some grave doubts about the whole thing.

After the story was published we were met with some very strong criticism. Some Christians who had been working with the Mormons felt that we had betrayed their cause. They seemed to think that we were working against the purposes of the Lord and that we should

keep quiet about our findings. We do not hold any bad feelings about this. We know that these people really believe the discovery is authentic and that we are misled in our conclusions.

THE 1831 REVELATION OVERLOOKED?

But then we also know that these people have not compared the 1831 revelation with the pages in the Book of Mormon manuscript.

It is our feeling that this new theory will not stand the test of time and the more it is advocated the more damage it will do. Nothing could have delighted us more than to have found the California researchers' claims to be correct, but the evidence indicated the contrary and we had to state the case as we saw it.

THE GREAT DOCUMENT SWITCH?

(TANNERS-p. 22) — The fact that the California researchers have a tendency to jump to wild conclusions without carefully examining the evidence is clearly demonstrated by what happened after William Kaye examined the Book of Mormon manuscript in Salt Lake City. Before leaving Salt Lake City, Mr. Kaye was very disturbed because the researchers or Walter Martin had set up a press conference to be held as soon as he returned to Los Angeles. He claimed that he could not make a meaningful statement until he made a thorough study of the matter, which might take weeks to complete. Mr. Kaye's inability to make an immediate decision confirming the theory together with his statement that the documents he had seen were not laminated apparently led the researchers to the erroneous conclusion that the Mormon leaders had switched the documents to confuse the investigation. One would think that since Mr. Kaye had been "accompanied by one of Mormonism's long time critics, Jerald Tanner" when he made his examination of the documents (*Salt Lake Tribune*, July 9, 1977) the researchers would have checked here before making any accusation. Instead, however, they went immediately to the press with a completely irresponsible statement. In an article entitled, "RESEARCHERS OF MORMONS CRY 'TRICKERY,'" we find the following:

"Researchers challenging the authenticity of the Mormon Church's founding scriptures have charged that a handwriting expert was **tricked into looking at the wrong documents** during his visit to the Salt Lake City archives . . .

The three were anxiously awaiting the arrival Thursday

afternoon of examiner William Kaye before a press conference at Los Angeles International Airport where details of Kaye's trip were to be announced. That anticipation flared into anger when the handwriting expert claimed he had been shown a stack of fragile and antique papers rather than the laminated documents viewed by examiner Henry Silver and Cowdrey . . .

"He was deliberately tricked," Davis said . . .

The researchers contend that Kaye was shown the wrong documents in an effort to destroy his credibility and confuse his results when copies of the alledged scriptures are forwarded in the next 10 days." (Torrance, Calif. So. Bay Breeze, July 8, 1977)

In a speech given July 10, 1977, at Melodyland, Walter Martin emphatically affirmed that the LDS Church had switched documents:

"Mr. Kaye . . . went to Salt Lake to look at the same documents Mr. Silver did. When he got there, they didn't show him the documents. **They showed him another one and they lied to him,** point blank, outright, till Mr. Kaye refused to discuss it with them any further and left. We hope to get Mr. Kaye back in there again . . . This is how desperate it has become. **You switch documents on an expert and make a fool of yourself,** because the expert had five copies of the original documents in his brief case, and he knew they gave him the wrong documents.

That is a very important point . . . What we have to see is this, and I hope we can, that you are going to run square into people putting documents in front of you and saying this is it and **lying through their teeth.** Somebody says, 'Do you have to say that?' Yes, . . . here is a church knowing what they have got and now **lying to cover it up.** Now, of course it's a beautiful lawsuit for the Mormons unless I'm telling the truth and I'm willing to wager legally, of course, that I'm telling the truth, . . ."

Because of Walter Martin's statements made in this speech we feel that a second statement is necessary to clarify the issue.

**NO DOCUMENTS SWITCHED!
MR. KAYE COMMENTED TO JERALD TANNER
ON THE FINE TREATMENT BY THE LDS CHURCH**

Now, if Mr. Kaye knew that the documents had been switched, he certainly said nothing to me about the matter. In fact, everything he said both during and after our visit to the Mormon archives indicated just the opposite — i.e., that he was well satisfied that he had examined the original documents. Walter Martin gives the impression that Mr. Kaye left the Historical Department because of a dispute over the documents being switched: “. . . Mr. Kaye refused to discuss it with them any further and left.” Actually, we examined the documents for about an hour and a half, and after we left Mr. Kaye commented about the fine treatment he had received. If he knew he had been “lied to,” he gave no indication of this to me. Everything he said led me to believe that he felt he had examined the original documents.

In any case, Mr. Kaye was sent back to Salt Lake City, and, after examining the Book of Mormon manuscript for the second time, it was apparently decided that the documents had not been switched after all. In their book *WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?* p. 176, the researchers indicate that Mr. Kaye “made two trips to the Mormon originals in Utah,” but they tell nothing about the reason he made the second trip nor do they mention their charge that the documents had been switched. Some may argue that it is best to forget this whole tragic affair, but I think it sheds a great deal of light on the atmosphere in which *WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?* was produced.

