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Across Arabia with Lehi and Sariah: “Truth Shall Spring out of the Earth”

Warren P. Aston


Aston draws on his own research in Yemen and Oman as well as on the work of other scholars and researchers to explore two locations in the Book of Mormon account of Lehi’s journey through Arabia: Nahom and Bountiful. Preliminarily, Aston highlights Nephi’s own directional indications for each leg of the journey, considers the relevance of existing trade routes, and suggests relative durations of stops along the way. He reviews the research on the tribal area associated with Nahom, including the discovery of an altar dating to roughly 600 BC that bears the tribal name NHM—possibly the first archaeological evidence of the Book of Mormon’s authenticity. Aston uses twelve criteria taken from Nephi’s descriptions of the area to identify the fertile Khor Kharfot area at the mouth of Wadi Sayq as the most likely candidate for Bountiful. The discussion also speculates on the kind of ship that Nephi may have built and the plausibility of a trans-Pacific voyage. Taken together, the archaeological and geographical evidence of Nahom and Bountiful strongly argue for the historicity of the Book of Mormon account.
KAUAI AND OAHU: "ACROSS ARABIA WITH LEHI AND SARIAH:

Desert scene south of Marib, Yemen. Photo by Justin Andrews. All maps and other photos courtesy Warren Aston.
Thousands of years ago the prophet Enoch saw that in the last days truth would be sent forth “out of the earth” (Moses 7:62). Joseph of Egypt foretold that a latter-day seer bearing his name would bring forth the words of his posterity “from the dust” (see 2 Nephi 3:19–20), and Isaiah later prophesied of a sealed book in the last days that would “whisper out of the dust” (Isaiah 29:4). Finally, the Psalmist predicted that “truth shall spring out of the earth” (Psalm 85:11). Latter-day Saints, of course, see the coming forth of the Book of Mormon—a record literally taken from out of the earth—as the fulfillment of these prophecies concerning our day. Some 176 years later, however, we can see that these predictions may not only refer to a single event in 1830, as significant as that was, but may also allude to a broader revelatory process whereby other buried records as well as confirmation of their truth will also come from “out of the earth.” The incredible unfolding in recent years of the first 18 chapters of the Book of Mormon as new finds have placed them in their real-world setting can be seen as exactly that.
Lehi and Sariah’s monumental journey from Jerusalem to Bountiful through the modern lands of Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Oman takes place in a setting largely unfamiliar to those who live far from the mountains and deserts of Arabia. In recent decades, however, a small corps of Latter-day Saint researchers has begun exploring the world in which that journey was made. To date, these efforts have demonstrated quite clearly that the incidental details recorded by Nephi fit the ancient world of the Near East accurately. A broad consensus on the route taken, in addition to totally plausible locations for almost all of the important places in Nephi’s text, has resulted. My own research on Arabia (including several expeditions there) has shaped my views on what can be reasonably inferred from the scholarship that attempts to shed light on Lehi and Sariah’s journey. As recent investigations have produced encouraging results, this article highlights findings that will likely influence and guide future research.

Guiding Principles

The following three principles have governed my research for over 20 years.

1. “Proof” of the truthfulness of the Book of Mormon will not result from scholarly pursuits. As Hugh Nibley stated years ago, “The evidence that will prove or disprove the Book of Mormon does not exist.” The aim of Book of Mormon research is to shed light on its message by providing helpful perspectives and to establish plausibility for the setting and details of the account. Those who claim to have found empirical proof of the Book of Mormon misunderstand not only doctrine but also the very nature of archaeological and historical research, which is highly tentative and subject to revision. Ultimate vindication or proof of the truthfulness of the Book of Mormon still comes to each reader only as Moroni outlined (see Moroni 10:3–5).

2. What scripture clearly says must always take precedence over other data from any branch of science or knowledge. We must never undervalue what was written by prophets under inspiration, nor underestimate the Lord’s ability to fulfill his word. While we can extrapolate and even speculate within reasonable limits, scriptural certainties must still govern all that we do. Finally, we must be careful that the intriguing details of the Book of Mormon’s setting do not divert us from its message of the Messiah and from its unique ability to change lives.

3. In reconstructing an ancient desert journey, one must recognize that no amount of library research is sufficient without actual exploration in the locations involved. Parts of Arabia remain largely unexplored, so despite the stunning correlations that have emerged concerning Lehi’s story, more exploratory work is needed. (As of this writing, for example, no other Latter-day Saint has visited every possible location for Nephi’s Bountiful or explored the large region east of Nahom.) The setting of that record must be brought to life through competent research that does nothing to detract from its eternal, instructive truths. The Book of Mormon deserves no less.

On Directions, Trade Routes, Duration

Most readers of the Book of Mormon have yet to fully appreciate Lehi and Sariah’s contributions as leaders of an epic migration that was quite possibly the longest made in premodern times. I will focus mostly on the journey’s later stages, and in particular the locations of Nahom and Bountiful. First, however, I will discuss three issues relevant to the entire journey.

