

The Book of Mormon

~ Part 6 of 7

(May 8, 2007)

A number of people have wanted to know our opinion of the recently aired PBS program called "The Mormons."

I was only able to watch some of the first half but had the rest described to me by other viewers.

I think that the piece was visually stunning and that it offered some admissions that have not typically been offered by the LDS community – like Daniel Peterson of BYU admitting that JS peered into a seer stone in a hat to translate the Book of Mormon.

I just wish they would have been as forthcoming about everything LDS instead of just admitting a little.

When I was a kid we used to drive to Mexico and smuggle fireworks back through the border.

We learned very early on that a little confession is better than total denial when you're trying to pull a con.

So we'd get to the border and the border patrol would ask: "Do you have any fireworks in your vehicle?"

With a look of surprise on our face we would say, "Yes, we do. Is that bad?"

They would ask for them and after confiscating them they would let us go – not aware that our bumpers were lined thousands more.

The point is, admitting to some fault

<p>goes a long way in making people believe everything else is all right.</p> <p>I saw this in the documentary.</p> <p>Fifty years ago you would have NEVER heard a member of the church admit to Joseph using a stone in a hat to translate the Book of Mormon.</p> <p>The internet won't let them deny it any longer.</p> <p>Fifty years ago you would have never seen an apostle apologizing for the murders at Mountain Meadows.</p> <p>Bit by bit, they admit to having the fireworks, all the while concealing the fact that they are sitting on a powder keg of information that once admitted to will blow the thing to smithereens.</p> <p>In the end, The Mormons documentary did more to help make Mormonism acceptable than to reveal it or change it.</p> <p>That is certainly unfortunate.</p>	
<p>Recently and over the course of our ministry I've received some emails regarding the disappointment I must be to my family. How I have "disgraced my parents and siblings," and "ed my wife and children astray."</p> <p>When I hear these things I think of the Lord speaking to His disciples as recorded in Matthew 10:37-38</p>	<p>It reads:</p> <p><i>"He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.</i></p>

And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.”

When I was born-again, I saw for the first time the allegiance Jesus deserves in my life.

And while I love and appreciate my parents for what they have done for me, and my wife for what she does and has endured, they are not my Lord nor Sovereign King – Jesus is.

He has every whit of my devotion and love and allegiance.

A wonderful result of this allegiance is the fact that when I love the Lord with all my heart, I am able to love my parents and wife all the more in return.

If my parents priorities are not Him, I reject their priorities without one whit of shame.

If my wife’s priorities are not Him, it does not change my total dedication to Him in the least.

Additionally, verse thirty eight is important in this sense as it says:

And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me.

“*Taking up the cross*” is a metaphor for being ready and willing to die for the cause, but the additional “*and follow after me*” let’s us know that the cause must be Him – not a church or a father, or mother, or children, or job or wife – we take up our cross and follow Him.

The teenagers and young adults today have an online community system known as “face book” and “my space.”

	<p>In my space kids post their personal profiles and other things that describe them and their interests.</p> <p>My daughter and I did a little experiment. We went through a looked at the My Space for all the LDS kids we could think of.</p> <p>When it came to the most important thing in their life, the LDS kids put “Church.”</p> <p>Not one of them put Jesus.</p> <p>Conversely, when we examined the Christian kids we knew, not ONE of them put church, but all of them put Jesus or The Lord or God.</p> <p>There is a mighty big difference between taking heat – bearing your cross for belonging to a certain “Church” and bearing your Cross as it relates directly to your following Jesus.</p> <p>It’s the difference between religion and a relationship with the Lord.</p> <p>The first might make your life a little better, but the latter will make your death glorious.</p> <p>I hope this helps.</p>
<p>How about we begin tonight with a little quiz, eh? Eh?</p> <p>Let’s play . . . the Name Game! Woooooo Wooooooo!</p> <p><i>Question # 1</i></p> <p>True or False?</p>	

In the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon the hill Cumorah was spelled Camorah?

Answer? TRUE

Why is this significant? There were maps printed and available in Joseph Smith's day that showed a chain of islands called the Camaros Islands and guess what the capital city of the Camaros Islands was called . . . Moroni!

Hmmmmm the name game.

Question #2

What two things do the following words have in common?

Alpha, Angola, Antipas, Antipus, Archeantus, Ezias, Jonas, Judea, Omega, Timothy, and Zenos?