**THE THREE RESEARCHERS CAREFULLY IGNORE
THE 1831 REVELATION**

(TANNERS-p. 23) — On page 5 of this book we indicated that a manuscript copy of a revelation given in June, 1831, provides devastating evidence against the idea that Solomon Spalding wrote twelve pages of the Book of Mormon. This revelation appears in the Doctrine and Covenants as Section 56. Fortunately, we have now been able to obtain photocopies of this revelation which we have included in this book. The reader will notice that the handwriting in this revelation looks more like the writing in the Book of Mormon manuscript than the handwriting of Solomon Spalding. It would appear that the researchers are unable to deal with this objection, and

therefore they have almost completely ignored it. According to Sandi Weisel, "one of the researchers" has gone so far as to suggest "that Section 56 could be a forgery." (*Los Angeles Herald-Examiner*, Sept. 17, 1977)

We do not think there is the slightest possibility that this document is a forgery, and such a suggestion seems just as fantastic as the idea that the Mormon Church forged another copy of the Book of Mormon pages. Since the researchers did not even come up with the theory concerning handwriting until February, 1976, this would mean that any forgery would have to have been made **after** that time. The paper the revelation was written on, however, has the appearance of being very old, and it was given to the researchers own handwriting expert, William Kaye, for examination. Mr. Kaye is supposed to be an expert in detecting forgeries. Also, it is interesting to note that a number of years before the researchers came up with their idea, Earl Olson wrote an article which stated that the handwriting in Section 56 had been written by an unknown hand. (*Brigham Young University Studies*, Summer 1971, page 332)

In their book **WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?** the researchers are almost totally silent concerning the 1831 revelation. Although they do not suggest it is a forgery in their book, they brush it aside in one paragraph of less than 100 words. We do not see how it is possible to skirt around this important issue in such a manner.

MISSPELLED WORDS SHOW THE AUTHORS ARE DIFFERENT

(TANNERS-p. 23) — The researchers claim that the spelling in Spalding's **Manuscript Story** and in the 12 pages of the Book of Mormon manuscript proves that one author wrote both documents. In a tape entitled, "WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?," Howard Davis said that they made a study of the way the unidentified scribe spelled words and then "tabulated all of the misspelled words in the known production of Solomon Spalding, **THE MANUSCRIPT STORY**, and they were identical." In another speech given July 10, 1977, Dr. Davis boldly asserted: "Even the spelling errors are the same in both productions. Any fool can see that after about two hours of study."

We certainly cannot agree with Dr. Davis on this matter. There may be a few cases where the same errors are made, but to say that "all of the misspelled words . . . were identical" is certainly an overstatement. For instance, Dean C. Jessee points out that the word **were** is spelled

"ware" by the unidentified scribe in the Book of Mormon whereas it is correctly spelled in Spalding's manuscript. Actually, we feel that an extremely strong case can be made against the claim that Solomon Spalding wrote the Book of Mormon pages by comparing misspellings in these pages with those found in the 1831 revelation.

CHARGE OF FORGERY IS AN ATTEMPT TO SAVE FACE

(TANNERS-pp. 22-23) — It seems ironical that in proclaiming there was another (forged) copy of the Book of Mormon manuscript pages the researchers should provide us with an example of exactly the type of thing Fawn Brodie believes happened at the time the Spalding theory was born. She says that when Spalding's manuscript was finally located by Hurlburt, it seems likely "that these witnesses had so come to identify the Book of Mormon with the Spaulding manuscript that they could not concede having made an error without admitting to a case of memory substitution which they did not themselves recognize." (No Man Knows My History, pp. 447-48). Mrs. Brodie believes that because of their inability to admit they had made a mistake they put forth the idea that Spalding had written a second manuscript.

The California researchers likewise became so zealous to establish their theory that they put forth the idea that there was another copy of the Book of Mormon manuscript which had been forged by the LDS Church. There was, of course, no evidence to support such a charge, and the researchers did not even mention the matter in WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?

"THE ONLY WAY TO PROVE IT IS TO GET HOLD OF SOLOMON SPALDING'S HANDWRITING AND TO CONTRAST IT WITH THE BOOK OF MORMON MANUSCRIPT" — Walter R. Martin, July 10, 1977.

(TANNERS-pp. 27-28) — It is very interesting to note that in a speech given July 10, 1977, Dr. Walter Martin, the chief supporter of the California researchers, frankly admitted that the only way the researchers could prove their case was on the basis of the handwriting:

"Solomon Spalding was a Congregationalist minister who liked to write religious novels in Biblical language. We already know he wrote one called 'Manuscript Story' . . . He wrote another one called 'Manuscript Found.' That was the one that

became the basis for the Book of Mormon. The Mormons deny this. The only way to prove it is to get hold of Solomon Spalding's handwriting and to contrast it with the Book of Mormon manuscripts. Howard Davis did that."

In a newspaper advertisement for a lecture to be given at Melodyland, we read that "FOR THE FIRST TIME ANYWHERE DR. MARTIN WILL TELL THE INCREDIBLE STORY OF HOW THREE FOREMOST HANDWRITING EXPERTS AND TWO LAW FIRMS THIS PAST WEEK DEVELOPED INDISPUTABLE EVIDENCE THAT THE BOOK OF MORMON WAS COPIED."

The same advertisement says that this is "THE MOST IMPORTANT DISCOVERY IN 20TH CENTURY CHURCH HISTORY."

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE A REHASH OF OLD MATERIAL

Now that the handwriting case seems to be disintegrating, the researchers are trying desperately to save it by providing a great deal of circumstantial evidence. Most of this material comes from the writings of Howe, Deming, Shook, Patterson, Wyl and Dickinson. The book WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON? is actually just a rehash of old material. A statement on the cover of the book says that it contains "A Startling New Discovery." If the handwriting analyses had checked out, this statement would certainly be true. As it is, however, we are left with little more than a reorganization of material which was printed and widely circulated during the 19th century.

SILENCE?

(TANNERS-p. 30) — After we first published DID SPALDING WRITE THE BOOK OF MORMON? in July, 1977, we hoped the researchers would respond to some of the criticism we put forward. Instead, there has been complete silence. The researchers were probably referring to us when they wrote: "There are other amateurs who have tried their hands at identifying this handwriting who are no better qualified than Jessee. Both Jessee and these other self-styled experts are not experts at all, and their opinions are just that — opinions. They are worth nothing in a court of law.(WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?p. 229)

(TANNERS — p. 18) — After publishing *Did Spalding Write the*

Book of Mormon? in July, 1977, we received a great deal of criticism for not waiting until the California researchers finished their book before making an attack on the new theory. It was felt that after we examined all their evidence we might change our minds about the matter. The book was delayed for some time. It finally appeared in November. It is entitled, **Who Really Wrote the Book of Mormon?** After reading this book carefully, we must report that our feelings have not changed. In fact, we are more convinced than ever that we made the right decision. The evidence against the new Spalding theory now seems to be overwhelming, and the California researchers' failure to come to grips with some of the basic criticisms leads us to the conclusion that they have no real answers to the objections. Instead of publicly dealing with the issues, the researchers sent us a drawing of a jackass which the reader will find below.