Nephi’s Directions

In the introduction to his record, Nephi tells us that it also includes “the course of their travels.” And, in fact, he does record a directional statement for each of the five stages of land travel:

From the Jerusalem area to the Valley of Lemuel:
he departed into the wilderness . . . by the borders near the shore of the Red Sea; and . . . in the borders which are nearer the Red Sea (1 Nephi 2:4–5)

From the Valley of Lemuel to Shazer:
we traveled . . . in nearly a south-southeast direction (1 Nephi 16:13)
From Shazer to the place where Nephi’s bow broke:
we did go forth again . . . following the same direction (1 Nephi 16:14)

From the place where the bow broke to Nahom:
we did again . . . [travel] . . . nearly the same course as in the beginning (1 Nephi 16:33)

From Nahom to Bountiful:
we did travel nearly eastward from that time forth (1 Nephi 17:1)

Since the first four statements are directionally correct for an overland journey from Jerusalem to the Red Sea and then down the western side of Arabia, it seems evident that Nephi’s directions mean the same as they do today. Note how Nephi was able to determine that the direction (to Shazer) was not merely southeast but nearly south-south-east; he could also differentiate a slight adjustment to that direction (“nearly the same course”) in the fourth stage.

Nephi’s ability to determine directions so accurately has profound implications when he writes that the final stage was “nearly eastward.” As he had earlier done, Nephi would surely have recorded a more specific direction if it were possible. As I will later show, the site that best matches Nephi’s Bountiful lies in fact almost directly due east of Nahom, which is, as this article documents, a location now attested archaeologically.

Main trade routes in western Arabia in Lehi’s time.
Are the Ancient Trade Routes Relevant?

The ancient trade routes (the so-called Frankincense Trail) that brought incense and other products up from southern Arabia to the Mediterranean region connected water sources but also followed desert terrain suitable for camel caravans, as Lehi’s party would also have done.

Some early writers assumed that Lehi followed the entire trade route in reverse, eventually arriving at the incense-growing region on the south coast of Arabia, equated with Bountiful. While there is no question that the Lehites must have used the trade routes for a significant distance, the matter is not so simple: to begin with, their time in the wilderness occupied eight years, a distance covered by traders in only three or four months, so clearly some extended stops were made by Lehi’s group. Delays and difficulties from seeking tribal permissions and paying taxes are unlikely for a small family group not carrying commercial goods; the Lehites probably attracted scant attention on their journey. There would also seem little need for a Liahona if all that was necessary was to follow an established trade route.

Most importantly, however, as travel from Nahom to Bountiful was “nearly eastward from that time forth” (1 Nephi 17:1), trade routes are ruled out; due to the lack of water sources there were never any trade routes in an easterly direction from the Nahom area. From Nahom the trade route veered southeast toward Marib and Timna, then east to Shabwah; the Lehites would then have needed to backtrack northwest for hundreds of miles in a great arc to reach the fertile coast. Such a zigzag course runs counter to Nephi’s unambiguous directional statement.

Accepting that this final stage would have been away from trade routes helps us understand what Nephi recorded. The Lord’s instruction not to “make much fire” (1 Nephi 17:12) is highly significant. In well-traveled areas the making of fire would not have presented a problem, and perhaps the group needed to conserve fuel resources. They now ate their meat raw (see 17:2), probably spiced as many Arabs still do; camel’s milk would have helped them cope with reduced availability of water. All this paints a clear picture of survival in a region away from other people. This region today remains almost devoid of water, people, and roads.

It is testament to the literal accuracy of Nephi’s record that it fits what is now known about this part of Arabia. From Nahom the stony Mahrah plateau leads “nearly eastward” between two deserts (the Empty Quarter desert to the north and the Ramlat Saba’tayn desert in the south) all the way to the

---

At Nahom, Lehi’s party turned abruptly eastward, a direction away from established trade routes.
fertile coast. This totally feasible “nearly eastward” pathway from Nahom is one of the most significant findings in recent years; no one knew that degree of detail about Arabian geography even 100 years after the Book of Mormon was given to the world.

How Long Was Each Stage of the Journey?

Finally, Nephi’s text suggests that much of the eight years in the wilderness was spent in the Valley of Lemuel, in ancient Midian, safely distant from Jerusalem. The valley seems to have been a place for Lehi’s people to regroup and prepare more fully for their journey after the hasty departure from their home. From here, Nephi and his brothers returned twice to Jerusalem to obtain the brass plates (and, as it turned out, Zoram) and Ishmael’s family. Sacrifices were offered here, and it seems clear that Lehi presented to his family their own genealogy, the teachings found on the brass plates, and his own revelations, including his vision of the tree of life. Solidifying the group, Nephi, his three brothers, and Zoram married the five daughters of Ishmael (see 1 Nephi 16:7); Nephi also had at least two sisters who may have been married to the two sons of Ishmael who brought their “families” with them (see 1 Nephi 7:6). The birth of children to all these couples would naturally soon follow their marriages. Jacob and Joseph were also born to Lehi and Sariah “in the wilderness” (1 Nephi 18:7), perhaps in the Valley of Lemuel. All this activity, forming the bulk of Nephi’s desert account, and also a “great many more things” (1 Nephi 9:1), likely took a considerable period. On the morning of their departure, Lehi received the Liahona, perhaps the reason that Nephi could determine directions so precisely.9

