

Inconsistencies in the book of Mormon- by Charli Yana

Any religion centered on a scriptural foundation stands or falls on the accuracy of its text. While the Bible has a wealth of evidence supporting its historical, chronological, and geographical accuracy, the *Book of Mormon*, has been heavily criticized for its inaccuracies.”

Dewayne Bryant, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

1. ‘Lucifer’ referring to Satan: Lucifer, in the KJV, is only found in Isaiah 14:4 where the context is addressing the king of Babylon and calls **him** “Lucifer” in verse 12 which interpreted means “Day Star, son of Dawn” (*he is not **like** Lucifer as the context is specifically referring to him*). The name does not exist elsewhere in scripture, even in Revelation 12:9; 20:2 Satan is called “that ancient serpent, who is called the devil and Satan”. He is not called ‘Lucifer’ there either.
2. Jesus being ‘Lucifer’s’ (Satan’s) brother: Jesus is part of the Godhead and as deity He doesn’t have siblings in that sense. (Gen 1:26; Mat 28:19) Nowhere in scripture does it give Satan such an elevated position in equality to the Godhead.
3. Man existed as spirits in another realm before being sent here in physical form: Using Proverbs 8:23 as proof text is taking the passage out of context to substantiate this doctrine. “Wisdom” is being personified according to verse 12 and is not referring to a ‘pre-state’ of mankind.
4. Horses: 1 Nephi 18:25 states there were horses in the Americas in about 591-589 B.C.

In 1493, on Columbus' second voyage to the Americas, Spanish horses, representing E. caballus, were brought back to North America, first in the Virgin Islands, and, in 1519, they were reintroduced on the continent.

Digs in western Canada have unearthed clear evidence horses existed in North America as recently as 12,000 years ago. Other studies produced evidence that horses in the Americas existed until 8,000–10,000 years ago. (*Even though the earth has only been in existence about 6,000 years according to biblical genealogy, this suggestion that horses existed long before 600 B.C. is evident that they didn't exist in the era that the Book of Mormon says they did.*)

It is unlikely that Native people obtained horses in significant numbers to become a [horse culture](#) any earlier than 1630–1650. From a trade center in the [Santa Fe, New Mexico](#) area, the horse spread slowly north. The [Comanche people](#) were thought to be among the first tribes to obtain horses and use them successfully. By 1742, there were reports that the [Crow](#) and [Blackfoot people](#) had horses. The horse became an integral part of the lives and culture of Native Americans, especially the [Plains Indians](#), who viewed them as a source of wealth and used them for hunting, travel, and warfare.

Wikipedia: Horses in the United States

5. Production of iron and steel: About 588-559 B.C. 2 Nephi 5:15 and Ether 7:9 speak of working in iron and steel when both of those metals were unknown in the New World at that time. In 1 Nephi 4:9 (600-592 B.C.) a military leader named Laban had a sword with the gold hilt and steel blade.

-Studying evidence from South America, Purdue University archaeologist Kevin J. Vaughn notes: “Even though ancient Andean people smelted some metals, such as copper, they never smelted iron like they did in the Old World.... Metals were used for a variety of tools in the Old World, such as weapons, while in the Americas, metals were used as prestige goods for the wealthy elite” (Purdue University, 2008). People in the New World did make use of copper and

precious metals like gold and silver, but scientists believe ironworking did not emerge until about A.D. 800.-
Dewayne Bryant, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

6. The Golden plates with “Reformed Egyptian”: This is a language that does not exist. Ancient Egyptian had numerous dialects (Archaic, Old, Middle, Late, Demotic, and Coptic) but “reformed” is not one of them. Hieroglyphs were mysterious and unknown until French scholar Jean Francois Champollion deciphered and published them in 1822 as the first translation of the Rosetta Stone.