WE HEREBY PRESENT UNTO SANDRA AND JERALD TANNER OUR SPECIAL RESEARCH
 AWARD FOR YOUR OUTSTANDING BOOK: "DID SPALDING WRITE THE BOOK OF MORMON?"
 AND IN LIEU OF YOUR NEXT FORTHCOMING SPALDING WORK:

* Before our second book is out of course! Ha!

Wayne Bowdrey
David A. Davis
 DON SCALC

The Tanners begin by talking about how they printed a photograph of the top of a page of the original Book of Mormon manuscript. They state that “this page had previously been suppressed by the Mormon Church.” If it was suppressed, how did they get a copy of it? It is always amusing to read of the books, etc., “suppressed” by the Mormon Church. Usually our own books or sources are quoted to show the suppression!

The dissimilarities in handwriting between Spaulding and the Unidentified Scribe are obvious even to the Tanners. Sandra Tanner pointed out that the similarities in the two handwritings were probably due to the period of time. That is not hard to understand since every classroom from then until now, in the early grades, had the alphabet either on the desk, on or above the blackboard, or on papers handed out. Every student practiced the same strokes when they learned how to write. Every generation learns by the same technique. Each time period should have its similarities for that very reason.

The significance of the 1831 revelation cannot be understated. It comprises the 56th section of the Doctrine and Covenants, one of the standard works of the LDS Church. It is uncertain at this time who the scribe was that copied down the 56th section. It was not in Joseph Smith’s handwriting, or his wife’s, or his mother’s, or anybody that has been identified yet. However, it is in the same handwriting as the Unidentified Scribe who wrote the 12 pages in question in the original Book of Mormon. Solomon Spaulding died in October, 1816, the Unidentified Scribe of Section 56 wrote in 1831. Even Jerald and Sandra Tanner knew that was irrefutable evidence against the Spaulding theory. The three researchers’ only answer to the Tanners’ attacks was to send them a picture of a jackass.

When the handwriting analysis didn’t pan out, the researchers cried forgery, suggesting that since the handwriting doesn’t match up, the Book of Mormon manuscript pages must be a forgery. This is an unbelievable argument!

Davis, Cowdrey, and Scales falsely claimed that the words in the Book of Mormon manuscript and the Spaulding manuscript were even misspelled the same way. If they had indeed tabulated the errors as they said they had, they would have found the differences. The three researchers have merely resurrected old material, long since dead, to create their book. Their arguments aren’t even good ones!

FAWN BRODIE
Author of
No Man Knows My History

The late Fawn Brodie wrote the anti-Mormon book **NO MAN KNOWS MY HISTORY**, which was first published in 1945. Her book came out before Jerald

and Sandra Tanner began their anti-Mormon crusade; however, Brodie led the way for the modern day anti-Mormons to follow. The Tanners, and most other anti-Mormons, have used Brodie's material. Throughout her book, Brodie mentions the Spaulding theory. She, like the Tanners, is an advocate of the VIEWS OF THE HEBREWS theory. They had to speak out against Spaulding in order to defend their commitments already made to the other theory. Most of the statements that follow are from Brodie's book, with a few related comments from other sources. **Brodie spells Hurlburt's name, "Hurlbut."**

67 YEARS OF COLLECTING LETTERS

(BRODIE-p. 442) — The Spaulding-Rigdon theory of the authorship of the Book of Mormon is based on a heterogeneous assortment of letters and affidavits collected between 1833 and 1900.

TOO MUCH UNIFORMITY OF STYLE (Among the Eight Conneaut Witnesses)

(BRODIE-pp. 446-447) — It may be noted also that although five out of the eight had heard Spaulding's story only once, there was a surprising uniformity in the details they remembered after 22 years. Six recalled the names Nephi, Lamanite, etc.; six held that the manuscript described the Indians as descendants of the lost ten tribes; four mentioned that the great wars caused the erection of the Indian mounds; and four noted the ancient scriptural style.

WITNESSES PROMPTED?

(BRODIE-p. 447) — The very tightness with which Hurlbut here was implementing his theory rouses an immediate suspicion that he did a little judicious prompting.

AFFIDAVITS ALL WRITTEN BY THE SAME PERSON?

(BRODIE-p. 446) — It can clearly be seen that the affidavits were written by Hurlbut, since the style is the same throughout.

STORIES TOO DIFFERENT — SPAULDING MANUSCRIPT NOT RELIGIOUS

(BRODIE — p. 450) — The Book of Mormon had but one scant reference to a love affair, and its rythmical, monotonous style bore no resemblance to the cheap cliches and purple metaphors abounding

in the Spaulding theory.

DEFENSIVE ACTION TAKEN BY HURLBURT TO EXPLAIN "RELIGIOUS MATTER" OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

(BRODIE-p. 449) — It is significant that five of Hurlbut's witnesses were careful to except the "religious" matter of the Book of Mormon as not contained in the Spaulding manuscript, and the others stated that "the historical parts" were derived from the Spaulding story. The narrative Hurlbut found had no religious matter whatever, but the Book of Mormon was permeated with religious ideas. It was first and foremost a religious book. The theology couldn't have been wrought by interpolation, since practically every historical event was motivated either by Satan or the Lord.