In contrast, the other stopping places en route to Bountiful occupy only a few verses each in Nephi’s account and may have been stops only to rest and to replenish supplies. I see no good reason to suppose that the last stage of the journey, crossing the barren wastelands to Bountiful, was much longer in duration than the earlier stages. Despite its many difficulties, Nephi chose to record more positive things than negative about it, stating that the Lord provided the “means” for them to survive in the desert (see 1 Nephi 17:2, 3). This help may have included leading them to large pools of standing water, which remain for months after rare rainfall.

Nephi no doubt saw the parallels between the exodus of his family and the earlier exodus of Moses and the children of Israel.10 Later in the Book of Mormon, Alma, who had access to the Lehites’ fuller account, reveals the reason that they did not progress in their desert journey at times: their lack of faith. As with the Israelites, their afflictions are specified as “hunger and thirst” (compare Alma 37:41–42; Exodus 16:3; 17:3) rather than physical bondage or servitude. This fits perfectly with what we now know of the terrain they had to cover.

“The Place Which Was Called Nahom”

Nahom, the burial place of Ishmael, is the first uniquely Book of Mormon location that can be
verified archaeologically. The wording of 1 Nephi 16:34, “the place which was called Nahom,” makes it seem clear that Nahom was an already-existing, locally known name. It appears that Nephi, knowing that the group would never return to the Old World, was careful to place on record the name of the burial place of Ishmael, his father-in-law. Because it is unlikely that Ishmael conveniently died right at a burial place, his body may have been carried for some distance, perhaps for days, before being given a proper burial at Nahom.

The place-name Nahom is found in only one location in Arabia, and there are some strong clues suggestive of its origin. In Epigraphic South Arabian, the language of southern Arabia in Nephi’s day, NHM refers to masonry dressed by chipping. Because Nahom was a burial place, it is possible that the name originally derived from the construction of aboveground burial tombs. While a local name, to a native Hebrew speaker it held peculiarly appropriate links to what had happened there in connection with Ishmael’s death. The roots of the name refer to comforting, consoling, groaning, and so on; thus there was no need to give the place another name. In biblical Hebrew, one of these possible roots (NHM) is often used in connection with mourning a death. Nephi’s deceptively simple account captures all of these elements perfectly.

### The Nahom Altar Discoveries

The late Ross T. Christensen of Brigham Young University was the first to suggest, in 1978, that Nephi’s Nahom might correspond to a place called “Nehhm” on a 1763 map of Yemen. Beginning in 1984, my research in Yemen eventually confirmed that this was a large tribal area centered roughly 25 miles northeast of the Yemeni capital Sana’a and that the name has survived to the present day. Discovering that travel “eastward” to the coast from Nahom was feasible further strengthened the likelihood that it was the same place Nephi had referred to.

Over several years I was able to document the place-name (the consonants NHM variously spelled as Nihm, Nehem, Nahm, Naham, and so on but always in the same location) in other early maps, in Arab historical references, and in a letter written by the Prophet Muhammad, all these sources referring back to about AD 100, with strong inferences that the name was older still. In 1995 I presented these data at the Seminar for Arabian Studies in England. Scholars agree that the tribe was located where it still is but may have had a wider influence.

Until recently, however, a gap of about seven centuries remained between what could be documented and Nephi’s 600 BC reference to Nahom. In 1997 a German team’s excavation of the Bar‘an temple site near Marib in Yemen uncovered a num-

![Votive altars bearing the tribal name Nihm excavated near Marib, Yemen, date to Lehi’s time. The close-up highlights the inscription NHM (read right to left).](image-url)
ber of inscribed limestone altars dedicated to three local gods. The inscription carved into one of these altars, which had already been dated to between 700 and 600 BC, named its donor as Bi’athtar, the grandson of Naw‘um the Nihmite (or from the place of the tribe of Nihm).18 Latter-day Saint scholars were alerted to the find in a 1999 Journal of Book of Mormon Studies article.19

On 12 September 2000, two colleagues, Lynn Hilton and Gregory Witt, and I identified a second altar bearing the name Nihm at the site. Standing about 26 inches tall, this second altar bore an identical inscription to the first. Two months later, with the cooperation of the German archaeological team at the site, I returned to Yemen and made a complete examination of the temple complex and other altars, one of which later proved to also have the same inscription.20

The text, unchanged on all three altars, refers to the ruler Yada‘-il, who is likely the prolific builder Yada‘-il Dharih II (about 630 BC), or perhaps a later ruler, Yada‘-il Bayyin II (about 580 BC).21 In either case, this places the making of the altars to within decades of Lehi’s day. In addition, since Naw‘um was the grandfather of Bi’athtar, the name Nihm itself must be at least two generations older still, thus dating to about the seventh and eighth centuries BC. The altar discovery was reported (along with a photograph) in the February 2001 Ensign magazine and referred to in the April 2001 general conference.22 In his landmark 2002 work published by Oxford University Press, By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture That Launched a New World Religion, scholar Terryl L. Givens provided the following assessment of the find: “Found in the very area where Nephi’s record locates Nahom, these altars may thus be said to constitute the first actual archaeological evidence for the historicity of the Book of Mormon.”23 The three altars provide irrefutable evidence that the name NHM truly dates to before Lehi’s era in 600 BC, just as Nephi recorded.