The *Book of Abraham* contained three facsimiles taken from ancient papyrus which was lost. Being rediscovered it depicted a funerary papyrus “depicting several scenes from the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*.” Facsimiles Nos. 1 and 3 are canopic jars holding the internal organs of deceased and not the deities Elkenah, Libnah, Mahmackrah, and Korash which should have been identified as Qebesenuf, Duamutef, Hapi, and Imseti. They were not idols but funerary jars. Many of the spellings are impossible in biblical Hebrew but were invented to sound biblical. Excerpts from Dewayne Bryant, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

7. “Believe in Mormon scriptures, ask for wisdom from God and with help from the Holy Spirit you will know them to be true”: Muslims believe the Quran to be inspired; is it true? Once again, the internal evidence doesn’t demonstrate inspiration. If you had to have major surgery and needed to pick your surgeon, which of two choices would you chose to ensure your survival? The first was known for being consistent with a 100% success rate and the second had a consistency rate of 50/50. True, both the Bible and The Book of Mormon focus on Jesus but the one I would put my trust in is the Bible since it has evidence of inspiration (historical, geological, scientific) and contains no inconsistencies.

-Some religions (e.g., Buddhism and Hinduism) base their credibility on some mystical or transcendental experience. Even some “Christian” groups claim that their credibility and authenticity may be established on the basis of the Holy Spirit Whom, they say, gives them their assurance. But when the Bible is examined, no such role is assigned to the Holy Spirit.

The nature of truth is such that it does not depend upon subjective human experience for its veracity.-
Dave Miller, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

8. Reliance on the KJV:

-The author of *The Book of Mormon* obviously had before him a copy of the King James Bible, and simply copied many sections directly from it (though it is claimed that *The Book of Mormon* was actually written from 600 to 421 B.C. [see “A Brief Explanation...,” 1981]).

The KJV is an uninspired translation of available Hebrew and Greek manuscripts into the English language of the late 16th and early 17th century, completed in 1611. But God gave the Old Testament to the Israelites in their native language (Hebrew), and He gave the New Testament in the first century in the common language of that day (Koine Greek). Question: why in the world would God give His Word to Joseph Smith in 19th century America (1830), not in American English, but in the British language of 17th century England? The obvious answer to the question is that God would not do so.

Mormons frequently attempt to establish the superiority of *The Book of Mormon* over the Bible by insisting that the Bible has been corrupted through the centuries in the process of translation (a contention similar to Islam’s defense of the Quran—see Miller, 2005). But if

the Bible has been so adversely affected, why does *The Book of Mormon* quote so much of the King James Version?

Second, all textual critics (those who study the original manuscript evidence that attests to the text of the New Testament) know that textual variants exist in the extant manuscript evidence. The vast majority of these discordant readings are resolved when all of the textual evidence is considered (e.g., Metzger, 1968, p. 185). If *The Book of Mormon* were inspired, not only would it refrain from incorporating the King James Version within its pages, it also would not include in those sections the manuscript errors that have crept into the text. Here was the perfect opportunity in 1830 for God to clarify the variants that had accumulated during the previous 200 years (as well as the 1,500 years prior to the KJV). Instead, *The Book of Mormon* perpetuated the mistakes.

Third, in addition to errors that are due to textual variants, the KJV also made grammatical and stylistic errors that were naively copied by *The Book of Mormon*.

The unbiased observer is forced to conclude: God knows Hebrew and how to transfer words from one language to another; the author of *The Book of Mormon* obviously did not.-

Dave Miller, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

9. Polygamy:

-*The Book of Mormon* clearly condemned plural marriage as one of the “grosser crimes” and “whoredom”—at least among the Nephites. It specifically singled out the plural marriages of David and Solomon, denouncing them as an “abomination.” Yet *Doctrine and Covenants* insisted that David and Solomon were completely justified, and committed no sin in having multiple wives and concubines. Observe the comparison between the two books:

| BOOK OF MORMON | DOCTRINE & COVENANTS |
|--|---|
| "David and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord." | "David also received many wives and concubines, and also Solomon...and in nothing did they sin.... David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me." |

A “concubine” in antiquity was a wife—not a mistress (unmarried sexual partner)—despite popular misconception (cf. Hamilton, 1980, 2:724)].