SPAULDING MANUSCRIPT EXAMINED — CLEARLY NOT THE SOURCE FOR THE BOOK OF MORMON

(BRODIE-p. 447) — She (Mrs. Davison, Spaulding's widow) gave Hurlbut permission to examine Spaulding's papers in the attic of a farmhouse in Otsego County, New York; but he found there only one manuscript, which was clearly not the source for the Book of Mormon. This was a romance supposedly translated from twenty-four rolls of parchment covered with Latin, found in a cave on the banks of Conneaut Creek. It was written in modern English and was about 45,000 words long, one sixth the length of the Book of Mormon.

CHARGE OF MEMORY SUBSTITUTION MADE BY GUARDIAN OF SPAULDING MANUSCRIPT — PRES. OF OBERLIN COLLEGE

(BRODIE — p. 449) — But it should be remembered, as President Fairchild pointed out in his analysis of the problem, that "the Book of Mormon was fresh in their minds, and their recollections of the Manuscript Found were very remote and dim. That under the pressure and suggestion of Hurlbut and Howe, they should put the ideas at hand in place of those remote and forgotten, and imagine that they remembered what they had recently read, would be only an ordinary example of the frailty of memory." (Joseph H. Fairchild: "Solomon Spaulding and the Book of Mormon," Western Reserve Historical Society, No. 77, Vol. III, March 23, 1886, pp. 197-8).

CLAIM OF "ANOTHER" MANUSCRIPT UNFOUNDED

(BRODIE-pp. 447-448) — Hurlbut showed this manuscript to Spaulding's neighbors, who, he said, recognized it as Spaulding's, but stated that it was not the "Manuscript Found." Spaulding "had altered his first plan of writing, by going farther back with dates and writing in the Old Scripture style, in order that it might appear more ancient." This surmise may have been true, though there was no signed statement swearing to it. But it seems more likely that these witnesses had so come to identify the Book of Mormon with the Spaulding manuscript that they could not concede having made an error without admitting to a case of memory substitution which they did not themselves recognize.

THE SPAULDING/RIGDON THEORY

Sidney Rigdon was a counselor to Joseph Smith. Very briefly, the Spaulding/Rigdon theory is based on the charge that Spaulding left his manuscript with Mr. Patterson, a very good friend who owned a printing office, and Sidney Rigdon stole it or copied it. The theory further supposes that Rigdon, or Rigdon and Joseph Smith, used it to create the Book of Mormon.

STYLE OF BOOK OF MORMON IDENTICAL WITH JOSEPH SMITH'S LATER WRITINGS

(BRODIE-p. 442) — . . . the Spaulding/Rigdon theory is based first of all on the untenable assumption that Joseph Smith had neither the wit nor the learning to write the Book of Mormon, and it disregards the fact that the style of the Book of Mormon is identical with that of the Mormon prophet's later writings, such as the Doctrine and Covenants and Pearl of Great Price, but is completely alien to the turgid rhetoric of Rigdon's sermons.

NO GOOD EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT RIGDON & SMITH EVER MET UNTIL AFTER THE BOOK OF MORMON WAS COMPLETED

(BRODIE-p. 442) — Protagonists of the theory do not explain why, if Rigdon wrote the Book of Mormon, he was content to let Joseph

Smith found the Mormon Church and hold absolute dominion over it throughout the years, so secure in his position that he several times threatened Rigdon with excommunication when Rigdon opposed his policies. But most important, there is no good evidence to show that Rigdon and Smith ever met before Rigdon's conversion late in 1830. There is, on the contrary, abundant proof that between September 1827 and June 1829, when the Book of Mormon was being written, Rigdon was a successful Campbellite preacher in northern Ohio, who if conniving secretly with Joseph Smith, three hundred miles east, was so accomplished a deceiver that none of his intimate friends ever entertained the slightest suspicion of it.

PATTERSON DIDN'T EVEN HAVE A PRINT SHOP UNTIL AFTER SPAULDING'S DEATH

(BRODIE-p. 448) — Hurlbut, at least, was certain that Spaulding had written a second manuscript. Eber D. Howe, Hurlbut's collaborator, now wrote to Robert Patterson, the Pittsburgh printer mentioned by Spaulding's widow. He replied "that he had no recollection of any manuscript being brought there for publication, neither would he have been likely to have seen it, as the business of printing was conducted wholly by Lambdin at that time." (*Mormonism Unveiled*, p. 280)

The partnership of Patterson and Lambdin had not in fact been formed until January 1, 1818, two years after Spaulding's death. (Robert Patterson, Jr.: *WHO WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?* (Philadelphia, 1882), p. 7)

PATTERSON DENIED KNOWING SPAULDING

(BRODIE-p. 451) — Mrs. McKinstry (Spaulding's daughter) said, "In that city (Pittsburgh) my father had an intimate friend named Patterson, and I frequently visited Mr. Patterson's library with him and heard my father talk about books with him." Patterson, it will be remembered, denied knowing Spaulding at all.

CURSORY GLANCES DON'T LEAVE ACCURATE IMPRESSIONS

(BRODIE-p. 451) — Spaulding's daughter remembered seeing the manuscript in her father's trunk after his death, and stated that she had handled it and seen the names she had heard read to her at the age of six. She admitted, however, that she had not read it." (See

statement of Mrs. M.S. McKinstry (Matilda Spaulding) in Ethan E. Dickinson: "The Book of Mormon," Scribner's Monthly, August, 1880.)

NO EVIDENCE RIGDON LIVED IN PITTSBURGH UNTIL AFTER SPAULDING'S DEATH IN 1816

"If the evidence pointing to the existence of a second Spaulding manuscript is dubious, the affidavits trying to prove that Rigdon stole it, or copied it, are all unconvincing and frequently preposterous.

First there is no evidence that Rigdon ever lived in Pittsburgh until 1822, when he became pastor of the First Baptist Church.

