

INTERPRETER

A JOURNAL OF MORMON SCRIPTURE

VOLUME 28 · 2018

THE INTERPRETER FOUNDATION

OREM, UTAH

THE INTERPRETER FOUNDATION

CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT

Daniel C. Peterson

VICE PRESIDENTS

Jeffrey M. Bradshaw

Daniel Oswald

Noel B. Reynolds

Allen Wyatt

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Kevin Christensen

Steven T. Densley, Jr.

Brant A. Gardner

William J. Hamblin

Jeff Lindsay

Louis C. Midgley

George L. Mitton

Gregory L. Smith

Tanya Spackman

Ted Vaggalis

BOARD OF EDITORS

Matthew L. Bowen

David M. Calabro

Craig L. Foster

Taylor Halverson

Ralph C. Hancock

Benjamin L. McGuire

Tyler R. Moulton

Martin S. Tanner

Bryan J. Thomas

Gordon C. Thomasson

A. Keith Thompson

John S. Thompson

Bruce F. Webster

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Robert S. Boylan

John M. Butler

James E. Faulconer

Kristine Wardle Frederickson

Benjamin I. Huff

Jennifer C. Lane

David J. Larsen

Donald W. Parry

Ugo A. Perego

Stephen D. Ricks

G. Bruce Schaalje

Andrew C. Smith

John A. Tvedtnes

Sidney B. Unrau

Stephen T. Whitlock

Lynne Hilton Wilson

Mark Alan Wright

DONOR RELATIONS

Jann E. Campbell

TREASURER

Kent Flack

PRODUCTION EDITOR & DESIGNERS

Kelsey Fairbanks Avery

Timothy Guymon

Alan Sikes

THE INTERPRETER FOUNDATION

EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS

Merrie Kay Ames

Starla Butler

Kasen Christensen

Jolie Griffin

Don Norton

Kaitlin Cooper Swift

Stephen Swift

Jennifer Tonks

Elizabeth Wyatt

MEDIA & TECHNOLOGY

Sean Canny

Scott Dunaway

Richard Flygare

Brad Haymond

Steve Metcalf

Tyler R. Moulton

Tom Pittman

Russell D. Richins

Alan Sikes

S. Hales Swift

Victor Worth

© 2018 The Interpreter Foundation. A 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization.



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 444 Castro Street, Suite 900, Mountain View, California, 94041, USA.

ISSN 2372-1227 (print)
ISSN 2372-126X (online)

The goal of The Interpreter Foundation is to increase understanding of scripture through careful scholarly investigation and analysis of the insights provided by a wide range of ancillary disciplines, including language, history, archaeology, literature, culture, ethnohistory, art, geography, law, politics, philosophy, etc. Interpreter will also publish articles advocating the authenticity and historicity of LDS scripture and the Restoration, along with scholarly responses to critics of the LDS faith. We hope to illuminate, by study and faith, the eternal spiritual message of the scriptures—that Jesus is the Christ.

Although the Board fully supports the goals and teachings of the Church, The Interpreter Foundation is an independent entity and is neither owned, controlled by nor affiliated with The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, or with Brigham Young University. All research and opinions provided are the sole responsibility of their respective authors, and should not be interpreted as the opinions of the Board, nor as official statements of LDS doctrine, belief or practice.

This journal compiles weekly publications. Visit us online at MormonInterpreter.com
You may subscribe to this journal at MormonInterpreter.com/annual-print-subscription

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>The Word and the Kingdom</i>	vii
Daniel C. Peterson	
<i>The Possibility of Janus Parallelism in the Book of Mormon</i>	1
Jeff Lindsay	
<i>Not Just Sour Grapes: Jesus’s Interpretation of Isaiah’s Song of the Vineyard</i>	21
John Gee	
<i>Celebrating the Work of John W. Welch</i>	37
Steven T. Densley, Jr.	
<i>Changing Critics’ Criticisms of Book of Mormon Changes</i>	49
Brian C. Hales	
<i>Playing to an Audience: A Review of Revelatory Events</i>	65
Kevin Christensen	
<i>“Possess the Land in Peace”: Zeniff’s Ironic Wordplay on Shilom</i>	115
Matthew L. Bowen	
<i>Through a Glass Darkly: Examining Church Finances</i>	121
Larry T. Wimmer	
<i>Unveiling Women’s Veils of Authority</i>	133
Lynne Hilton Wilson	
<i>“Swearing by Their Everlasting Maker”: Some Notes on Paanchi and Giddianhi</i>	155
Matthew L. Bowen	
<i>Two Notes on the Language Used in the Last Supper Accounts</i>	171
Robert S. Boylan	
<i>Is the Book of Mormon a Pseudo-Archaic Text?</i>	177
Stanford Carmack	

The Status of Women in Old Testament Marriage.....233

Noel B. Reynolds

*Easters: The Eternal Atoning Sacrifice Testifies of
the Everlasting Redeeming Savior*.....237

Alan C. Ashton

Approaching Abinadi.....257

Stephen O. Smoot

Abinadi: A Minor Prophet, A Major Contributor.....261

Andrew C. Smith

*“Thou Art the Fruit of My Loins”: The Interrelated
Symbolism and Meanings of the Names Joseph and
Ephraim in Ancient Scripture*.....273

Matthew L. Bowen and Loren Blake Spendlove

Pressing Forward with the Book of Abraham.....299

Stephen O. Smoot

A Valuable Book for the Increasingly International Church.....309

Jeff Lindsay

THE WORD AND THE KINGDOM

Daniel C. Peterson

Abstract: *Members of the Church have been charged since ancient times with the covenant need to share the Gospel message with those around them. In more recent times, this has been described as a need for “every member” to be a missionary. There are many ways that we can do so through the use of modern technology and the dedication of our talents. The “ministry of the word” beckons each of us onward.*

Acts 6:4 describes the ancient Christian apostles as engaged, shortly after the death and resurrection of Jesus, in the “ministry of the word [*diakonia tou logou*].”¹ But, evidently, it wasn’t only the apostles who were so engaged. Acts 8:4 suggests that other early Christian disciples “went every where preaching the word [*ton logon*].” The New International Version (NIV) rendering of the passage puts it slightly differently, saying that those who had been scattered by early anti-Christian persecution that broke out in Jerusalem “preached the word wherever they went.”

Since ancient Greek manuscripts lack capitalization in the sense that English uses it, there’s a possibility that when these scriptural passages describe the early apostles and other Christians as “preaching the word,” they’re referring to “the Word” — or, to express it another way, to the resurrected Lord Jesus Christ, whom John 1:1 terms “the Logos.” (Indeed, in one sense, that is inescapably and necessarily what they were doing.)

I doubt very much, however, that the distinctively Johannine use of the Greek term *logos* is relevant here. Instead, I’m inclined to think that

1. Unless indicated otherwise, English biblical quotations are from the King James Version of the Bible. Acts 6:2 uses similar language to describe the apostles’ reluctance to abandon “the word of God” (*ton logon tou theou*) in order “to wait on tables” or “to serve tables” (*diakonein trapezein*). The noun *diakonia* and the infinitive verb *diakonein* are both related to the English word *deacon*.

the text simply means they were out speaking with non-Christians about the message of Christianity — they were using words.

In 1 Peter 4:10–11, the chief of the apostles (or someone writing on his behalf) counsels his early fellow-disciples in the following manner:

As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. If any man speak [*lalei*], let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister [*diakonei*], let him do it as of the ability which God giveth: that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever.

Perhaps, though, it might be helpful to see this same passage in more modern language. I turn, once again, to the NIV:

Each of you should use whatever gift you have received to serve others, as faithful stewards of God’s grace in its various forms. If anyone speaks, they should do so as one who speaks the very words of God. If anyone serves [*diakonei*], they should do so with the strength God provides, so that in all things God may be praised through Jesus Christ. To him be the glory and the power for ever and ever.

Let’s look more closely at the sentence, “If anyone speaks [*lalei*], they should do so as one who speaks the very words of God [*logia theou*].”

The NIV’s translation of *logia theou* as “the very words of God” is far superior to the King James rendering “as the oracles of God” — far less confusing, anyway, for modern readers. It makes clear that early Christians weren’t merely preaching the Word but that, unsurprisingly because unavoidably, they were communicating the Christian message in words.

Let’s go just a little bit further, though. The word used in 1 Peter 4:11 for “speaking” is the Greek verb *laleo* or (in its infinitive form) *lalein*. It’s the same verb used, in its appropriate conjugation, for the religious teaching of Jesus at Matthew 12:46, for the Savior’s speaking in parables at Matthew 13:10, and for Paul’s preaching at 2 Corinthians 12:19. But it’s also the word employed for ordinary daily speech among ordinary people. It’s used, for example, to refer to idle or careless speaking at Matthew 12:36 as well as for talking with neighbors at Ephesians 4:25 and for general daily conversation at James 1:19.

I want to suggest here, therefore, that the “ministry of the word” doesn’t pertain only to formal sermons. It doesn’t belong only to ordained apostles and Church leaders or to full-time missionaries. I contend that it pertains to all members of the Church, to every Latter-day Saint — and that it can

include not only preaching in sacrament meeting but teaching in Sunday school and in seminary and institute classes. Beyond that, though, it can include teaching in families and even blogging or writing or discussing the Gospel and its principles with friends, neighbors, and acquaintances.

During his concluding remarks at the April 1959 General Conference of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, President David O. McKay said something that has reverberated ever since that day.

In 1923 in the British Mission there was a general instruction sent out to the members of the Church advocating ... “Throw the responsibility upon every member of the Church that in the coming year of 1923 every member will be a missionary. Every member a missionary! You may bring your mother into the Church, or it may be your father; perhaps your fellow companion in the workshop. Somebody will hear the good message of the truth through you.”