Burial Sites in Nahom

Given that Nahom was a place of burial, the 1936 discovery of the largest ancient burial site in all of Arabia close to the boundary of the modern Nihm tribe is obviously significant. This necropolis consists of thousands of circular aboveground tombs built of roughly hewn limestone slabs spread over several ridges,24 dating as far back as 2900 BC.25

At least two much smaller burial sites are also located within the modern tribal area of Nihm.26 With the altar discovery confirming the antiquity of the name Nahom, these ancient burial areas now have a special significance for Latter-day Saints: one is likely the actual burial place of Ishmael.

“And We Called the Place Bountiful”

The sensitive reader can detect the enthusiasm and relief captured in Nephi’s words as he wrote of the group’s arrival at the shores of the Indian Ocean after a journey of some 2,100 miles across Arabia (see 1 Nephi 17:6).27 For those in the party with the faith to see that they had been divinely led, the green vista they had arrived at was truly a place “prepared of the Lord” (17:5). They emerged into a place full of trees and other vegetation, some bearing edible fruit, a discovery that would impress anyone after eight years of desert life; in fact “much fruit” was the very reason Bountiful was so named (see 17:5, 6).

Clearly, the group was also impressed with the vast ocean panorama before them. Nephi recorded a proper name for the ocean, Irreantum, meaning “many waters” (1 Nephi 17:5) and for which a plausible South Arabian origin has recently been suggested.28 Since 1830, however, critics of the Book of Mormon have seen Nephi’s “Bountiful” as a particularly easy target because of its claims of fruit and timber. For over a century, Latter-day Saint writers could only assign the location of Bountiful to a vague “somewhere” in Arabia.

Nephi’s Criteria for Bountiful

No attempt to locate Bountiful on today’s map can be made without first carefully evaluating the Book of Mormon text. First Nephi provides us with an unexpectedly detailed picture of the place, as the following 12 observations make clear.

1. “Nearly eastward” from Nahom. There is a clear directional link between the locations of Bountiful and Nahom. Bountiful lay “nearly eastward” from Nahom (1 Nephi 17:1). Given Nephi’s ability to determine directions in the Old World accurately, we should expect Bountiful to be close to the 16th degree north latitude, as we now know Nahom is.
2. Accessible from the interior. Clearly, the terrain had to permit reasonable access from the interior deserts to the coast, something impossible at some places along the Arabian coast.

3. Surrounding fertility. Nephi’s mentions of Bountiful (1 Nephi 17:5, 7) suggest that a wider area may have enjoyed notable fertility, in addition to that of the initial encampment (see 17:6).

4. Sheltered location. Logically on the east coast of Arabia, Bountiful offered an initial tent encampment (see 1 Nephi 17:5–6) but also long-term shelter. The site had to offer a suitable place like a sheltered bay for constructing and launching a sizable ship (see 18:8).

5. Much fruit and wild honey. Bountiful was named for its “much fruit” and “wild honey” (see 1 Nephi 17:5; 6; 18:6), and perhaps also for its small game that could be hunted (see 18:6). It is likely that Bountiful was uninhabited when Lehi’s party arrived there (see item 11); if so, this would require that the fruit there was not cultivated but was growing wild.

6. Shipbuilding timber. Enough timber of types and sizes to permit building an oceangoing vessel was available (see 1 Nephi 18:1, 2) and seemingly at hand.

7. Year-round freshwater. Year-round water is required for the abundant flora described and the group’s extended stay (carrying water would have diverted significant time from the demanding labor of shipbuilding).

8. Nearby mount. A mountain prominent enough to justify Nephi’s reference to it as “the mount” (1 Nephi 17:7; 18:3) must have been near enough to have allowed Nephi to “pray oft” (18:3).

9. Cliffs. The incident of Nephi’s brothers attempting to take his life by throwing him into the depths of the sea (see 1 Nephi 17:48) makes little sense without substantial cliffs overlooking the ocean. Such cliffs, which typically have rocks at their base, would constitute a real danger, whereas a sand beach would pose little threat to a young man described as being “large in stature” (2:16) and “having . . . much strength” (4:31), regardless of his swimming ability.

10. Ore and flint. Ore, from which metal could be smelted to construct tools, was available nearby (see 1 Nephi 17:9–11, 16); and although it remains possible that Nephi carried flint with him to make fire, some type of flint (see 7:11) seems to have been located near the ore source.