SPAULDING'S FAMILY MAINTAINED THAT HIS MANUSCRIPT HAD BEEN CAREFULLY PRESERVED IN A TRUNK

(BRODIE-p. 452) — One woman, who had worked as mail clerk in Patterson's office between 1811 and 1816, stated that she knew Rigdon and that he was an intimate friend of Lambdin's, but that this was clearly untrue is evidenced by the statement of Lambdin's widow that she had never heard of Rigdon. Another old settler claimed that Spaulding told him the manuscript had been spirited away and that Rigdon was suspect, but this statement is in conflict not only with the facts of Rigdon's life, but also with the accounts of Spaulding's wife and daughter, who made no mention of a lost manuscript and held that the "Manuscript Found" had been carefully preserved in the trunk. (For texts of all these statements see Robert Patterson Jr.: WHO WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON?)

SUSPECT AFFIDAVITS AND OUTRIGHT PERJURY

(BRODIE-p. 452) — Patterson senior never left any statement that incriminated Rigdon, although the two men knew each other casually in Pittsburgh after 1822. In the 1870's and 1880's, when anti-Mormonism was most bitter in the United States, there was a great outcropping of affidavits such as those solicited by the younger Patterson. All were from citizens who vaguely remembered meeting Spaulding or Rigdon some 50, 60, or 70 years earlier. All are suspect because they corroborate only the details of the first handful of documents collected by Hurlbut and frequently use the very same language. Some are outright perjury.

HOWE "LOST" THE EVIDENCE

(BRODIE-p. 448) — Howe now purchased Hurlbut's affidavits for five hundred dollars and published them in his **MORMONISM UNVEILED**. At once the Mormons challenged Howe to produce the Spaulding manuscript, but he did not even produce the one Hurlbut had uncovered, which shortly disappeared.

PREACHERS SOLICIT SUSPECT AFFIDAVITS IN ATTEMPT TO DISCREDIT THE MORMONS

(BRODIE-p. 450) — After the publication of Howe's book, affidavits popped up here and there, usually solicited by preachers anxious to discredit Joseph Smith. The Mormons replied with books and pamphlets of their own, such as Parley P. Pratt's **MORMONISM UNVEILED** in 1838 and Benjamin Winchester's **THE ORIGIN OF THE SPAULDING STORY** in 1840. Winchester quoted another of Spaulding's neighbors, one Jackson, who had read Spaulding's manuscript and maintained 'that there was no agreement between them'; for, said he, Mr. Spaulding's manuscript was a very small work, in the form of a novel, saying not one word about the children of Israel, but professed to give an account of a race of people who originated from the Romans, which Mr. Spaulding said he had translated from a Latin parchment that he had found.

"LOST" EVIDENCE APPEARS IN HOWE'S PERSONAL FILES

(BRODIE-p. 448) — Some writers insinuated that Hurlbut had sold it to the Mormons for a fabulous sum; actually it lay buried in Howe's files, which were later inherited by L.L. Rice, who followed Howe as editor of the Painesville Telegraph. Rice eventually went to Honolulu and there discovered the manuscript among his papers. He forwarded it to Joseph H. Fairchild, president of Oberlin College, who placed it in the college library. The manuscript contained a certificate of its identity signed by Hurlbut, Wright, Miller and Oliver Smith (no relation to Joseph Smith), and bore the penciled inscription "Manuscript Story" on the outside. Its discovery was jubilantly hailed by the Mormons who held that the Spaulding theory was now proved groundless. The manuscript was first published by the reorganized Church in Lamoni, Iowa, in 1885.

Anti-Mormon Fawn Brodie recognizes the fact that the affidavits supporting the Spaulding theory were accumulated over a 67-year period. It is apparent from reading the letters, that each one was dependent upon another letter that had been

written earlier for information, like a chain reaction. Brodie suggests that perhaps Hurlburt really wrote the letters. Of the eight witnesses, there was surprising uniformity in the details they remembered — even after 22 years! Some had read Spaulding's manuscripts only once, too! The style of the affidavits were so similar, Brodie believed that they were all written by Hurlburt. Such forgeries would certainly not be out of line with Hurlburt's integrity, **as you will see in the next chapter**. This author thinks it significant, too, **that none of the letters are true affidavits** either — they are missing dates, signatures, and witnesses.

Hurlburt's witnesses suggest that perhaps only parts of Spaulding's manuscript were used to create the Book of Mormon — the historical parts. That would be like saying, "A whale swallowed Jonah (the historical part); now go create the Old Testament!" Even Brodie realizes that the Book of Mormon could not have been written by interpolation; there is too much continuity for that. Webster defines interpolation as "to enlarge, or corrupt (a book, manuscript, etc.) by putting in new words, subject matter, etc."

Among Spaulding's personal papers after his death, Brodie said that Hurlburt "found there only **one** manuscript, which was clearly not the source for the Book of Mormon." Previously we have charted the journey of Spaulding's manuscript. It has been traced from its very beginning — from among Spaulding's papers in an old trunk, to Hurlburt, to Honolulu and Mr. Rice, and to Oberlin College where it is today. See a copy of that one and only Spaulding manuscript in the Appendix of this book on p. 392. Notice the description of Spaulding's manuscript by his neighbor, Mr. Jackson, on p. 431 **before** Hurlburt retrieved it from the old trunk. The description is the same. All this talk about a second manuscript (first mentioned by Hurlburt and picked up by Davis, Cowdrey, & Scales) is Hurlburt's **hasty and unfounded second explanation of why Spaulding's manuscript bore no resemblance to the Book of Mormon**. Brodie reports that he didn't even have any signed statements to support his charge of a second manuscript. Hurlburt provided some witnesses to support such a charge; however, Brodie and Oberlin College President Fairchild felt that it was simply a case of memory substitution. The witnesses didn't have the Spaulding manuscript, but they had the Book of Mormon. IF the witnesses were real, they were so sure the Book of Mormon was from Spaulding, they merely thought of them as the same and "remembered" the same names and stories when reading the Book of Mormon.