Answers?

First, they are ALL found in the Book of Mormon.

Second, they are all Greek names, which chronologically should not and could not be in the Book of Mormon if it was legit.

Having Greek names in the Book of Mormon would be like Moses including a Brittany Spears song in Genesis.

Highly improbable.

Question #3

Are the twelve apostles in the Book of Mormon similar to the twelve apostles in the Bible?

Answer: Yes. How?

There were three pairs of New Testament Apostles who shared the same name:

Simon Peter and
Simon the Canaanite.

James the son of Alphaeus and
James the son of Zebedee.

And Judas the brother of James and
Judas Iscariot, the betrayer.

Question #4:

What significance could these actual geographical locations - which were all located within 200 miles of Joseph Smith's home - play in the construction of the Book of Mormon?



Lehigh Valley, PA
Oneida, NY
Angolah, NY
Morgantown, PA
Jacobsburg, PA
Alma, Quebec
Shiloh, OH
Kiskiminitas River, OH
Morin, Quebec
Sherbrooke, Quebec
Tecumseh, Quebec
Ripley, Maine

Well, guess what? In the Book of Mormon we have the same situation among the "apostles:"

Jonas and Jonas

Mathoni and Mathoniha (I love the little "ha" additions) and . . .

Kumen and Kumenonhi

A coincidence? A divine pattern? Or just one more evidence of plagiarism?

(hmmmmmm) the name game.

Answers?

The significance is in their similarity to people and places identified in the Book of Mormon itself.

Lehi
Onidah
Angola
Morianton
Jacobugath
Alma
Shilom
Kishkumen
Moron
Shurr
Teacum
Ripliancum

	<p>Oh, the fun never ends with this book, does it?</p> <p>I look forward to the day when we see an LDS apostle in a documentary say:</p> <p>“We are truly sorry that we ever promoted the Book of Mormon over the Bible. It is a book of fiction which we at one time embraced as an authentic translation from an ancient record. Our whole attention is now upon the Bible as the true and living Word of God.”</p>
<p>But enough of the name game.</p> <p>But hey! Let’s look at yet another source Joseph surely borrowed from in composing the BOM.</p> <p>Hang on to yer bonnets, chillins! The wagon is a headin downhill!</p>	
<p>In 1823, when Joseph Smith was a seventeen year old boy, a Pastor named Ethan Smith (no relation) wrote a fictional book titled: <i>View of the Hebrews; or the Tribes of Israel in America</i>.</p> <p>From 1821 to 1826, the author of the book, was pastor to Oliver Cowdery and his family in Poultney, Vermont.</p> <p>In case you didn’t know, Oliver Cowdery was a scribe to Joseph Smith during the translation of the Book of Mormon.</p> <p>He was also a witness to the golden plates (which we are going to discuss next week). And he was also Joseph Smith’s cousin!</p> <p>View of the Hebrews was popular, and</p>	

was distributed and talked about all throughout New York and parts of New England.

A second edition of it was printed in 1825.

There was a great deal of interest in the origins, customs, religion and life of the Indians during these years and Ethan Smith collected much of this information from two or three dozen different sources and reconfigured it into a book.

Now an early church historian by the name of BH Roberts (who, by the way, is quite underrated and ignored by the LDS Church today because of his views) did a comparative study of the Book of Mormon and View of the Hebrews. His findings were compiled in a book called:

Studies of the Book of Mormon.

You tell me if the findings could be reasonably considered a coincidence or if they are another indication that Joseph did not translate the Book from an ancient record on golden plates but instead took information from other sources and used it to compile the book modern Mormonism calls “the most correct book on the face of the earth.”

Ready? I’m reading from Studies, which is included in Grant Palmer’s book An Insider’s View of Mormon Origins.

(See pages 60 – 64)

The Book of Mormon has been

	<p>presented to the world as a translation of God's Word from an ancient record written on golden plates.</p> <p>Over the last six weeks we have shown you that the framework and the contents of the Book of Mormon originated from a variety of external sources which have been authenticated and verified.</p> <p>Since 1830, the LDS church – from it's leaders, to its missionaries, and its members – have used the book of Mormon as bait to get people to buy into Joseph Smith, who later introduced temple rites, plural marriage, and some incomprehensibly humanistic descriptions of God.</p>
--	---