11. Unpopulated. 1 Nephi 17 is full of clues that Bountiful at that time likely had no resident population that could contribute tools and manpower to the shipbuilding process. For one thing, specific revelation from God was required to show Nephi where ore could be found (see 17:9–10); and Nephi expended great effort to fashion his own bellows, locate ore, smelt it, and manufacture the tools he would need. Such basic items would have been easily obtained by anyone living in, or near to, a populated seaport. In addition, Nephi would not have had to rely on his brothers to assist him had local labor been available. Lehi could easily have been directed to bring sufficient wealth from his estate in Jerusalem to purchase a ship had they been in a shipbuilding area. When the time came, the continually dissenting Laman and Lemuel seem to have left Bountiful readily enough for surely their first open-sea voyage, suggesting there was little there to entice them to remain and perhaps return to their beloved Jerusalem. It also seems unlikely that the Lord would have directed Lehi’s group, at such a critical juncture in their journey, to settle where they would be exposed to the pagan beliefs then prevalent in Arabia. Rather, Bountiful may have been intended to keep them apart from other people for that reason. However, the fact that all water sources in Arabia attract people requires us to identify reasons why such an attractive place with abundant water would remain uninhabited.

12. Ocean access. Coastal conditions had to allow access to the open ocean and to suitable winds and currents (see 1 Nephi 18:8–9) to carry the vessel seaward, most probably east toward the Pacific coast of the Americas, as Alma indicates (see Alma 22:28). Travel eastward across the Pacific against its prevailing currents and winds is problematic, however.

Such a detailed and comprehensive description of a locale is unique in the Book of Mormon narrative. While it is true that, archaeologically, only inscriptions could definitively establish that a group lived at a specific location so long ago, from a scriptural perspective the plausibility of the many specific requirements for Bountiful that are embedded in Nephi’s record has been clearly established. By describing in such precise detail a
particular location in Arabia—together with the route to get there, specific directions, and even a place-name en route—Joseph Smith put his prophetic credibility very much on the line. Could this young, untraveled farmer in rural New York State in 1830 somehow have known from maps or writings about a burial area named Nahom and a fertile site on the coast of Arabia? When the holdings of libraries that Joseph Smith and his contemporaries could have accessed before 1830 are examined, the answer is clearly no. Long after the 1830 publication of the Book of Mormon, maps of Arabia continued to show the eastern coastline and interior as mostly unknown, unexplored territory. Even quite modern maps misplace place-names and ignore or distort major terrain features. Not one of the explorers of Arabia in past centuries explored the Qamar coast west of Salalah. In fact, the location in Arabia most closely mirroring Nephi’s Bountiful remained unknown to the outside world for over 160 years after the Book of Mormon was published.

The 1987–1992 Survey of the Eastern Coast of Southern Arabia

During my first visit to Oman in 1987, it soon became apparent that the 60-mile-wide Salalah bay in southern Oman failed to fully match the description of Bountiful preserved in 1 Nephi. The only previous visit to Salalah by Latter-day Saints had been the one-day visit in 1976 by Lynn and Hope Hilton, giving time enough to establish only that many of the required features were present. However, I found that these elements did not come together in any one location in Salalah and that several essential requirements—such as fruit and timber trees and a nearby mountain—were altogether absent anywhere along the coast.
Accordingly, the following year I began a program of systematic exploration of the entire eastern coast of Yemen and southern Oman, soon discovering that the Qamar Mountains west of Salalah had greater fertility than any other areas on the southern coast of Arabia.

When in April 1992 the last segment of this essential survey was completed, it was the first (and so far only) time the entire southeast coast of Arabia had been explored from Latter-day Saint perspectives, yielding objective data in relation to the location of Nephi’s Bountiful.31

Climate and Coastline Change Since Lehi’s Day

A question that naturally arises is whether the climate in this part of the world has changed
appreciably over the 2,600 years since Nephi wrote his account. Also, could the coast be different now in ways that would mask the location of Bountiful? The short answer to both questions is no. Despite reduced rainfall, there has been no significant climate change during the last two millennia, and the ruins of coastal buildings firmly dated more than 2,000 years ago assure us that both coastline and sea levels have not changed appreciably since then.

At this point it is interesting to reflect on the situation had exploration of the Arabian coast not revealed a place matching Nephi’s description of Bountiful. Our only choice would have been to conclude that either (1) the peninsula coast has undergone significant climatic and topographical changes over the past two millennia (for which there is no evidence) or (2) Nephi’s account is not based on historical reality but is fictitious.

Nephi recorded a wealth of detail indicating that he was an eyewitness to the events and places recorded. It was not until completion of the coastal survey in 1992, however, that Latter-day Saints knew of a place on the Arabian coast that could be considered a likely candidate for Bountiful. Hidden from the outside world and largely unknown even within Oman today, this location meets all the criteria unusually well. It matches Nephi’s description detail for detail.