Mr. Patterson's son, Robert Jr., wrote a book in 1882 about the whole fiasco. **He said that "the partnership of Patterson and Lambdin had not in fact been formed until Jan. 1, 1818, two years after Spaulding's death."** This **one** statement shoots down the entire Spaulding-Rigdon theory because it is all based on the supposition that Spaulding and Patterson were very good friends and Spaulding had left his manuscript at the print shop for publication, that Rigdon was at the print shop at the same time; that Rigdon copied or stole the manuscript and took

it to Joseph Smith, and that Joseph Smith used it to create the Book of Mormon. Patterson wasn't even in the printing business when all of this was supposed to have taken place!

Hurlburt seems to be the one masterminding the theories concerning the Spaulding manuscript and the Book of Mormon. He was the first one to claim any relationship between the two. After the manuscript was found, he invented the theory of a second manuscript. In a further desperate attempt to save the Spaulding/Book of Mormon theory, he invented a story to incriminate Sidney Rigdon with Patterson and the manuscript at the print shop. He has certainly worked hard to discredit Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon. Why? I wonder if it has anything to do with his being excommunicated from the LDS Church **not once, but twice, for adultery**. He must have been a very angry man!

Not only did Hurlburt fail on the Spaulding/Rigdon theory, but he got caught in his deception when he produced a letter from Spaulding's only daughter, Mrs. McKinstry, stating: "In Pittsburg, my father (Spaulding) had an **intimate** friend named Patterson . . ." This statement was essential to Hurlburt's theory that Spaulding gave his manuscript to Patterson, his good friend, for printing and then Sidney Rigdon stole or copied it. However, Brodie points out that Patterson denied knowing Spaulding at all. If he didn't know Spaulding, he didn't know of his manuscript either! **So much for Rigdon stealing Spaulding's manuscript.**

This author finds Brodie's statement on p. 266 interesting: "After the publication of Howe's book, affidavits popped up here and there, usually solicited by preachers anxious to discredit Joseph Smith." **Notice that it was the preachers who were the most active anti-Mormons then. It is the same story today. Those preachers who feel their livelihood is threatened by the rapid growth of the Mormon Church usually make the biggest noise.**

Jerald and Sandra Tanner, in their book DID SPALDING WRITE THE BOOK OF MORMON? on pp. 25-32, also included the opinion of Edward E. Plowman and anti-Mormons John L. Smith and Harry L. Ropp.

JOHN L. SMITH (THE UTAH EVANGEL NEWSPAPER)

"John L. Smith, who has written a great deal against the Mormon Church, has examined the documents in the Mormon archives and has come out against the new theory:

. . . a new effort has been made to associate the Book of Mormon with the reputed work of one Solomon Spaulding

. . .

In my thinking this effort only adds more confusion to the

circumstantial evidence supporting this theory. I visited the LDS Historical Department and was shown the documents in question. I must confess that I am convinced that the current claim that Spaulding was the writer of the contested twelve pages of the Book of Mormon is in error. Even an amateur such as I could see that the specimen of Spaulding's handwriting and the twelve pages did not match.' (*The Utah Evangel*, October-November 1977, p. 1)"

The "new theory" that John L. Smith is coming out against is the one in Cowdrey, Davis, and Scales book WHO REALLY WROTE THE BOOK OF MORMON? He feels that there is only "circumstantial evidence supporting this theory."

Smith makes an interesting statement — "I visited the LDS Historical Department and was shown the documents in question." Tanners showed a page from the documents in their book, MORMONISM: SHADOW OR REALITY?, p. 6, and stated that it had "previously been suppressed." But Smith says he went to the Historical Department and was shown the same "suppressed" documents. Interesting!

Tanners and Smith express the same sentiments about the whole thing — "Even an amateur such as I could see that the specimen of Spaulding's handwriting and the twelve pages did not match."

The late Harry L. Ropp is the next anti-Mormon writer that the Tanners mentioned in their book. Ropp is not a very well known anti-Mormon writer, and makes frequent use of the Tanner's material. He does very little original study and is slow to keep up with new discoveries, as shown by his failure to take Dee Jay Nelson out of his book. Dee Jay Nelson, if you will remember, was a man who used fraudulent credentials to perpetrate a false story about the Book of Abraham. (See chapter 5). Even the Tanners have removed Nelson from their books.

Ropp agrees with Tanners regarding Cow, Dav, Sca and their theories. Here is Tanners' report of what Ropp had to say.

HARRY L. ROPP (THE MORMON PAPERS) QUOTED FROM TANNERS "DID SPAULDING WRITE THE BOOK OF MORMON" — P. 25

"In his new book, *The Mormon Papers*, the non-Mormon writer Harry L. Ropp tells that the 1831 revelation and the Book of Mormon pages appear "remarkably similar":

"I have examined firsthand the pages of the manuscripts in question . . . in Salt Lake City. . . . Though I am not a

specialist in handwriting analysis, even to the untrained eye the Book of Mormon manuscript and the 1831 Doctrine and Covenants manuscripts are remarkably similar. If the manuscript of Doctrine and Covenants 56 was in fact written in 1831 (after Spaulding's death) and if it and the Book of Mormon manuscript are found to be in the same handwriting, then the new theory of Davis, Cowdrey, and Scales could not be supported.

Because this 1831 document has not yet been examined by the experts, we urge Christians to suspend judgment until all the evidence is in. Making claims that could later be proven false by the LDS Church could be very detrimental to Christian witnessing. On the other hand, if the 1831 document is not genuine or is shown to be in another hand, this new evidence would be a very powerful argument against the credibility of the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's claim to be a prophet of God." (The Mormon Papers, 1977, Appendix D)

When Ropp states that he has "examined firsthand the pages of the manuscript in question . . . in Salt Lake City . . .," is he saying that he has been privileged to see the "suppressed" documents, too?

Previously Ropp stated that "If the 1831 document is not genuine or is shown to be in another hand, this new evidence would be a very powerful argument against the credibility of the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's claim to be a prophet of God." If, on the other hand, the 1831 document is shown to be genuine and in the same hand, would not that evidence be a very powerful argument for the credibility of the Book of Mormon and Joseph Smith's claim to be a prophet of God? Is what is good for the goose, good for the gander also?