And that is the message today. *Every member* — a million and a half — *a missionary!* I think that is what the Lord had in mind when he gave that great revelation on Church government, as recorded in the 107th section of the Doctrine and Covenants.²

President McKay then cited Doctrine and Covenants 107:99–100:

Wherefore, now let every man learn his duty, and to act in the office in which he is appointed, in all diligence. He that is slothful shall not be counted worthy to stand, and he that learns not his duty and shows himself not approved shall not be counted worthy to stand. Even so. Amen.

“That,” he then concluded, “is the responsibility of every man and woman and child who has listened to this great and wonderful conference.”³

Not only have our numbers vastly increased since President McKay addressed a Church membership of 1.5 million in 1959, but our capacity for being missionaries has been vastly enhanced by modern technology. And the obligation continues to rest upon every Latter-day Saint to be a missionary.

“For years,” said President Henry B. Eyring, then First Counselor in the First Presidency of the Church, during the April 2008 General Conference,

2. David O. McKay, *April 1959 Conference Report* (Salt Lake City: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints) 121-22.

3. *Ibid.*

we have remembered the words of President David O. McKay: “Every member a missionary.” I am confident that the day is coming that through the faith of the members we will see increasing numbers of people invited to hear the word of God who will then come into the true and living Church.⁴

President McKay was merely making still more explicit the obligation that is implicit in such scriptural passages as this one from the Book of Mormon in which Alma the Elder addresses a group of new disciples:

And it came to pass that he said unto them: Behold, here are the waters of Mormon (for thus were they called) and now, as ye are desirous to come into the fold of God, and to be called his people, and are willing to bear one another’s burdens, that they may be light; Yea, and are willing to mourn with those that mourn; yea, and comfort those that stand in need of comfort, and to stand as witnesses of God at all times and in all things, and in all places that ye may be in, even until death, that ye may be redeemed of God, and be numbered with those of the first resurrection, that ye may have eternal life — Now I say unto you, if this be the desire of your hearts, what have you against being baptized in the name of the Lord, as a witness before him that ye have entered into a covenant with him, that ye will serve him and keep his commandments, that he may pour out his Spirit more abundantly upon you?⁵

So we’re all, each and every one of us who is a baptized member of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, under covenant obligation to God to sustain and defend his Kingdom and “to stand as witnesses of God at all times and in all things, and in all places that ye may be in, even until death.” Surely this is at least part of what we affirm virtually every Sunday, when — in response to the recitation of a prayer handed down to us from the ancient Nephites — we testify that we will take upon us the name of the Son of God.⁶

The only question that remains is, “How should we do it?” And the answer is, “In every way that we can.” Via the Internet, even shy members of the Church located in the heart of “Mormon country” are now easily and inexpensively able to reach people around the planet. Moreover, where

4. Henry B. Eyring, “The True and Living Church,” *Ensign* (May 2008): 22.

5. Mosiah 18:8–10.

6. See Moroni 4:3; cf. Doctrine and Covenants 20:77; also Doctrine and Covenants 20:37.

we've long had to seek out those who might accept the Gospel, now, via online searches, people who might receive the Gospel — even in remote locations where our missionaries have never yet penetrated — are able to seek *us* out.⁷ And we need to be ready to help them when they find us.

I want to suggest again, though, that commitment to the Restored Gospel will be most firmly established on the basis of a conviction that its principles (along with a lifestyle based upon them) are true, good, and beautiful.⁸

In this regard, the great English Romantic poet John Keats may have been wrong. In 1819, he published his famous “Ode on a Grecian Urn.” (He would live only until 1821, dying of tuberculosis at the painfully young age of twenty-five.) The concluding lines (49–50) of the “Ode” assert that

”Beauty is truth, truth beauty,” — that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

But surely “goodness” belongs in the list as well — unless, perhaps, he intended to include goodness under the category of beauty, which would not be altogether wrong. It seems to me wise, though, to make the triad explicit.

In all of these respects, the Restored Gospel has always faced opposition. Its critics have long claimed, of course, that the founding claims of Joseph Smith and the Restoration are untrue. But some critics have also claimed, and in recent years have claimed very vocally, that the Gospel and the Church that teaches it are, in fact, not morally good and that the principles of the Gospel are actually ugly.

Advocates of the Gospel must, accordingly, counter such criticisms. On the affirmative side, they must demonstrate by whatever means that its principles are not only true but good and beautiful. Some of this work can and must be done by exhibiting the effects of the Gospel in the lives of the Saints:

7. Increasingly, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints itself is using the power of the Internet — an innovation, in its way, as powerfully revolutionary as Gutenberg’s invention of movable type and probably more significant than the steam engine — to preach the Gospel. See, for example, “Mormon Missionaries Expand Online Teaching,” *Newsroom*, March 8, 2018, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, <https://www.mormonnewsroom.org/article/mormon-missionaries-online-teaching-expansion>.

8. For related reflections, see Daniel C. Peterson, “Making Visible the Beauty and Goodness of the Gospel,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scholarship* 17 (2016): vii–xxii, <https://www.mormoninterpreter.com/making-visible-the-beauty-and-goodness-of-the-gospel/>.

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on an hill cannot be hid.

Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.⁹

And it shall come to pass in the last days, *that* the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.¹⁰

Some people seem to expect that the truth, in reality, must be unpleasant. Anything else, they're convinced, is mere fantasy and wishful thinking. Before he accepted the existence of God and eventually became, very arguably, the greatest Christian apologist of the twentieth century, C. S. Lewis was an atheist who was pretty much of that opinion:

The two hemispheres of my mind were in the sharpest conflict. On the one side a many-islanded sea of poetry and myth; on the other a glib and shallow "rationalism." Nearly all that I loved I believed to be imaginary; nearly all that I believed to be real I thought to be grim and meaningless.¹¹

Part of the message of Christianity, though, is that the dichotomy between truth, on the one hand, and goodness and beauty, on the other, is a false one. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* expresses the thought,

All creatures bear a certain resemblance to God, most especially man, created in the image and likeness of God. The manifold perfections of creatures — their truth, their goodness, their beauty all reflect the infinite perfection of God.¹²

9. Matthew 5:14–16.

10. Isaiah 2:2–3.

11. C. S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2017), 209–10

12. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* 1.1.41.

According to the ancient Latin tradition of oratory or rhetoric, the three aims of a serious orator are *probare* (“to show to be real or true,” “to prove”), *delectare* (“to delight,” “to please”), and *flectere* (“to persuade,” “to stir”). Sometimes the triad is *docere* (“to teach,” “to show”), *delectare*, and *movere* (“to stir,” “to affect,” “to move someone to action”).¹³

These three aims seem to me to correspond reasonably well to the triad of truth, beauty, and goodness. People must be informed of the truth or must have it shown or demonstrated to them. But they must also be made to see the truth as delightful, as attractive and beautiful, as something to be desired. And, finally, they must be moved to act upon the truth, believing it to be good and worthy of action.

These are the aims of those who would help others understand and accept the claims of the Restoration. Different people will have varying capacities for doing so. Some may be better at arguing for the truth. Others will be more gifted at illustrating the goodness of the Kingdom and of lives lived in discipleship. Still others will be particularly talented at displaying to people the beauty of the Plan of Happiness and of other aspects of the Restoration. And members of the audience we are trying to reach will respond in various ways to various approaches. No single approach is optimal for all.

That’s why every one of us is needed. “And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee: nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you.”¹⁴

“The Kingdom of God,” the great Reformer Martin Luther is reported to have said, “is like a besieged city surrounded on all sides by death. Each man has his place on the wall to defend and no one can stand where another stands, but nothing prevents us from calling encouragement to one another.”¹⁵

We should all step forward in the “ministry of the word,” just as the early chapters of Acts say the ancient Christians did. But we need not all do it in the same way because we’re all situated differently and equipped with different skills. For some, an important way of engaging in that ministry will be through writing, whether in scholarship or via blogs or in letters to the editor or in notes to relatives and friends.¹⁶ For

13. Thus, for example, Cicero, *Orator* 21.69, and Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine* 4.12, which builds on Cicero’s discussion.

14. 1 Corinthians 12:21.

15. Martin Luther, quoted in Eugene England, *Dialogues with Myself: Personal Essays on Mormon Experience* (Midvale, UT: Orion Books, 1984), 185–86.

16. See Gary E. Stevenson, “Let Us Share Our Knowledge of a Savior,” *Ensign* (April 2018): 28–35.

others, it will be by means of conversations with neighbors, co-workers, clients, patients, fellow community volunteers — the possibilities are endless. And one possibility, of course — it would be a stunning surprise if I failed to mention it, given my position — would be to support efforts such as the Interpreter Foundation, which is trying as hard as its resources will permit to contribute its “widow’s mite” to the building up, the sustaining, and the defending of the Kingdom of God.

Daniel C. Peterson (*PhD, University of California at Los Angeles*) is a professor of Islamic studies and Arabic at Brigham Young University and is the founder of the University’s Middle Eastern Texts Initiative, for which he served as editor-in-chief until mid-August 2013. He has published and spoken extensively on both Islamic and Mormon subjects. Formerly chairman of the board of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) and an officer, editor, and author for its successor organization, the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, his professional work as an Arabist focuses on the Qur’an and on Islamic philosophical theology. He is the author, among other things, of a biography entitled *Muhammad: Prophet of God* (Eerdmans, 2007).

THE POSSIBILITY OF JANUS PARALLELISM IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

Jeff Lindsay

Abstract: *Janus parallelism, a tool evident in ancient Hebrew poetry, is documented at some length by Scott B. Noegel in Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job, which I recently reviewed. Since the authorship of Job predates the removal of the Lehighites from Jerusalem, this tool may have been available to writers in the Book of Mormon. While we do not have the original text to analyze wordplays in the original language, it may be possible to apply some of the cases considered by Noegel to find remnants of related “polysensuous” wordplays that might have been present in the original text or to consider other previously proposed wordplays that may include a Janus-like aspect.*

Recently I reviewed¹ Scott B. Noegel’s detailed work, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*,² a valuable scholarly examination of a unique element of Hebrew poetry. Noegel finds in the Book of Job over 50 examples of Janus parallelism in which a single word with two or more meanings can have one meaning that looks backward to a previous clause and another meaning looking forward to a following clause, adding richness and apparently intentional ambiguity in the Hebrew.