“We are not teaching polygamy or plural marriage, nor permitting any person to enter into its practice.... There is nothing in my teachings to the Church or in those of my associates, during the time specified, which can be reasonably construed to inculcate or encourage polygamy.... And I now publicly declare that my advice to the Latter-day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land” (President Wilford; “Official Declaration—1” in *Doctrine and Covenants*, 1981, pp. 291-292).

Question: Why would God refer to plural marriage as a perpetual practice that would bring damnation upon those who fail to practice it, and then call for Latter-day Saints to refrain from such marriages? God is timeless, and would have known ahead of time that the U.S. government would reach a point at which it would call the Mormon practice of

plural marriage to account. Therefore, He would not have enjoined the requirement as “everlasting” if He later intended to nullify the practice.

All translators of the Bible are uninspired in their translating efforts. Joseph Smith, on the other hand, claimed to have been supernaturally guided in the process of translating *The Book of Mormon*, and preserved from making any errors. One official explanation as to why the original 1830 edition of *The Book of Mormon* was filled with grammatical mistakes and content blunders is—“printer’s errors.” This claim, of course, contradicts the above claim of President Wilford, who vouched for the authenticity of the existing 1830 edition and even included in his reproduction of it a “memorandum” by one of the original printer’s associates—John Gilbert. The memorandum recounts the care given to insuring accuracy in the printing of the manuscript that was brought to the printer by Hyrum Smith (Joseph’s brother), who, along with Martin Harris, supervised the project. Hence, the claim that “printer’s errors” are responsible for the errors in the original 1830 edition would be a suitable explanation if it fit the facts, but it simply cannot account for the types of mistakes contained in *The Book of Mormon*—**the types of mistakes printers do not make.**-

Dave Miller, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

10. Baptism for the dead:

-Despite the teaching of proxy baptism in *Doctrine and Covenants*, *The Book of Mormon* forcefully teaches that the eternal destiny of those who reject the truth while in the body is fixed at death, with no possibility of repentance after death:
(Alma 34:32-35; see also 42:4,13,28; Helaman 13:38; 2 Nephi 9:24-25,27; Mosiah 2:36,39)

Not only do Mormon scriptures contradict each other on the doctrine of baptism for the dead, the doctrine most certainly contradicts what the Bible teaches from beginning to end.

Pro 11:7 When the wicked dies, his hope will perish, and the expectation of wealth perishes too.

Heb 9:27 And just as it is appointed for man to die once, and after that comes judgment,

2Co 5:10 For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive what is due for what he has done in the body, whether good or evil.

Mormon President Howard Hunter affirmed:

Latter-day prophets have told us that baptism is an earthly ordinance that can be performed only by the living. How then can those who are dead be baptized if only the living can perform the ordinance? That was the theme of the Apostle Paul’s writing to the Corinthians when he asked this question: “Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?” (1 Cor. 15:29) (1995, p. 2).

...“dead” refers to the “old man of sin” (Romans 6:6). We are baptized for the dead in the sense that we are baptized in water to eliminate the dead man of sin. Hence Paul was asking why one would be baptized to eliminate the old man of sin in anticipation of eternal acceptance if the resurrection will not be forthcoming.

He wanted the Corinthians to face the fact that many things Christians do have meaning only if resurrection is an anticipated and ultimate objective. If when we die, that’s it—no

future conscious existence—why take risks living the Christian life as the apostles frequently did? If this life is all there is, forget Christianity and live it up (vs. 32).

In other words, the reality of the resurrection has a direct bearing on how a person lives while in the body on Earth, since his spiritual status is made permanent at death, and that condition will be brought forward at the resurrection. This verse provides no corroboration of the Mormon doctrine of vicarious baptism.

(Rev 22:11 Let the evildoer still do evil, and the filthy still be filthy, and the righteous still do right, and the holy still be holy.)

2 Pet 3:18-20; 4:6

Notice in verse 20, the words “formerly” (NKJV) and “when”—“when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah.” So the preaching was done **in the days of Noah** by Jesus via the Holy Spirit Who, in turn, prompted Noah’s inspired preaching (2 Peter 2:5).