Wadi Sayq winds eastward through mountains toward the ocean.
Making a Match

This remarkable place is Khor Kharfot (“Fort Inlet”), the most naturally fertile location on the Arabian coast, with abundant springs, timber trees up to 40 feet in circumference, and vegetation extending over several miles. Kharfot is the coastal mouth of Wadi Sayq (“River Valley”), a valley more than 16 miles long leading through the mountains from the interior desert. Wild figs, an important staple in Lehi’s world, are prolific, along with tamarinds, dates, wild honey, and a variety of edible nuts, berries, vegetables, herbs, and roots. In addition to small game and birds, the plentiful sea life may hold the key to understanding how Lehi’s group, with its limited manpower, could derive sufficient protein from the environment without diverting substantial time and energy to hunting. A sheltered sea inlet until it was closed by a sand bar in fairly recent times, Kharfot was an ideal location to build a ship.

Towering over the west side of the bay is the obvious candidate for the “mount” where Nephi retired often to pray. A small plateau at its base offers a sheltered encampment and 120-foot cliffs, providing an eminently suitable place to dispose of a troublesome younger brother.

Nephi, whose skills included metalworking, was familiar with gold, silver, and copper (he mentions their presence in the New World; see 1 Nephi 18:25); yet he says that only “ore” was smelted at Bountiful (see 17:16). Although rare, exposed surface iron deposits recently located near Wadi Sayq by BYU geologists could have yielded adequate ore for making Nephi’s tools. Just a few miles inland of Kharfot, huge quantities of chert, a form of flint, lie exposed in limestone seams and nodules over several miles. Several areas of ruins are evident,
with the oldest found at the base of the elevated mountain on the west side of the bay. Such limited remains make it seem likely that the place was uninhabited when the Lehmtes arrived there, thus explaining why Nephi needed revelation for such basic items as tools.\textsuperscript{35}

When considered together, all these factors reveal a location that is completely consistent with the events that Nephi describes, conforming to every detail found in the scriptural account. No other coastal location has all the features that Nephi so clearly described.

**Exploring Khor Kharfot**

With the coastal survey completed, I led two FARMS- and BYU-sponsored expedition teams to Khor Kharfot in 1993. Personnel included FARMS president Noel B. Reynolds, geologist William Christiansen, and noted Italian archaeologist Paolo M. Costa. Dr. Costa later presented a paper about the site at the prestigious annual Seminar for Arabian Studies held in London in July 1993, noting Kharfot's abundant flora and offering a preliminary dating for the human traces.\textsuperscript{36} Data from those expeditions also allowed Latter-day Saint researchers to begin moving beyond the cautious stance that was prudent in the past regarding specific Book of Mormon locales. Late in 1993, for example, FARMS reported the first expeditions to Kharfot as follows:

Khor Kharfot and its environs have all the features mentioned in the Book of Mormon in connection with Old World Bountiful. It has no features that would conflict with the Book of Mormon account. A survey of alternative sites in the Arabian Peninsula has turned up no others that come close to fitting the criteria for Bountiful so well. On this analysis, Khor Kharfot emerges as the most probable site for Lehi's Bountiful.\textsuperscript{37}

A 2002 assessment of Kharfot stated, “There now exists convincing evidence that an obscure location at the extreme western end of Oman’s Dhofar coast, Khor Kharfot, is the probable location of Nephi’s Bountiful.”\textsuperscript{38} Because Kharfot depicts so clearly what Nephi described, a photograph of the site illustrated the 1992 *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* entry on “First Book of Nephi”\textsuperscript{39} and continues to be used to portray the Old World Bountiful, sometimes in official Church materials.\textsuperscript{40} In 1995 Nigel Groom, the leading authority on the incense trade in early Arabia, published a major paper referring to the importance of the discovery of Kharfot and the still-emerging picture of early eastern Arabia as follows:

The recent discovery of ancient sites in the vicinity of Harfut (Kharfot) by Aston and Costa, now being investigated by a Brigham Young University team . . . raises new problems of identifying sites in Dhofar with places mentioned in the early sources.\textsuperscript{41}

Periodic fieldwork at the site by BYU geologists, botanists, archaeologists, and historians, sometimes working with Omani colleagues, has continued since. The identification of previously unknown surface iron deposits near Kharfot, making Nephi’s account even more credible, has been one of the most significant findings resulting from this fieldwork.\textsuperscript{42} Research is also under way with phytoliths (fossilized pollens) in an effort to identify plant species at the site dating back to Lehi’s day.\textsuperscript{43} While fieldwork at the Nahom and Bountiful sites will continue for many years to come, the body of data about both places means that their location is no longer merely conjectural. In the case of Nahom, the location is substantiated by the most powerful evidence of all—inscriptional; at Kharfot, the weight of support rests upon the way that this pristine place uniquely meets an extended, very detailed scriptural paradigm.

Significantly, several very early Maya accounts from Guatemala speak of the traditional place of their ancestors’ departure as a place of abundance, near “Babylonia” across the ocean. Some of these writings go further and also describe the Old World departure point as a “ravine” and a place of reeds, a quite specific description that closely matches Khor Kharfot.\textsuperscript{44} Perhaps in these writings elements of Lehi and Sariah’s epic journey are preserved.