Janus parallelism might have been one of the tools of Semitic poetry known by and available to writers in the Book of Mormon. Therefore, it may be possible to apply some of the cases considered by Noegel to find remnants of related wordplays that may have been present in the original text, or to consider other previously proposed wordplays that may include

1. Jeff Lindsay, “Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job: A Review of Scott B. Noegel’s Work,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 27 (2017): 213–220. <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/janus-parallelism-in-the-book-of-job-a-review-of-scott-b-noegels-work/>

2. Scott B. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009).

a Janus-like aspect. This tenuous exercise is fraught with difficulty and the obvious risk of false positives, but I present a few preliminary results in hopes of stimulating additional research.

Noegel's analysis may give future scholars a handful of tools to investigate further some of the many apparent Hebraic wordplays already noted in the Book of Mormon as well as tools for further tentative analysis of other passages in the Book of Mormon. In the tentative analysis that follows, I have used the fifty-plus examples of Janus parallelism in the Book of Job as a basis to search for related language patterns in the English of the Book of Mormon to see if there may be remnants of an initial Janus parallelism in the ancient text. This assumes that Nephite writers may have been aware of Janus parallelism from their training in the ways of Hebrew poetry or through their study of the brass plates. Interestingly, most of the examples that can be proposed as possibilities come from the writers who should be or appear to be most familiar with the brass plates, including Nephi, Jacob, and Alma.

The task is, of course, terribly obscured by our lack of the ancient text. Looking at a translation complicates the recognition of wordplays, and this is particularly the case for Janus parallelism, where we need to know what word with two meanings was used, and what words were used before and after it. Translation can obscure not only the original words but the order of adjacent phrases. In spite of the difficulties and, yes, the high risk of false positives via the "Texas Sharpshooter Fallacy,"³ some plausible Janus parallelisms perhaps can be rooted out by those familiar with ancient Near Eastern languages.

It is possible that Janus parallelism was a tool that wasn't appreciated or used to any significant degree by Nephite writers. On the other hand, it may have been used with great skill in a few cases that are obscured by the translation. A further complication is relying on the assumption that Hebrew is necessarily behind the literary work of Alma or others, several centuries removed from the Hebrew roots of Nephi and Lehi. Significant changes in the written language may obscure what we can infer from Hebrew wordplays. Nevertheless, regardless of the validity

3. *The Texas sharpshooter fallacy* is an informal fallacy committed when differences in data are ignored, but similarities are stressed. From this reasoning, a false conclusion is inferred. It is related to the *clustering illusion*, which refers to the tendency in human cognition to interpret patterns where none actually exist. The name comes from a joke about a Texan who shoots at the side of a barn, then paints a target centered on the tightest cluster of hits and claims to be a sharpshooter. See "Texas sharpshooter fallacy," *Wikipedia*, last edited 24 October 2017, 21:51, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Texas_sharpshooter_fallacy.

of any tentative findings proposed here, I'd like to encourage others to consider the possibilities of Janus parallelism in the Book of Mormon (and perhaps even the Book of Moses) in future research.

Several Possible Cases of Janus Parallelism in the Book of Mormon

Noegel examines over 50 Janus parallelisms. Many of them involve concepts or words that don't seem to be present in the Book of Mormon, but a handful involve words or concepts in the Book of Mormon that at least can be explored for hints of Janus parallelism. This initial effort aimed at low-hanging, speculative fruit has yielded a dozen tentative Book of Mormon examples of Janus parallelism.

In the discussion below, page numbers refer to pages in Noegel's *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*.

Possibility #1. On page 39, Noegel examines Job 3:23–24 and the dual meanings of וַיִּסְתֵּךְ from the roots סָכַךְ, (*cakak*, Strong's H5526⁴), meaning “hedged in, fenced in, enclosed, cover, covering,” and the root סָךְ, (*cuwk*, Strong's H5480⁵), meaning “pour out, anoint.” In Job 3:23, this word plus the preceding text can be translated as “to a man whose way is hidden, whom God has fenced in.” But if given the alternate meaning of “poured out,” then “whom God has poured out” anticipates “my groans are poured out for me as water” in the last part of Job 3:24. It's a nice example of the two-sided technique of Janus parallelism.

Turning to the Book of Mormon, we find a use of “poured out” in Alma 8:9–10 that may play a similar dual role:

9 Now Satan had gotten great hold upon the hearts of the people of the city of Ammonihah; therefore they would not hearken unto the words of Alma.

10 Nevertheless Alma labored much in the spirit, wrestling with God in mighty prayer, that he would *pour out* his Spirit upon the people who were in the city; that he would also grant that he might baptize them unto repentance.

Satan is gaining hold upon the hearts of the people, and in response Alma seeks to gain a hold upon God as he wrestles in might prayer. If the word original word translated as *poured out* also means “enclosed,

4. "Lexicon: Strong's H5526 – *cakak*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H5526&t=KJV>.

5. "Lexicon: Strong's H5480 – *cuwk*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H5480&t=KJV>.

fenced in, or covered,” then the preceding concepts of “getting hold upon” and “wrestling” may be echoed, while the other meaning of *poured out/anoint* naturally fits the following text regarding the sought-after influence of the Spirit and Alma’s desire that the people be baptized. But this is highly speculative, and those skilled in Hebrew may see this as impossible or improbable.

Possibility #2: In *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*, page 41, and later on page 132, Scott Noegel discusses a Janus parallelism in Job 3:25–26, in which a single Hebrew word can mean “stir up, quarrel with” or “dread, fear.” The Book of Mormon often uses *stir up* for those fomenting anger against the Nephites or the righteous, as well as for righteous people striving to persuade sinners to repent. Thus it is usually collocated with “anger” or themes related to “repentance.” But in a couple of cases, its use is linked to “fear” and thus in theory might be able to function as a Janus parallelism similar to the one discussed by Noegel. Enos 1:23 is one example:

23 And there was nothing save it was exceeding harshness, preaching and prophesying of wars, and contentions, and destructions, and continually reminding them of death, and the duration of eternity, and the judgments and the power of God, and all these things — *stirring them up* continually to keep them in the *fear of the Lord*.

As translated, *stirring them up* looks back to the statement on the need to preach with *exceeding harshness* and continually remind the people of the threats of death and damnation. The proposed alternate reading related to “fear” and “dread” would also look forward to the following statement about the “fear of the Lord.”

A related possibility comes from 2 Nephi 28:18–20:

18 But behold, that great and abominable church, the whore of all the earth, must tumble to the earth, and great must be the fall thereof.

19 For the kingdom of the devil must *shake*, and they which belong to it must needs be *stirred up* unto repentance, or the devil will grasp them with his everlasting chains, and they be *stirred up to anger*, and perish;

20 For behold, at that day shall he rage in the hearts of the children of men, and stir them up to anger against that which is good.

If we interpret the destruction and shaking of the kingdom of the devil with dread and fear, then in verse 19 the word translated as “stirred

up” could be looking backward to the dread the devil faces and the terrifying need for those under his power to repent. But if they don’t repent, they are bound by his chains and, in a repeated instance of *stirred up*, are led to anger and death. If this is a case of a Janus parallelism, it is interesting that the pivotal word is repeated with two instances of *stirred up* around the reference to *everlasting chains*. Both can relate to fear associated with the description in the preceding passages (destruction of the devil’s kingdom and his grasping of victims with everlasting chains), while both can also relate to being stirred up (to repentance or anger). It could function as a Janus parallelism with its face split in two. But here the meanings linked to fear and dread are implicit in contrast to the explicit use of *fear* in Enos 1:23.

The double use of *stirred up* in verse 19 could be viewed as a combination of Janus parallelism and simple alternate parallelism, which is how Donald W. Parry formats it, where these verses are also part of a larger chiasmus.⁶

Possibility #3. On page 43, Noegel discusses a Janus parallelism in Job 4:2–3 in which one Hebrew root, יָצַק (*yacar*, Strong’s H3256⁷), in verse 3 plays a Janus role with its meanings of “bind” (primarily in Aramaic) and “chastise, admonish.” Noegel renders this passage as:

If one tried a word with you, would you not be offended? Yet
who can refrain from speaking?

Behold, you have יָצַק many, and have strengthened weak
hands.⁸

As *you have chastised* is related to the reference to words and speaking in verse 2. As *you have bound* relates to the following *you will strengthen/bind*, where *strengthen* comes from the root חָזַק (*chazaq*, Strong’s H2388⁹). The word pair *yacar-chazaq*, also found in Isaiah 8:11 and Hosea 7:15, strengthens the significance of the pairing in this case of apparent Janus parallelism. Again it is *yacar* that serves as the Janus

6. Donald W. Parry, *Poetic Parallelisms in the Book of Mormon: The Complete Text Reformatted* (Provo, UT: Neal A. Maxwell Institute, Brigham Young University, 2007), 120–21; <http://publications.mi.byu.edu/book/poetic-parallelisms-in-the-book-of-mormon-the-complete-text-reformatted/>.

7. "Lexicon: Strong's H3256 – *yacar*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H3256&t=KJV>.

8. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*, 43.

9. "Lexicon: Strong's H2388 – *chazaq*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H2388&t=KJV>.

pivot word, but the relationship to *chazaq* is part of a pairing that occurs elsewhere in the Bible and suggests that the relationship is intentional.