These people to whom Noah preached were said to be “**spirits in prison**”, because during the time Peter was writing his second letter that is where those people were located. Those who were drowned in the Flood of Noah’s day descended into the hadean realm, where they continued to reside in Peter’s day.

Jesus could not have preached the whole Gospel in its entirety since the Gospel includes the **resurrection** of Christ (Romans 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:4). However, at the time the preaching was to have occurred, Jesus had not yet been raised!

Heb 11:39-40

Heb 11:39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: (40) God having provided some better thing for us, that they **without us** should not be made perfect.

All who lived prior to the sacrifice of Christ could be saved only in anticipation of that atoning act, as pre-planned by Deity in eternity (Revelation 13:8).-

Dave Miller, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

11. LDS claim that the Smithsonian Institute used the *Book of Mormon* as a scientific guide for locating archaeological sites was adamantly denied in 1986. The same was denied by National Geographic Society in 1982.
12. Native American Indians descendants of Jewish migrants known as the ‘Lamanites’: DNA research has confirmed migrations from Asia as the primary source of Native American origins.

In an issue of *Dialogue*, the oldest independent journal for Mormon studies (that is, not owned or operated by the LDS Church), Yale anthropologist Michael D. Coe, who specializes in pre-Columbian Mesoamerica studies, summarizes some of the most troubling issues:

There is an inherent improbability in specific items that are mentioned in the Book of Mormon as having been brought to the New World by Jaredites and/or Nephites. Among these are the horse...the chariot, wheat, barley, and metallurgy (true metallurgy based upon smelting and casting being no earlier in Mesoamerica than about 800 A.D.). The picture of this hemisphere between

2,000 B.C. and A.D. 421 presented in the book has little to do with the early Indian cultures as we know them, in spite of much wishful thinking.

There is also little doubt in the minds of non-Mormon scholars that Joseph Smith had no ability whatsoever to read “Reformed Egyptian” or any other kind of hieroglyphs. The papyri translated as the Book of Abraham in the Pearl of Great Price are, in the opinion of qualified Egyptologists, a series of fragments of the Egyptian “Book of the Dead,” something which Smith could not have known since Champollion’s decipherment of the Egyptian script had not yet been published (Coe, 1973, p. 42).
Dewayne Bryant, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

Addendum

- Contrary to the Bible prophecy concerning the Lord’s birth in Bethlehem (Micah 5:2), and the fulfillment of that prophecy in Matthew 2:1, the Book of Mormon reads: “And behold, he (Jesus) shall be born of Mary at **Jerusalem**” (Alma 7:10, parenthetical comment and emp. added). The writer of the Book of Mormon was simply wrong.
- The Bible tells us that at the crucifixion of Jesus, darkness covered the land for three hours (Matthew 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44). However, the Book of Mormon states three different times that there was darkness “for the space of **three days**” (Helaman 14:20, 27; 3 Nephi 8:3, emp. added). Of course, this is a big difference.
- Finally, whereas the Book of Mormon has people wearing the name Christian in about 73 B.C. (Alma 46:13, 15), the Bible clearly reveals that the disciples of Christ “were called Christians **first** in Antioch” (Acts 11:26, emp. added). This was in approximately A.D. 40, and thus represents a difference of over 100 years. Which account are people to believe? After all, according to Mormons, both books are inspired.

Eric Lyons, *The Bible Versus the Book of Mormon*; Apologetics Press

These are just a few problems besetting the Mormon church. If the *Book of Mormon* is the “most correct” book ever written, why does it contain so many mistakes? Why so many contradictions with history, archaeology, and ancient languages? Scientists, historians, archaeologists, and linguists have exposed the Mormon scriptures as the invention of a marvelously fertile imagination. So marvelous, in fact, that it has taken a century and a half to prove it conclusively false. Convincing though it was to Smith’s contemporaries, this grand old story has proven to be no match for scientific investigation. [For additional analysis of the *Book of Mormon*, see Miller, 2009.]
Dewayne Bryant, Ph.D.; Apologetics Press

In every sense, the Bible does stand up to scientific investigation.

www.truthdiscovered.net