The next writer that the Tanners mention is Edward E. Plowman. Below is what Plowman had to say in his October 21, 1977 article.

EDWARD E. PLOWMAN
(WRITER FOR CHRISTIANITY TODAY MAGAZINE)

"Edward E. Plowman, the man who wrote the article for *Christianity Today* which brought world-wide attention to the new Spaulding theory, came back to Salt Lake City and was permitted to see the 1831 revelation. After his examination, Mr. Plowman told us that he believed the 1831 revelation was in the same hand as the 12 pages of the Book of Mormon manuscript. In an attempt to counteract the favorable publicity that the researchers were receiving, Mr. Plowman wrote another article in which he stated:

"Three California researchers have suffered some setbacks . . . analyst Henry Silver, 86, dropped out of the case without offering a final opinion . . .

See p. 17 for phony Silver "final opinion."
--

Silver is involved in another handwriting case involving the Mormon Church. He is one of several analysts who have ruled that the so-called Mormon will of Howard E. Hughes was indeed written by Hughes.

Several other experts disagree with Silver on the will. One of them is William Kaye, the second of the three analysts hired by Martin and the three researchers. Kaye studied handwriting samples of the minister-novelist Solomon Spalding . . . and the twelve Book of Mormon manuscript pages . . . Early last month he reported that the comparison he made "shows unquestionably" that the written materials "have all been executed by the same person."

Two weeks later, the third expert Howard C. Doulder, arrived at an opposite conclusion . . . that Spalding "is not the author" of the disputed Book of Mormon pages, . . .

Meanwhile, Mormon archivists have assembled a large amount of evidence — some of it impressive — to rebut the Spalding theory. They scored a coup of sorts when they discovered that a manuscript page from another Mormon book, Doctrine and Covenants, is apparently in the same handwriting as that of the Unidentified Scribe in the Book of Mormon manuscript. It is dated June, 1831 — fifteen years after Spalding's death. . . . The average layman can readily note the striking dissimilarities between Spalding's specimens and the others. . .

Among Mormonism's critics are Jerald and Sandra Tanner, ex-Mormons who now operate a Salt Lake City publishing firm that specializes in anti-Mormon research. Tanner made a fresh study of the Spalding theory after the researchers' claims were publicized, managed to accompany Kaye to the Mormon archives to examine manuscript pages and produced a book,

Did Spalding Write the Book of Mormon? The volume's answer: No. Adding insult to injury, it contains some of the same photocopy reproductions of handwriting samples as the Cowdrey-Davis-Scales book to make its point, and it came on the market earlier.

Why do handwriting experts differ among themselves? And why do they sometimes reach conclusions that are contrary to what seems obvious to an ordinary person? Observers point out that 'experts' can be found on both sides in most important court cases involving handwriting analysis. Often it is a case of one analyst emphasizing similarities and the other pointing out dissimilarities . . . everyone seems to agree that handwriting analysis is not an exact science." (*Christianity Today*, October 21, 1977, pp. 38-39)"

The first article concerning Cow,Dav,Sca in *Christianity Today* was favorable and supported their theory. It brought a lot of attention to the new (resurrected) Spaulding theory. Plowman went to Salt Lake City and was permitted to examine the "suppressed" documents in question. He reversed his opinion against Cow,Dav,Sca saying that even the "average layman" can see that Spaulding's handwriting and that of the Unknown Scribe of the Book of Mormon aren't the same. Plowman also mentioned the discovery of more writing from the Unidentified Scribe in the Doctrine & Covenants — written 15 years after Spaulding's death. Things do not look good for the three researchers. William Kaye, one of the handwriting experts was the **only** one that agreed with Cow,Dav,Sca and Walter Martin. Everyone else was against them — Tanners, Brodie, Walters, John L. Smith, Ropp, the entire LDS Church and handwriting experts Silver and Doulder.

Jerald and Sandra Tanner quote Wesley P. Walters in his evaluation of the Spaulding theory as put forth by Cowdrey, Davis, and Scales. It makes a good summary, so we will stop here.

WESLEY P. WALTERS (MINISTER)

"This work brings together a great deal of painstaking research, collecting evidence from hard-to-find books and old newspapers to build a circumstantial case for the 140-year-old theory that the Book of Mormon is traceable to a now-missing manuscript written by a Congregational minister named Solomon Spalding . . . The case is built entirely upon circumstantial evidence from testimonies of persons who had knowledge of events at various stages in the proposed chain linking Spalding to Rigdon to Smith. In general, the

later the testimony, the more detailed and specific it becomes in affirming these connections, the witnesses' memory apparently improving with age.

A new feature in the research team's presentation of the theory is that there were **two** lost manuscripts of Spalding's novel instead of one. According to the older theory it was thought that Rigdon had simply **copied** the manuscript left by Spalding at the printer's and that it had subsequently been returned to the Spalding household where his wife and daughter reported seeing it in the family trunk after his death in 1816. On the basis of a very late testimony . . . the authors of this book maintain that there was a second copy of Spalding's work, one which had been prepared for the printer and which, according to Miller, needed only a title page and a possible preface to ready it for publication. They further maintain that Rigdon actually **stole** this copy from the printer's office and gave it to Joseph Smith . . .

This theory seems apparently confirmed with the sensational discovery by the researchers that twelve pages of the Book of Mormon manuscript appear to be in the handwriting of Spalding himself . . . When looked at carefully, however, this discovery raises so many knotty problems and conflicts in regard to the theoretical reconstruction in the first part of their book, that it actually tends to discredit it.