Mosiah 23 may offer something similar in a passage that begins and ends with a discussion of events in Helam, under the guidance of Alma₁ (the Elder). Here the key word is “chasten,” which is one of the ways the KJV translates *yacar* (e.g., Proverbs 19:18 has *yacar* behind the KJV “chasten thy son”):

18 Therefore they did watch over their people, and did nourish them with things pertaining to righteousness.

19 And it came to pass that they began to prosper exceedingly in the land; and they called the land Helam.

20 And it came to pass that they did multiply and prosper exceedingly in the land of Helam; and they built a city, which they called the city of Helam.

21 Nevertheless the Lord seeth fit to *chasten* [*chasten/bind*] his people; yea, he trieth their patience and their faith.

22 Nevertheless — whosoever putteth his trust in him the same shall be lifted up at the last day. Yea, and thus it was with this people.

23 For behold, I will show unto you that they were brought into bondage, and none could deliver them but the Lord their God, yea, even the God of Abraham and Isaac and of Jacob.

24 And it came to pass that he did deliver them, and he did show forth his mighty power unto them, and great were their rejoicings.

25 For behold, it came to pass that while they were in the land of Helam, yea, in the city of Helam, while tilling the land round about, behold an army of the Lamanites was in the borders of the land.

Here the word *chasten* in vs. 21 with the meaning of “chastise or admonish” fits the following statement that *God trieth their patience and faith*. But if *chasten* in the Book of Mormon comes from Hebrew *yacar*, it could also have a meaning of “bind,” which, as Noegel points out, can be paired with the concept of strengthening. If so, the preceding text may link up with that sense of *yacar*, as it describes the nourishing given to the people and their prospering under the help of the Lord.

An interesting aspect of this passage is that according to the *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, the name Helam may mean “to strengthen.”¹⁰ The name also occurs as a geographical name in 2 Samuel 10:16–17 (הילם, *cheylam*, Strong’s H2431¹¹). While the etymology may be uncertain, *cheylam* has a listed meaning of “stronghold.”¹² Helam obviously comes from a different root than *chazaq*, which is paired with *yacar* in Job 4:2–3 and in two other verses in the Old Testament. Nevertheless, *Helam* instead of *chazaq* with its meaning related to strength could also fit the “bind” or “bind up” sense of *yacar* and possibly form part of a Janus parallelism akin to that in Job 4:2–3.

The sense of “binding” for *yacar*, the tenuously proposed source for *chasten*, not only looks backward to Helam and related concepts in Mosiah 23, but may also foreshadow *bondage* in verse 23.

Possibility #4. On page 60, Noegel introduces a Janus parallelism from Job 18:4–5 based on *rock* and *enemy* being possible readings of a single Hebrew word, צוּר (*tsuwr*, Strong’s H6697¹³), with the concept of “enemy” deriving from the root צָרַר (*tsarar*, Strong’s H6887¹⁴), which can mean “to show hostility toward” or “to bind.”

You, who tear yourself to pieces in anger. Shall the earth be forsaken on your account? Or the צוּר be removed from its place?

In due course the light of the wicked is put out. The flame of his fire does not shine.

Noegel explains that the polysemy at work here involves a word normally translated as *rock* that could, in the purely consonantal text, be read as “adversary, enemy” as well, from a *qal* infinitive construct derived from a word meaning “show hostility toward.” Read as *rock*, the word in question parallels *the earth* in the previous stich, and as “enemy” it anticipates “the wicked” that follows.¹⁵

10. “Helam,” *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, accessed July 10, 2016, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/HELAM>.

11. “Lexicon: Strong’s H2431 – *Cheylam*,” *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H2431&t=KJV>.

12. *Ibid.*

13. “Lexicon: Strong’s H6697 – *tsuwr*,” *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H6697&t=KJV>.

14. “Lexicon: Strong’s H6887 – *tsarar*,” *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongs=H6887&t=KJV>.

15. Noegel, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job*, 60.

If the Book of Mormon takes advantage of a single Hebrew word meaning both “rock” and “enemy,” perhaps we should examine Nephi’s psalm, 2 Nephi 4, which has the Book of Mormon’s highest concentration of the word *enemy/enemies* (seven times in one chapter, with six occurrences in verses 27–33) and also uses the word *rock* in the very center (vs. 30) of the final string of six instances of *enemy/enemies*, with two more occurrences of *rock* in the closing verse, vs. 35. A dual meaning is inappropriate in most of these occurrences, but a Janus function might be possible in verse 33:

33 O Lord, wilt thou encircle me around in the robe of thy righteousness! O Lord, wilt thou make a way for mine escape before mine enemies! Wilt thou make my path straight before me! Wilt thou not place a stumbling block in my way — but that thou wouldst clear my way before me, and hedge not up my way, but the ways of mine enemy.

If the second sentence of verse 33 used *tsuwr*, then *escape before mine enemies* might also have the sense of “escape before my rock,” suggesting deliverance before the eyes or under the oversight of the Savior. *Before my rock* would look back to the first sentence of verse 33 and the beginning of the second sentence of verse 33, both of which are addressed to the Lord, identified as the rock of Nephi’s salvation (vv. 30, 35). But read as *before my enemies* as we have in the English translation, the meaning naturally points to the latter half of verse 33, where Nephi seeks a clear path to escape and asks that his way not be hedged up, but the ways of his enemies.

The tentatively proposed alternate reading of *rock* in this case would not only look backward to *Lord* but forward to *the stumbling block in my way* — a contrasting, negative sense of a rock-like object that instead of providing escape can cut off escape. However, objections to this proposal can be made, including the purely visual nature of the Janus parallelism in Job 18:4–5, which may not fit with whatever punning Nephi may have used here. Further, since Nephi is crying to the rock of righteousness (vs. 35), attempts to use the meaning of *enemy* would seem inappropriate.

Possibility #5: Jacob 7:25 may offer another example of the Janus parallelism proposed in Example 4, building upon dual meanings of *rock* and *enemy* from a single Hebrew word.

25 Wherefore, the people of Nephi did fortify against them with their arms, and with all their might, trusting in the God and *rock* [*rock/enemy*] of their salvation; wherefore, they became as yet, conquerors of their enemies.

If the word translated as *rock* could also convey the meaning of “enemy,” then the *enemy of their salvation* would look forward to the end of this verse, which speaks of the Nephites becoming “conquerors of their enemies.” Meanwhile, *rock of their salvation* naturally looks backward to God in whom they trust.

Possibility #6. On page 74, Noegel discusses a Janus parallelism from Job 21:12-13, which turns on a Hebrew word that can mean both “waste away, consume” and “carry, bear along.” This may be at play in 2 Nephi 4:25-26:

25 And upon the wings of his Spirit hath my body been carried away upon exceedingly high mountains. And mine eyes have beheld great things, yea, even too great for man; therefore I was bidden that I should not write them.

26 O then, if I have seen so great things, if the Lord in his condescension unto the children of men hath visited men in so much mercy, why should my heart weep and my soul linger in the valley of sorrow, and my flesh *waste away*, and my strength slacken, because of mine afflictions?

The reading of *waste away* naturally relates to the slackening of his strength that follows, but the alternate reading (tentatively proposed, of course) of *carry, bear along* might relate to the preceding words about lingering in the valley of sorrow and especially to his body *being carried away* in verse 25. However, this may be too much of a stretch to be a meaningful or logical Janus parallelism.

Possibility #7: On pages 97-98, Noegel explores a Janus parallelism in Job 29:20-23 that includes use of a Hebrew word that can mean “pierce” or “renew.” The relevant root is חָלַף , *chalaph* (Strong’s H2498¹⁶). In the Book of Mormon, Jacob’s use of *pierce* in Jacob 2:9 may use a similar wordplay:

8 And it supposeth me that they have come up hither to hear the pleasing word of God, yea, the word which healeth the wounded soul.

9 Wherefore, it burdeneth my soul that I should be constrained, because of the strict commandment which

16. "Lexicon: Strong's H2498 – *chalaph*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H2498&t=KJV>. For the meaning of *pierce*, see the Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon entry at this Blue Letter Bible page.

I have received from God, to admonish you according to your crimes, to enlarge the wounds of those who are already wounded, instead of *consoling and healing* their wounds; and those who have not been wounded, instead of feasting upon the pleasing word of God have daggers placed to *pierce* their souls and *wound* their delicate minds.

Pierce their souls is obviously parallel with the following phrase, *wound their delicate minds*, but an alternate reading of *renew* would be parallel to the preceding phrases about consoling, healing, and feasting upon the word. Similar parallelism may be at play in another case of *pierce* in this chapter, Jacob 2:35, coupled with the next verse, Jacob 3:1:

35 Behold, ye have done greater iniquities than the Lamanites, our brethren. Ye have broken the hearts of your tender wives, and lost the confidence of your children, because of your bad examples before them; and the sobbings of their hearts ascend up to God against you. And because of the strictness of the word of God, which cometh down against you, *many hearts died, pierced* with deep wounds.

1 But behold, I, Jacob, would speak *unto you that are pure in heart*. Look unto God with firmness of mind, and pray unto him with exceeding faith, and he will *console* you in your afflictions, and he will plead your cause, and send down justice upon those who seek your destruction.

The reading of *pierced* looks back to his words to the wicked whose sins brought the result that *many hearts died*. But an alternate reading of *renew* would look forward to his contrasting words to the pure in heart, to whom Jacob says God *will console you*. The structure of “wound — pierce/renew — console” is essentially the same but in reverse order of what we saw in Jacob 2:9 with the first instance of *pierce* in the Book of Mormon. To me, it looks as if Jacob is deliberately linking *console* to *pierced* in both these cases in Jacob 2 as if there were a Janus parallelism in his original text. Is this merely wishful thinking?

Possibility #8: On page 112, Noegel examines a Janus parallelism in Job 31:35 in which a single Hebrew word can mean both “mark” (as in a visible marking) and “desire.” Perhaps something similar occurs with the only occurrence of *mark* from the small plates of the Book of Mormon in Jacob 4:14:

14 But behold, the Jews were a stiffnecked people; and they despised the words of plainness, and killed the prophets, and

sought for things that they could not understand. Wherefore, because of their *blindness*, which *blindness* came by looking beyond the *mark* [*mark/desire*], they must needs fall; for God hath taken away his plainness from them, and delivered unto them many things which they cannot understand, because they *desired* it. And because they *desired* it God hath done it, that they may stumble.