**“Towards the Promised Land”**

We now turn to the resources and possibilities that awaited Lehi’s group at Bountiful.

**Nephi’s Ship**

The long trek from Jerusalem to Nahom took Nephi past several places where ships could be
observed, including Ezion-Geber, the major Red Sea port of his day. However, a vessel capable of carrying a group from Arabia to the Americas clearly requires better design and workmanship than one making brief fishing forays or regional trading runs. Thus the Lord told Nephi that he would be shown how to construct it (see 1 Nephi 17:8), and Nephi recorded that the Lord did “show me from time to time” (18:1) how to proceed. Nephi neither worked the timbers nor built his ship “after the manner of men” (18:2), and his choice of the phrase curious workmanship (18:1) implies that he was building something other than the ships of his day.

Regarding the kind of ship Nephi built, the text offers only three hints. First, the fact that the people went “down into” the ship (1 Nephi 18:5, 6 [twice], 8) suggests a decked vessel, as does the mention of dancing on board (see 18:9). Second, sails and at least one mast were involved since the ship was “driven forth before the wind” (18:8, 9) and “sailed again” (18:22). Third, some type of rudder system was used, because after binding him, Nephi’s angry brothers “knew not whither they should steer the ship” (18:13). As to the size of the ship, one estimate is that a 60-foot ship would be required; however, a smaller, more utilitarian ship seems likely.45

The Period of Construction

With the limited manpower available to Lehi’s group and the need to also attend to domestic concerns at Bountiful, a likely minimum period required for constructing the ship is two years. It may well have taken longer. Nephi records a period of gathering “much fruits and meat from the wilderness, and honey in abundance, and provisions” (1 Nephi 18:6, 8). The account makes it seem fairly certain that no outsiders joined the voyagers. If, as we suppose, their journey was eastward, a minimum of 17,000 miles of ocean voyaging lay ahead of them (see 18:12, 21–22), a journey of at least a year, possibly two. Stops en route for supplies are quite possible, but rainwater, fishing, and stored supplies may have provided the basis for their diet.

Historical Seafaring in Oman

Centuries before Lehi’s day, Oman was at the forefront of Arab sea exploration and trade, building ships that operated to Africa, India, and China.46 Historians have only recently recognized this, a fact that someone in 1830 could not have appreciated.47

Did Nephi Build a Raft?

With the Iron Age technology available to Nephi, his options for building an oceangoing vessel were limited. If indeed a hulled vessel, it was likely a lashed (“sewn”) ship rather than a nailed one. Great skill is required to ensure that the timbers are shaped precisely before being lashed together, a method taking two or three times longer than using nails. Another design possibility is a raft of some sort. Because it required much more timber than other ship styles, the raft concept did not...
develop in Arabia. For anyone building at Kharfot, however—and, very significantly, only at Kharfot—availability of timber was not an issue, and a raft design, more than any other, would have been totally unfamiliar (and thus not “after the manner of men,” 1 Nephi 18:2) to anyone in Lehi’s party. Building a large oceangoing raft would still have been a significant project, but one more closely matched to the materials and labor resources at hand. Additionally, although equipped with sails and rudder like a conventional ship, a raft design offers greatly improved stability and safety at sea. With a broad keel of several layers of securely lashed logs, taking on water and sinking would never have been a concern, and only an unusually powerful storm could have presented any danger. A raft also offers greater deck space (perhaps using multiple decks) for storage, for the growing of small gardens, and for private quarters for each family—all significant factors that were exploited by other cultures that used rafts. Finally, the shallow draft of a raft would more easily allow stops and require less skill in maneuvering than would a regular ship, perhaps explaining why there is no mention in Nephi’s record of any predeparture test sailing.

Archaeologist P. J. Capelotti, referring to the 5,000-mile Kon Tiki raft voyage, makes a general point about the merits of rafts that will strike Latter-day Saint readers as significant:

By its very structure, a raft is a floating warehouse. *They were therefore the perfect vessel to carry the contents of a culture across an ocean.* They are not fast, but they are virtually indestructible. If a conventional sailboat gets a small hole in its hull, it sinks. By contrast, a balsa-wood raft can lose two thirds of its hull and still keep its crew and twenty tons of cargo afloat.

While it may require an adjustment to the cultural assumptions of most Latter-day Saints, a raft design not only meets the scriptural requirements of Nephi’s “ship,” but seems to be the optimal and most feasible structure that could have been constructed at the unique site of Bountiful.

**Modern Parallels to Lehi’s Voyage**

Much can be learned about Lehi’s sea voyage from more recent voyages. One Latter-day Saint attempt in the 1950s focused attention on Book of Mormon origins and the practical realities of life at sea. Since then, better-known seamen like Thor Heyerdahl have demonstrated that the oceans were highways linking different civilizations, rather than barriers separating them. The closest modern parallel to the Lehite voyage, however, was undoubtedly the seven-month voyage from northern Oman to China by the Irish writer Tim Severin in 1980–81 in an 80-foot sewn ship, the *Sohar*, built by 30 men without using a single nail.