In the first place the handwriting experts themselves are now divided on the matter of whether it is really Spalding's handwriting. Of the three experts employed, Howard Doulder has reversed his preliminary judgement after careful examination of the original document; Mr. Henry Silver has withdrawn from the case without rendering a final opinion; and only Dr. William Kaye has issued a final report affirming the handwriting as that of Spalding. While the handwriting appears quite similar to Spalding's there seems to be some obvious differences to anyone who looks at it carefully. Furthermore, the manuscript of one of Joseph's revelations is in the handwriting of a scribe whose writing, to the layman's eye, looks more like the Book of Mormon portion attributed to Spalding than the undisputed samples of Spalding's handwriting itself. This shows that someone whose handwriting was very much like Spalding's was one of Joseph's scribes in the 1830 period . . .

According to the older Spalding's theory, based on the extant testimony, while Spalding's novel may have had some religious content, it is Rigdon who is credited with adding most of the religious material. If one looks at the content of the alleged Spalding portion

(of the Book of Mormon), however, he notices that nearly the entire material is religious in nature. It speaks of there being a 'church' at Jerusalem about 600 B.C., writes approvingly of being a 'visionary man,' portrays New Testament Christianity as being well known in the Old Testament period, and even depicts Christianity as being established in America before the arrival of Europeans. These are some of the main features of early Mormonism, and if regarded as Spalding's work it would make Spalding rather than Smith or Rigdon the originator of the religious aspects of Mormonism. This is not the impression one gets from reading the early descriptions by witnesses who claimed to have heard Spalding's alleged manuscript read.

More significant yet is a major problem the authors fail to mention in their book. If the Book of Mormon manuscript does contain the actual handwriting of Spalding, then the facts preclude identifying that manuscript with the printer's copy stolen by Rigdon. This is evident from the fact that the twelve manuscript pages attributed to Spalding are part of twenty pages on identical paper stock. The four pages that precede the 'Spalding' block of material and the four that follow are in the known handwriting of identified scribes of Joseph Smith, Jr. This would mean that at least eight pages **without text** were sent to the printer by Spalding along with his manuscript. What is even more inexplicable is that two of the four pages immediately before the twelve 'Spalding' pages have page-titles, summarizing the page's content, in the same apparent 'Spalding' hand, while the content of the pages themselves is written in the known handwriting of those serving as Joseph's scribes in 1829. Why would Spalding send a printer blank pages with page-titles at the top of two of these, followed by twelve pages of manuscript, the first page of which starts in the middle of a sentence (viz., 'and I commanded him in the voice of Laban . . .') = I Ne. 4:20)? This makes no sense at all and can hardly be regarded as a printer's copy. Moreover, Joseph Smith must be regarded as having composed and dictated the material on the blank pages sent by Spalding, and as having done this in the same vocabulary and style as the 'Spalding' portion. Furthermore he succeeded in filling these blank pages with no indication of either crowding or coming up short and even connected smoothly into the incomplete sentence of Spalding without a hint of discontinuity. Anyone that clever could just as easily have composed the entire content himself. In any event, the fragmentary nature of the alleged Spalding material makes it impossible to connect this with any printer's copy that might have been stolen by Rigdon."

SUMMARY

Wesley P. Walters recognizes that Cow, Dav, Sca have nothing but circumstantial evidence. Walters thinks the idea of **two** manuscripts is new, however this theory was exploited unsuccessfully 150 years ago by Hurlburt and Howe.

Walters could readily see the differences between Spaulding's handwriting and that of the Unidentified Scribe. Walters also mentions that concerning the twelve pages of I Nephi by the unknown scribe, they are "part of twenty pages on identical paper stock." Those four pages before and after are written by known scribes. There is no way Spaulding could have had any part in the matter. Furthermore, to show how preposterous the Spaulding theory is, Walters makes the statement: "This would mean that at least eight pages **without text** was sent to the printer by Spaulding along with his manuscript . . . Why would Spaulding send a printer blank pages with page-titles at the top of two of these, followed by twelve pages of manuscript . . ." This author would like to answer this one. You see, when Spaulding delivered his manuscript to the printer, he said: "Now, here is my one and only manuscript and eight blank pieces of paper. Sidney Rigdon is going to steal or copy this manuscript in about 15 years and take it to Joseph Smith so he can start a new church based upon my manuscript." The printer asks Spaulding how? "Well, this manuscript is like a new Bible and will be the foundation for a new church." The printer asks what the eight blank pages are for? "Well, I can't tell you that, but Sidney Rigdon will know how to use them. Wait a minute! I almost forgot to write some titles on the top of these blank pages — Sidney Rigdon will need them. This manuscript will make me famous some day and the book that Joseph Smith will write from it will be the second most read book in the world in 150 years." So that the whole world will know that this is the truth, Solomon Spaulding signed an affidavit to the above. This story is just as ridiculous as the claim by the three researchers that Spaulding wrote any part of the Book of Mormon.

We now come to the question of who really did write the Book of Mormon? As you have seen, this has been an object of concern to many anti-Mormons. Anybody who has done any writing at all knows that you make an outline, write, re-write, re-write, re-write, re-write again, proof it, re-write, check for continuity, check for repetition, etc. It is a very laborious task. The editor of this book, who is a teacher in a local college and has a Master's Degree, has written 42 text-workbooks, and 2 research books (They Lie in Wait to Deceive, Vol. 1 & 2); finds the production of the Book of Mormon absolutely "mind-boggling." Joseph Smith, with a 3rd grade education, **dictated** the Book of Mormon of approximately 500 pages, without re-writing, from his mouth **to scribes**, in 90 days. That feat could only be accomplished through the gift and power of the Holy Ghost! Emma Smith made the statement to her children that after interruptions, Joseph Smith would begin dictating right where he left off before:

“Your father would dictate to me hour after hour and when returning after meals or after interruptions he would at once begin where he had left off without either seeing the manuscript or having any portion of it read to him . . .”

The Saints Herald

Oct. 1, 1879 Page 290

“LAST TESTIMONY OF SISTER EMMA”

As you can see, Martin, Davis, Cowdrey and Scales stand alone among anti-Mormons in their support of the Spaulding/Book of Mormon theory.