A reading of “desire” instead of “mark” might be viewed as “looking beyond the desires [of God],” which would relate to the two instances of *desired* in the last part of this verse. The meaning of *looking beyond the mark* naturally fits the preceding passage, which refers to the *words of plainness*, which can be viewed as the written *mark* from the prophets whom the Jews killed. By rejecting those words and the prophets, the result is blindness, which, like *desired*, is mentioned twice before the pivotal word and relates well the concept of a visible mark. In short, this verse has *blindness, blindness, mark/desire, desired, desired*.

One reviewer made the salient comment that this proposal might also work if *mark* referred not just to the desires of God but to the Savior as the Desired One.

Possibility #9: On page 117 of his book, Noegel discusses a Janus parallelism in Job 36:15–16 in which a single Hebrew word can mean “distress” or “confinement.” A similar effect may be proposed for 2 Nephi 4:17–18, if the word translated as *encompassed about* could be related to the word Noegel treats in Job 36.

17 Nevertheless, notwithstanding the great goodness of the Lord, in showing me his great and marvelous works, my heart exclaimeth: O wretched man that I am! Yea, my heart sorroweth because of my flesh; my *soul grieveth* because of mine iniquities.

18 I am *encompassed about*, because of the temptations and the sins which do so easily *beset me*.

A reading of *distress* would relate to the preceding statement about the grieving of his soul, and the reading of confinement or being encompassed about would relate to being *beset* by temptations and sins. Of course, this phrase also fits well with the concept of distress.

Possibility #10. Here we consider another possibility in 2 Nephi 4. On page 126, Noegel discusses a Janus parallelism in Job 39:10–11 that turns on a single Hebrew word which can be read as “deep valley” or “strong.” A related Janus parallelism can be proposed for another part of Nephi’s psalm, 2 Nephi 4:26:

26 O then, if I have seen so great things, if the Lord in his condescension unto the children of men hath visited men [*“me”* according to Skousen’s research¹⁷] in so much mercy, why should my heart weep and my soul linger in the *valley* of sorrow, and my flesh waste away, and *my strength slacken*, because of mine afflictions?

The *valley of sorrow* parallels the weeping of his heart in the preceding phrase, while if *valley* can also be read as *strong*, it nicely parallels *my flesh waste away and my strength slacken* that follows.

Interestingly, references to *valley* in 1 Nephi 2:10, 14 are also immediately followed with words that may be related to *strength* such as *firm and steadfast* and *power*, respectively.

A weakness in this proposal is that it seems to require that Nephi had an underlying single word for “valley of sorrow,” when it would be more reasonable that a phrase is behind this term. However, if an original meaning of *deep valley* has been translated as “valley of sorrow,” the proposal might have more merit.

Possibility #11. An even more tenuous example might be proposed for 1 Nephi 13:34, based on the observation that a Hebrew word, נָגַף (*nagaph*, Strong’s H5062¹⁸), can mean both “stumble” and “smite.” Consider how such a word could fit Nephi’s text:

34 And it came to pass that the angel of the Lord spake unto me, saying: Behold, saith the Lamb of God, after I have visited the remnant of the house of Israel — and this remnant of whom I speak is the seed of thy father — wherefore, after I have visited them in judgment, and *smitten* them by the hand of the Gentiles, and after the Gentiles do *stumble* exceedingly, because of the most plain and precious parts of the gospel of the Lamb which have been kept back by that abominable church, which is the mother of harlots, saith the Lamb — I will be merciful unto the Gentiles in that day, insomuch that I will bring forth unto them, in mine own power, much of my gospel, which shall be plain and precious, saith the Lamb.

Stumble fits the immediately following description of the hindrance created by the removal of plain and precious parts of the gospel,

17. Royal Skousen, *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009), 87, 753.

18. "Lexicon: Strong's H5062 – *nagaph*," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H5062&t=KJV>.

while the alternate reading (tentatively proposed) of *smite* relates to the immediately preceding description of the remnant of Israel being smitten by the Gentiles.

The linkage of *stumble* and *plain and precious* in this passage also seems to have inspired Jacob in the above-mentioned passage of Jacob 4:14, which has its own proposed Janus parallelism.

This proposed example may be critiqued for relying on broad semiotic connections and not the precision of the Hebrew in Noegel's examples.

Possibility #12: Example #11 dealt with the possibility that 1 Nephi 13:34 used a Hebrew word, *nagaph*, which can mean both "stumble" and "smite." This same coupling may be at play in a passage from Isaiah 49:13 as quoted in 1 Nephi 21:13, but here Nephi's version has two added phrases, both of which are needed for the proposed Janus parallelism. In other words, the version of Isaiah that Nephi quotes (or edits) provides a possible example of Janus parallelism not found in our current version of Isaiah. Here is 1 Nephi 21:13, using formatting provided by Skousen,¹⁹ further modified to have the text unique to Nephi's record in italics, and the terms related to a proposed Janus parallelism in bold:

Sing, O heavens, and be joyful, O earth,
for the feet of those who are in the east shall be established.
 And break forth into singing, O mountains,
for they shall be smitten no more [possibly from *nagaph*,
 smite/stumble].
 For the Lord hath *comforted* his people,
 and will have *mercy* upon his afflicted. (1 Nephi 21:13)

If *smitten* comes from *nagaph* and can also mean "stumble," the action of stumbling could look backward to contrast with the firm establishing of feet in the previous stich, while *smitten no more* looks forward to the comfort and mercy the Lord provides in the following text.

In discussing Nephi's apparent use of dust-related themes in the Book of Mormon in a 2016 article for *The Interpreter*,²⁰ I wrote the following about the changes to Isaiah found in this passage:

19. Skousen, *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text*, 67.

20. Jeff Lindsay, "'Arise from the Dust': Insights from Dust-Related Themes in the Book of Mormon (Part 2: Enthronement, Resurrection, and Other Ancient Motifs from the 'Voice from the Dust')," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 22 (2016): 233-77, <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/arise-from-the-dust-insights->

Now the first and third lines are parallel, as are the second and fourth, and the final two lines.

The added word *smitten* might be related to the Hebrew *nagaph* (נָגַף), typically translated as “smite” or “smitten” in the KJV. This word can also have connotations of striking with the foot or striking against the foot. However, the root most commonly used for “smite” in the KJV is *nakah* (נָכָה), which lacks a connection to feet but can also have connections to rejoicing when it describes the striking of the hands together as in applause. In either case, *smitten* may have interesting ties to the preceding words in this verse.

Regarding the first addition dealing with “feet . . . established,” one Hebrew root often translated as “establish” is *quwm* (קָוַם), the same root used in Isaiah 52:1 for “arise.” It occurs as “establish” twenty-seven times in the OT but far more frequently as “arise,” “rise,” or related terms. If this were the word Nephi used and presumably was found in the brass plates, it would fit some aspects of the “rise from the dust” theme. In view of the dust-related themes that follow and Abinadi’s later discourse on another verse in Isaiah 52 (v. 7, “how beautiful upon the mountains are the feet . . .”), I suggest this addition is meaningful and that the combination *feet + mountains + rejoicing/singing* paints a picture of the redeemed ascending the cosmic mountain, Mount Zion or the House of the Lord, where they have risen away from and have been washed from the mundane dust of the world. Freed from darkness and captivity, they have accepted the Lord’s covenant, have put on the Lord’s beautiful garments, and in joy have received the enthronement or endowment of power and grace that the Lord offers. Their washed feet are established on Mount Zion.²¹

At the time, I had failed to notice that the Hebrew word *quwm*²² I proposed for *established* in Nephi’s added text is used by Isaiah five

from-dust-related-themes-in-the-book-of-mormon-part-2-enthronement-resurrection-and-other-ancient-motifs-from-the-voice-from-the-dust/.

21. Ibid., 256.

22. “Lexicon: Strong’s H6965 – *quwm*,” *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, <https://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strong's=H6965&t=KJV>.

verses earlier in Isaiah 49:8,²³ where the KJV translates it as *establish* in the passage *give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth*. This strengthens the case that the subsequent use of *establish* in Nephi's vs. 13 may come originally from *quwm* and thus may be relevant to the "rise from the dust" theme.

In my view, Nephi's additions, whether from his version of the brass plates or his interpretive editing of Isaiah, give Isaiah 29:13 enhanced poetical impact, not only because of the added parallelism that I previously discussed but also because of the possibility of an added Janus parallelism.

If Nephi's added *smitten* in vs. 13 derives from the Hebrew root *nagaph* with possible readings of *smite* and *stumble*, then we find both proposed meanings relate to the following and preceding text as mentioned above. Further, if the root *quwm* was used for *established*, this adds related meanings of rising and ascent in beautiful contrast to stumbling.

Thus, Nephi's use of Isaiah 49 is perhaps not only an intriguing use of the poetical technique of *inclusio* (as discussed in detail in Part 2 of the above-mentioned "Arise from the Dust" series) that adds enhanced parallelism related to his use of dust-related themes through the additional phrases from Nephi, but may be further enhanced with a Janus parallelism found in the unique verbiage in the Book of Mormon. I find this possibility to be especially interesting.

Weaker Examples

Another possibility involves the Janus parallelism in which a single word can mean "singing" or "looking," found in Job 36:24–25 and discussed by Noegel on page 120. This may be at play in 1 Nephi 1:8 and again in Alma 36:22, but the effect does not seem particularly interesting. Could there be anything deliberate in those passages?