While the account of the *Sohar*’s voyage to China is most interesting and instructive, we should exercise caution before drawing too many conclusions. For one thing, lacking a site prepared by the Lord, Severin was forced to use timber imported some 1,300 miles from India, the practice in northern Oman for thousands of years. Nephi, in southern Oman, would not have needed to do the same—the timber trees at Kharfot are very suitable for shipbuilding.
Long ridiculed by establishment science, the so-called diffusionist view—captured so matter-of-factly in the Book of Mormon accounts of the Jaredite, Lehite, and Mulekite sea voyages—is now supported by an overwhelming body of evidence, explicable only by accepting that ocean voyaging has taken place globally for thousands of years.\(^5^2\)

**Did Nephi Require Local Assistance?**

Bountiful was far more than merely a suitable port; it was also a place “prepared of the Lord” (1 Nephi 17:5). This suggests it had all the resources needed by the prophet-led group, including the guidance needed to construct a ship. Nephi plainly states that he was instructed of the Lord “from time to time” (see 18:1, 3) rather than instructed to visit with an experienced local shipbuilder, as some have speculated. Moreover, Nephi emphasizes three times that his ship was not built after “the manner of men” (18:2). Even if experienced shipbuilders had been available to instruct him, they could only have shared information about what they knew, not the long-distance craft Nephi required. To me, Nephi’s unequivocal statements effectively rule out assistance from others outside the group; it is also very unlikely that there was even a deepwater port operating in southern Oman in Lehi’s day.\(^5^3\)

The whole sense of Nephi’s account is that revelation guided the shipbuilding and that the timber and other items needed were on hand, as they are today. Whether viewed from scriptural or historical perspectives, there is simply no need to claim that the resources found at Bountiful and the Lord’s tutoring were somehow not enough for Nephi.

**El Niño and the Sea Voyage to the New World**

As noted earlier, continuing across the Pacific in an easterly direction is difficult in the extreme because the winds and surface currents move in a westerly direction—exactly opposite of what the Lehites needed to reach America. In recent years, however, science has begun to understand a phenomenon known as the ENSO effect. The acronym consists of *El Niño* (Spanish for “the [Christ] Child”—so called because the changed weather patterns commonly reach the Americas about Christmastime—and *southern oscillation*, since these changes commence in the southern Pacific Ocean. An *El Niño* event expands the normally narrow and unreliable east-moving equatorial countercurrent (the “doldrums”) for up to a year or more, thus allowing travel in an easterly direction across the Pacific.\(^5^4\) Once again, science and time vindicate the prophetic writings by demonstrating their total plausibility. How appropriate, then, that the very means that likely allowed Lehi to sail east to the New World, carrying with him the religion of the Christ to come, is itself named after the Son of God!

**Using Nephi’s Criteria to Evaluate Two Candidates for Bountiful**

After decades of research, only two specific locations have been seriously proposed for the Old World Bountiful—Khor Rori, an ancient port east of Salalah involved in the incense trade, and Khor Kharfot, farther west near the Yemen border.

Both sites are close to being “eastward” from Nahom. Both were originally sheltered inlets accessible from the interior, and freshwater, cliffs, and an ore source are common to both. They vary considerably, however, for the remaining six criteria, as shown below. On this analysis Khor Kharfot emerges as the better match for Nephi’s Bountiful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1 Nephi Criteria</strong></th>
<th><strong>Khor Rori</strong></th>
<th><strong>Khor Kharfot</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding area likely fertile (17:5–7)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much fruit and wild honey (17:5–6; 18:6)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipbuilding timber on hand (18:1–2)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A nearby “mount” (17:7; 18:3)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint deposits (17:9–11, 16)</td>
<td>none known</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpopulated area (17:5–6, 8–11; 18:1–2, 6)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Somewhere on the shores of the Indian Ocean, Lehi and Sariah’s long and difficult crossing of Arabia ended. Today we can stand on the beach at Khor Kharfot and gaze inland at trees and other greenery laced with freshwater streams. The air is full of insects, birds, and the sound of waves breaking on the beach. The bulky mountain on the western side of the bay looms even more prominently against the purple twilight following sunset. Perhaps the New World saga that occupies most of the Book of Mormon began long ago at this very location when a wooden ship pushed out into the vastness of the ocean. In such a place Nephi’s spare yet illuminating account comes to life as never before.

This article has summarized compelling reasons to take the Book of Mormon seriously as history. The congruence of so many logical, historical, and geographical specifics, including a uniquely fertile coast nearly eastward from a 600 BC Nahom, argues strongly that the Book of Mormon is no less than its translator claimed for it. Henceforth, only the uninformed can claim that it lacks historical and archaeological support. The discovery of ancient altars, tombs, and the geographical realities discussed in this article—coming forth literally “out of the earth”—is confirming and vindicating the record of Joseph in unprecedented ways in our own day.
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