Another possibility that also seems weak involves the Janus parallelism involving meanings of *murmur*, *complain* and *lodge* in Job 31:31–32 and discussed by Noegel on page 110. A possibility for a similar Janus parallelism might be found in several places in 1 Nephi where the concept of murmuring is often motivated by the failure of Lehi's family to remain in Jerusalem. Thus, the act of murmuring against Lehi, Nephi, or the Lord is linked to *not* lodging in the comfort of home, and may present possibilities for a related Janus parallelism or two. See 1 Nephi 1:11, 5:2, 16:5–6, 35–36, 17:22–24. In 1 Nephi 4:4–5, Nephi's brothers continue to

23. "Isaiah 49:8 (KJV), Masoretic Text," *Blue Letter Bible*, 2017, https://www.blueletterbible.org/kjv/isa/49/1/t_conc_728008.

murmur and stay at night outside Jerusalem as Nephi goes in to confront Laban, but the sense of *lodge* is not clearly presented.

Mining Other Known Wordplays

In addition to further exploring the potential Book of Mormon presence of Janus parallelisms that Noegel and others have already found in the Bible, another route for future research might be to examine wordplays that have already been proposed within the Book of Mormon, but checking for the possibility of Janus parallelisms in their use. As a tentative example along these lines, consider the intriguing wordplays involving the Egyptian word that can mean “rod” or “word,” as described in detail by Matthew Bowen in “What Meaneth the Rod of Iron?”:²⁴

Further support for the antiquity of Nephi’s imagery is detectable in his own comparison of the word to a rod, a comparison that may involve wordplay with the Egyptian term for “word” and “rod.” Although we have the Book of Mormon text only in translation and do not know the original wording of the text, we can use our knowledge of the languages that the Nephite writers said they used — Hebrew and Egyptian (1 Nephi 1:2; Mormon 9:32–33) — to propose reasonable reconstructions.

We note that the Egyptian word *mdw* means not only “a staff [or] rod” but also “to speak” a “word.” The derived word *md.t*, or *mt.t*, probably pronounced **mateh* in Lehi’s day, was common in the Egyptian dialect of that time and would have sounded very much like a common Hebrew word for rod or staff, *matteh*. It is also very interesting that the expression *mdw-ntr* was a technical term for a divine revelation, literally the “the word of God [or] divine decree.” The phrase *mdw-ntr* also denoted “sacred writings,” what we would call scriptures, as well as the “written characters [or] script” in which these sacred writings were written.

Now consider Nephi’s comparison of the word and the rod in the context of the Egyptian word *mdw*:

24. Matthew Bowen, “What Meaneth the Rod of Iron?” *Insights* 25/2 (2005): 2–3, <http://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1313&index=3>.

I beheld that the *rod* [*mdw/mt.t*, Hebrew *matteh*] of iron, which my father had seen, was the *word* [*mdw/mt.t*] of God. (1 Nephi 11:25)

And they said unto me: What meaneth the *rod* [*mdw/mt.t*, Hebrew *matteh*] of iron which our father saw, that led to the tree? And I said unto them that it was the *word* [*mdw/mt.t*] of God; and whoso would hearken unto the *word of God*, and would *hold fast unto it*, they would never perish. (1 Nephi 15:23–24)²⁵

Drawing upon the relationship between *rod* and *word* based on Bowen's research, the possibility of Janus parallelism may be considered in 1 Nephi 17 as Nephi refers to two miracles conducted by Moses through the power of his rod, though in Nephi's retelling, the *rod* has been changed to *word*, again showing Nephi's awareness of the wordplay, but perhaps showing something more. The stage is set in vs. 22 as Nephi's rebellious brothers complain that the people in Jerusalem were righteous and kept the law of Moses and statutes of God. In response in vs. 23, Nephi asks if the Hebrews would have escaped from the Egyptians "if they had not hearkened unto the *words* of the Lord?" He then recalls that it was the Lord who commanded Moses to lead Israel out of bondage, which was a good and essential thing (vv. 24–25). Then, in vs. 26, comes a potential Janus parallelism:

Now ye know that Moses was *commanded of the Lord* to do that great work; and ye know that by his *word* [*word/rod*] the waters of the Red Sea were *divided* hither and thither, and they passed through on dry ground.

Here Nephi refers to the dividing and smiting power of the rod, the rod of Moses, from Exodus 14:16: "But lift thou up thy *rod* and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it, and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea." But taking advantage of the wordplay between *rod* and *word*, the use of *by his word* can look back to the *words of the Lord* (v. 23) and the fact that "Moses was commanded of the Lord" (v. 26) to divide the sea.

While *his word* can look back to God's words and commands to Moses, if the same word also means "rod," then as a Janus pivot, it also looks forward to the dividing action of the rod against the sea (v. 26) as well as the defeat of the Egyptians (v. 27) and then the act of Moses

25. Ibid, 2.

smiting the rock with his rod mentioned in v. 29, but again changing *rod* to *word*: “Yea, and ye also know that Moses, *by his word* according to the power of God which was in him, *smote the rock*, and there came forth water, that the children of Israel might quench their thirst.”

Many similar situations in which apparent wordplays involve a word with two meanings might also serve as a Janus pivot, with one meaning looking forward and another looking backward. This is a topic for further investigation.

Summary

It may be impossible to find genuine Old World Janus parallelisms in a text translated into English from an original ancient record. Nevertheless, based on examples that have been found in the Hebrew Bible or based on potential wordplays that can be created in Hebrew, it may be possible to uncover some possibilities for further consideration. If these possibilities fit the context well and don't suffer from glaring defects, there may be something to consider tentatively. I am not sure if any of the possibilities proposed above rise to that level, but I hope others with suitable expertise might provide further feedback.

My search for possibilities in the Book of Mormon text relied primarily on taking examples from Noegel and electronically searching the Book of Mormon text for related possibilities. I was intrigued that the possible examples presented above tended to come from Nephi, with further contributions from Jacob and Alma, all men schooled in the brass plates and the techniques of Hebraic poetry. That may have been chance or may owe to my selective bias in expecting early Book of Mormon writers to be more likely to apply sophisticated parallelism than later writers. 2 Nephi 4, the psalm of Nephi, may be particularly fruitful, with three of the proposed examples listed so far.

My hope is that this preliminary and rough examination might stir someone with the required skills to take a more meaningful look at the possibilities. There is no reason why we must require Janus parallelism to exist in the Book of Mormon, but given the sophisticated application of Old World poetical tools in the text, most of which have only recently come to light, it would not be surprising for the real ancient Hebrew man named Nephi and his peers to have occasionally applied such a technique in their writings, if the Book of Mormon is a genuine ancient text. It would also not be surprising for some Janus parallelisms, tentatively reconstructed from English alone, to crop up by chance. While the examples shown above may prove to be of little value, past explorations of the role of various forms of parallelism in the Book of Mormon have

yielded insights in several ways, and my hope is that explorations of Janus parallelism or other forms of polysemy will provide further insights into the Book of Mormon.

Jeffrey Dean Lindsay and his wife Kendra are residents of Shanghai, China. Jeff has been providing online materials defending the LDS faith for over twenty years, primarily at JeffLindsay.com. His Mormonity blog (<http://mormonity.blogspot.com>) has been in operation since 2004. He also wrote weekly for Orson Scott Card's Nauvoo Times (NauvooTimes.com) from 2012 through 2016. Jeff has a PhD in chemical engineering from BYU and is a registered US patent agent. He serves as Head of Intellectual Property for Asia Pulp and Paper, one of the world's largest paper companies. Formerly, he was associate professor at the Institute of Paper Science and (now the Renewable Bioproducts Institute) at Georgia Tech, then went into R&D at Kimberly-Clark Corporation, eventually becoming corporate patent strategist and senior research fellow. He then spent several years at Innovationedge in Neenah, Wisconsin, helping many companies with innovation and IP strategy. Jeff has been in China for five years, where he works with various APP companies and mills in advancing their intellectual property and innovation. Since 2015, Jeff has been recognized as a leading IP strategist by Intellectual Asset Magazine in their global IAM300 listing based on peer input. He is also lead author of *Conquering Innovation Fatigue* (John Wiley & Sons, 2009). He is active in the chemical engineering community and was recently named a Fellow of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers. Jeff served a mission in the German-speaking Switzerland Zurich Mission and currently serves as counselor in the district presidency of the Shanghai International District. He and his wife Kendra are the parents of four boys and have nine grandchildren.

NOT JUST SOUR GRAPES: JESUS'S INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH'S SONG OF THE VINEYARD

John Gee

Abstract: In Jesus's Sermon on the Mount, he heavily references Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard. An understanding of both the original Hebrew and the Greek translation in the Septuagint of this passage helps provide greater context and meaning into Jesus's sermon. In particular, it clarifies Jesus's commentary and criticisms of both society and those administrators in charge of society, especially of the scribes and those that can be considered false prophets.

Latter-day Saints commonly view the book of Isaiah as a sealed and largely impenetrable text. Such a view is understandable, since Isaiah was written over two and a half millennia ago in a very different world and language from our own. Nephi said it was more comprehensible to those who “know concerning the regions round about,”¹ but such an approach has, by and large, been rejected and neglected by Latter-day Saints who would prefer an easier route to understanding. Instead we have pinned our hopes that Isaiah would be “plain unto all those that are filled with the spirit of prophecy.”² We have relied largely on those interpretations provided by Book of Mormon or modern prophets. Another potential source is the words of Jesus. Sometimes the direct commentary of Jesus has been recognized, but sometimes Jesus's commentary is more subtle and easily missed. Jesus's commentary on Isaiah's song of the vineyard is an example of one of these more easily missed commentaries.³ A comparison of the Isaiah passage and Jesus's commentary is informative.

1. 2 Nephi 25:6.

2. 2 Nephi 25:4.

3. It is, for example, missed by Craig L. Blomberg, “Matthew,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A.

The Hebrew Text

Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard takes up the first seven verses of the fifth chapter. It is a sad song, detailing the problems in Israel toward the end of the eighth century BC. The text runs as follows (with my translation):⁴

'āšîrāh nnā' li-ydîdî šîrat dôdî le-karmô
I will sing now for my beloved a song of my beloved for his
vineyard.
kerem hâyāh li-ydîdî
My beloved had a vineyard
be-qeren ben-šāmen
on a fruitful hill
wa-ye'azzeqē-hû
and he dug it
wa-yesaqqelē-hû
and he cleared it of stones
wa-yyiṭṭā'ē-hû sôrēq
and he planted good vines
wa-yyiben migdāl be-tôkô
and he built a tower in its midst
we-gam yeqeb hāšēb bô
and he also dug a winepress in it.
wa-yeqav la-'āsôt 'anābîm
And he hoped that it would produce grapes
wa-yya'as be'ušîm
but it produced sour grapes.
we-'attāh yôšēb yerûšālaïm
And now, inhabitants of Jerusalem
we-'îš yehûdāh
and men of Judah
šîpṭû-nā' bēnî û-bēn karmî
Please judge between me and my vineyard.
mah-lla-'āsôt 'ôd le-karmî
What more could I have done for my vineyard
we-lô' āšîti bô
but I have not done for it?
maddûa' qivvêti la-'āsôt 'anābîm
Why did I hope that it would bring forth grapes
wa-yya'as be'ušîm
although it brought forth sour grapes?

Carson, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007, 29–30; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, Baylor: Baylor University Press, 2016, 40–41.

4. Unless otherwise noted all translations are the author's own.

we-`attāh `ôdî`āh-nnā` `et-kem `ēt `āšer-`ānî `ôseh le-karmî
 And now I will make known to you what I will do for my
 vineyard:
hāsēr mešúkkātô
 Take away its hedge
we-hāyāh le-bā`ēr
 so that it will be devoured.
pārōš gedērô
 Break down its wall
we-hāyāh le-mirmās
 so that it will be trodden down.
va-`āšitē-hû bātāh
 and I will make it desolate.
lō` yizzāmēr
 it will not be pruned
we-lō` yē`ādēr
 and it will not be dug
we-`ālāh šāmîr wā-šāyit
 and thorns and wild figs will be on it.
we-`al he-`ābîm `āšawweh mē-hamîr `ālāyw māṭār
 And the clouds will I forbid from raining rain on it.
kî kerem yhwš šebā`ôt bêt-yisrā`ēl
 for the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel
we-`iš` yehûdāh neṭa` ša`āšû`āyw
 and the men of Judah is his favorite plant.
wa-yeqav le-mišpāt
 and he hoped for justice
we-hinnēh mišpāh
 but behold oppression,
li-šedāqāh
 for righteousness
we-hinnēh se`āqāh
 but behold wailing.⁵

The situation described by Isaiah is that the Lord planted the men of Judah in the house of Israel. He cleared away the land and protected it. He expected them to bring forth specific fruit: justice and righteousness. Isaiah uses a play on words to distinguish between grapes and sour grapes. Instead, of justice (*mišpāt*) the men of Judah brought forth oppression (*mišpāh*); instead of righteousness (*šedāqāh*) they brought forth wailing (*se`āqāh*). There are only two sounds changed in the first pair and one in the second, but the meaning is almost the complete opposite, contrasting the difference between the Lord's expectations and the actual results.

5. Isaiah 5:1-7

To understand the passage, one must comprehend exactly what the men of Judah are doing instead of what is expected. The term *mišpāh* is a *hapax legomenon* meaning it occurs only once in the Hebrew Bible.⁶ The noun derives from the verb (*šippāh*), another *hapax legomenon*,⁷ which is usually translated into something like *disfigure*, or *smite with a scab*,⁸ though the Septuagint has *ταπεινώσει*, *to humble*, *humiliate*. The Akkadian cognate of the verb from whence this comes, *sapāhu*, means to scatter, disperse, disrupt, squander, waste, or ruin financially.⁹

The term *še'āqāh* appears more frequently in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁰ It can mean a cry of anguish, termed the “cry of destruction” (*ša'āqāt-šeber*).¹¹ It is the cry of the crushed Esau when he realizes the consequences of selling his birthright.¹² It is the cry of the Israelites when they lose the Ark of the Covenant.¹³ The Egyptians themselves utter the same cry of anguish when their firstborn are killed.¹⁴ But there is another type of *še'āqāh*: the cry of oppression. It is the cry that goes forth to the Lord and demands the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.¹⁵ It is the cry of the oppressed children of Israel toiling in slavery to an unjust Pharaoh,¹⁶ which comes about because of the oppression (*laḥaš*) of the Egyptians, forcing the Israelites to do what they themselves refused to do. That same cry from Israel comes up because of the Philistines.¹⁷ The cry comes from violence (*hāmās*) and deceit or treachery (*mir mā*).¹⁸ It was even enshrined in the law of Moses: “Ye shall not afflict any widow, or fatherless child. If thou afflict them in any wise, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely

6. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2001, 641; hereafter cited as *HALOT*, Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1996, 705; hereafter cited as *BDB*.

7. *HALOT* 1348; *BDB* 705.

8. Isaiah 3:17.

9. Martha T. Roth, ed. *The Assyrian Dictionary of Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, The Oriental Institute, Chicago, IL: Chicago Press Corporation, 2000, S:151–57, s.v. *sapāhu*.

10. *HALOT* 1042–43; *BDB* 858.

11. Jeremiah 48:5.

12. Genesis 27:34.

13. 1 Samuel 4:14.

14. Exodus 11:6; 12:30.

15. Genesis 18:21; 19:13.

16. Exodus 3:7, 9.

17. 1 Samuel 9:16.

18. Zephaniah 1:9–10.

hear their cry (*ša' aqātō*).¹⁹ Job claims the impious (*hānēp*) have no hope of the Lord hearing their cry because they were more interested in gain;²⁰ instead God listens to the cry of the poor and afflicted.²¹

Isaiah follows his song of the vineyard with a series of specific woes that provide a list of problems he sees as prevalent in Israel. These include (1) accumulating vast tracts of land from acquiring the homesteads of individual families,²² (2) interest in intoxication,²³ (3) adopting evil practices,²⁴ (4) calling evil good and good evil,²⁵ (5) considering themselves wise,²⁶ and (6) justifying bad behavior and punishing those who do good.²⁷ These things draw the wrath of the Lord.²⁸

Since the men of Judah are not producing the results the Lord wants, there is no reason to protect them. The Lord proposes to remove their protection and make the house of Israel devoured, trodden down, and desolate. It will be left to produce thorns and wild figs, plants that are useless and obnoxious. It is not that the inhabitants (the plants) will disappear, but the inhabitants will be devoid of justice and righteousness, just like all the other uncultivated places.

The Septuagint Text

The Septuagint, a pre-Christian translation of the Bible into Greek, provides a number of interesting changes to this passage in Isaiah:

ἄσω δὴ τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ ἄσμα τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ τῷ ἀμπελώνι μου
 I will sing to my beloved a song of my beloved to my vineyard:
 ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ
 My beloved had a vineyard
 ἐν κέρατι ἐν τόπῳ πλίονι
 on a peak in a rich place,
 καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα
 and I surrounded it with a fence,

19. Exodus 22:22–23.

20. Job 27:8–9.

21. Job 34:8; Psalm 9:12.

22. Isaiah 5:8.

23. Isaiah 5:11.

24. Isaiah 5:18.

25. Isaiah 5:20.

26. Isaiah 5:21.

27. Isaiah 5:22–23.

28. Isaiah 5:25.

καὶ ἐχαράκωσα
 and I fortified it,
 καὶ ἐφύτευσα ἄμπελον σωρηχ
 and I planted a vineyard of Sorech,
 καὶ ᾠκοδόμησα πύργον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτοῦ
 and I built a tower in the midst of it,
 καὶ προλήνιον ὠρυξα ἐν αὐτῷ
 and I dug a winepress in it,
 καὶ ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλὴν ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀκάνθας
 and I expected it to produce grapes but it produced thorns.
 καὶ νῦν ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἰουδα
 And now, man of Judah,
 καὶ οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν ἱερουσαλημ
 and inhabitants in Jerusalem,
 κρίνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἄμπελῶνός μου
 judge between me and my vineyard.
 τί ποιήσω ἔτι τῷ ἄμπελῶνί μου
 What shall I still do to my vineyard
 καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησα αὐτῷ
 and I have not done to it
 διότι ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι σταφυλὴν ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀκάνθας
 because I expected it to produce grapes and it produced thorns?
 νῦν δὲ ἀναγγελῶ ὑμῖν τί ποιήσω τῷ ἄμπελῶνί μου
 Now I will announce to you what I will do to my vineyard:
 ἀφελῶ τὸν φραγμὸν αὐτοῦ
 I will take away its fence,
 καὶ ἔσται εἰς διαρπαγὴν
 and it will be for plunder,
 καὶ καθελῶ τὸν τοῖχον αὐτοῦ
 and I will pull down its wall,
 καὶ ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα
 and it will be for treading down,
 καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἄμπελῶνά μου
 and I will destroy my vineyard,
 καὶ οὐ μὴ τμηθῆ
 and it will not be harvested,
 οὐδὲ μὴ σκαφῆ
 neither dug at all,
 καὶ ἀναβήσεται εἰς αὐτὸν ὡς εἰς χέρσον ἄκανθα
 and in it will come up barren thorns,

καὶ ταῖς νεφέλαις ἐντελοῦμαι τοῦ μὴ βρέξαι εἰς αὐτὸν ὑετόν
 and I will command the clouds to not drop rain in it.
 ὁ γὰρ ἀμπελῶν κυρίου σαβαωθ οἶκος τοῦ ἰσραηλ ἐστίν
 For the vineyard of the Lord of Sabaoth is the house of Israel
 καὶ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ ἰουδα νεόφυτον ἠγαπημένον
 and the man of Judah is his beloved shoot.
 ἔμεινα τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίσιν
 I expected it to produce judgment
 ἐποίησεν δὲ ἀνομίαν
 but it produced iniquity,
 καὶ οὐ δικαιοσύνην ἀλλὰ κραυγὴν
 and not righteousness but a cry.²⁹

The Septuagint translators encountered a number of difficulties in their translation and solved them in a number of ways. Some of these are interesting, and one is important.

One problem was what to do with the Hebrew term *śōrēq*.³⁰ This appears to be a variety of grape,³¹ but the translators took it as a place name,³² which may have been the source of the grape variety.

More important is what the translators did with the term *be' ušim*.³³ In later Hebrew, this term means grapes that are either rotting³⁴ or in the early stage and not yet ripe³⁵ and thus highly acidic. The phenomenon was known to Aesop in his fable of the fox and the grapes; because the fox could not reach the grapes, he claimed that they were not yet ripe (ὄμφακες) and thus sour,³⁶ which is the source of the English expression *sour grapes* for denigrating something one was unable to attain. The Septuagint translators, however, connected this with a similar term, *bā'šā*,³⁷ that appears in Job, where it means something like thorns.³⁸ Where the grapes of Isaiah are either fermented because they are overripe or sour because they are unripe, the grapes of the Septuagint are not

29. Isaiah 5:1-7 LXXX

30. HALOT 1314; BDB 977.

31. Jeremiah 2:21.

32. Judges 16:4.

33. HALOT 107; BDB 93.

34. Mishnah Terumot 10.2.

35. Ibid., 1.2.

36. Aesop, *Fables*, 15a, in *Corpus Fabularum Aesopicarum*, ed. A. Hausrath, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1970, 1:21–22.

37. HALOT 107; BDB 93.

38. Job 31:40.

grapes at all, but rather thorns. It is this difference — highlighted in the Septuagint — that is crucial to understanding Jesus’s interpretation.

Jesus’s Interpretation

Jesus builds from Isaiah’s parable in the Sermon on the Mount. The gospels and documentary texts from Jesus’s day record a mixture of Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew in use.³⁹ Jesus could have given his sermon in Greek, or He may originally have used the same Hebrew terms as Isaiah did. In the latter case, Matthew, who put Jesus’s words into Greek, used the Septuagint’s wording to preserve the original allusion for a Greek speaking audience. This allusion, unfortunately, is lost in our current translations. Since “we believe the Bible to be the word of God as far as it is translated correctly,”⁴⁰ we should not be averse to insights from the original languages. The passage runs as follows:

Προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ψευδοπροφητῶν,
 Beware of false prophets
 οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ἐνδύμασιν προβάτων,
 which come to you in sheep’s clothing
 ἔσωθεν δέ εἰσιν λύκοι ἄρπαγες.
 But inwardly are rapacious wolves.
 ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς·
 From their fruits you will recognize them.
 μῆτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλὰς
 They do not gather from thorns grapes
 ἢ ἀπὸ τριβόλων σῦκα;
 or from thistles figs.
 οὕτως πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ,
 Likewise every good tree produces good fruit,
 τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ·
 but the rotten tree produces rotten fruit.
 οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν,
 It is not possible for a good tree to produce wicked fruit,
 οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.
 Nor a rotten tree to produce good fruit

39. Mark 5:41; 7:26–27; 15:22, 34; Luke 23:38; John 1:38, 41; 5:2; 18:33–38; 19:13, 17, 19–20; Acts 21:37, 40; 22:2; Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judean Desert and Related Material*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University, 2000.

40. Articles of Faith 1:8.

πάνδένδρονμηποιούνκαρπὸνκαλὸνἐκκόπτεταικαὶεἰςπῦρβάλλεται.

Every tree that does not produce good fruit is cut down and thrown on the fire.

ἄρα γε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτούς.

So from their fruits you will recognize them.⁴¹

The reference to gathering grapes from thorns would have been recognizable not just to Jesus's audience but to any early Christian versed in the Septuagint. They would have recognized the reference to Isaiah's song of the vineyard, although it is obscured by some modern translations. Those who recognized the allusion would have brought the associations of misconduct from Isaiah into Jesus's parable.

Jesus labels the false prophets as rapacious wolves (λύκοι ἄρπαγες).⁴² This is similar to his comparison of the scribes and Pharisees as whited sepulchers which look nice on the outside but inwardly are full of plunder and lack of restraint (ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας).⁴³ Plundering or seizing the goods of others is repeatedly condemned in the New Testament⁴⁴ and other early Christian literature,⁴⁵ but examples are not given other than the mention of the "confiscation of your possessions" (τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν).⁴⁶ Examples can be found in the Septuagint, however. The spoils (ἀρπαγῆς) of lions are found in their dens,⁴⁷ and such behavior is most closely associated with lions⁴⁸ and wolves.⁴⁹ Isaiah condemns those who write wicked laws that allow them to deprive orphans of judgment and "seize the decisions from the poor of my people" (ἀρπάζοντες κρίμα πενήτων τοῦ λαοῦ μου),⁵⁰ and thus widows are simply targets to be robbed and deprived of their rights (χήραν εἰς ἀρπαγὴν).⁵¹ Isaiah sees this as a particular problem among the elders and the rulers of the people (μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῦ λαοῦ

41. Matthew 7:15-20.

42. Matthew 7:15.

43. Matthew 23:25.

44. Luke 11:39; 18:11; 1 Corinthians 5:10; 6:10.

45. Didache 5:1; Barnabas 10:10; 20:1.

46. Hebrews 10:34.

47. Nahum 2:13 LXX = 2:12 KJV; ἀρπαγῆς = Hebrew *torēp*.

48. Psalms 21:14 LXX = 22:13 KJV ὁ ἀρπάζων = Hebrew *torēp*; Ezekiel 19:3 τοῦ ἀρπάζειν ἀρπάγματα = Hebrew *liṭrāp-terep*, 19:6 ἀρπάζειν ἀρπάγματα = Hebrew *liṭrāp-terep*; 22:25 LXX; ἀρπάζοντες ἀρπάγματα = Hebrew *torpē tārep*.

49. Ezekiel 22:27 LXX; ἀρπάζοντες ἀρπάγματα = Hebrew *torpē tārep*.

50. Isaiah 10:2 LXX; ἀρπάζοντες = Hebrew *ligzol*.

51. Isaiah 10:2 LXX; ἀρπαγὴν = Hebrew *šelālām*.

καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ).⁵² The writer of Ecclesiastes describes this “perversion of justice” (ἀρπαγὴν κρίματος).⁵³ Mostly it refers to the “stealing of money” (τὴν τῶν χρημάτων ἀρπαγὴν)⁵⁴ or forcefully taking away someone else’s goods.⁵⁵ Two Hebrew terms are translated by it: *gāzāl* means “to tear away, rob; to take illegitimately,”⁵⁶ and *tārap* means “to seize by force.”⁵⁷ The Law of Moses demanded that the offender “give back the thing that had been taken away” (ἀποδοῦ τὸ ἄρπαγμα ὃ ἤρπασεν) and adding a fifth of its value to it as well as a trespass offering (*ʾašām*) as part of the conditions for repentance for this sin.⁵⁸

There is a difference, however, in Jesus’s interpretation of the Song of the Vineyard and the way it is presented in Isaiah. In Isaiah, the society is rotten and will be destroyed. Jesus recognizes the role of the individual in the society. The source of the injustice in the society is false prophets (ψευδοπροφητῶν). The term for false prophets is ambiguous and could include those that were never prophets or those who had legitimately been prophets who were acting in ways contrary to their calling. In the Septuagint, those who tried to kill Jeremiah included priests and false prophets (οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται) indicating that some legitimately held their offices,⁵⁹ but the term is also used as a general one for imposters.⁶⁰ Early Christians recognized that true and false prophets would be difficult to distinguish.⁶¹ Jesus identified these false prophets as being involved in usurpation (ἄρπαγες), illegitimately taking that which belongs to others. In a world of limited communication and opportunities to get to know general Church leaders, the early Christians made it a rule that someone claiming to be a Church leader who came into town and asked someone to give him money was a false prophet⁶² and should not be obeyed.⁶³ Jesus elsewhere notes that there would be many false

52. Isaiah 3:14 LXX; ἀρπαγὴ = Hebrew *gezēlat*.

53. Ecclesiastes 5:7 LXX, 5:8 in KJV; ἀρπαγὴν = Hebrew *gēzel*.

54. 4 Maccabees 4:10.

55. Leviticus 5:21 LXX = 6:2 KJV; ἀρπαγῆς = Hebrew *gāzēl*.

56. HALOT 186; BDB 159–60; Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, London: Luzac & Co., 1903, 1:230.

57. Ibid., 380; BDB 382–83; Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, 1:555–57.

58. Leviticus 5:23–24 LXX = 6:4–5 KJV; τὸ ἄρπαγμα ὃ ἤρπασεν = Hebrew *haggezēl ʾašer gāzāl*.

59. Jeremiah 6:13; 33:7–8, 11, 16; 36:1 LXX.

60. Jeremiah 34:9 LXX.

61. Shepherd of Hermas, Mandates 11:7.

62. Didache 11:6.

63. Ibid., 11:12.

prophets who would arise and deceive many,⁶⁴ including, if possible, the elect.⁶⁵ Such false prophets will be well spoken of and generally well regarded (καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι).⁶⁶ Early Christian leaders warned that such false prophets brought in “destructive factions” (αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας).⁶⁷ The early Christians also designated as false prophet one who “does not do what he teaches.”⁶⁸ Early Christians also taught that “in the last days false prophets and corrupters will increase and they will turn the sheep into wolves and love will turn into hate.”⁶⁹ A false prophet, early Christians warned, would “destroy the understanding of the servants of God”⁷⁰ because he would speak to those who were of two minds (δίψυχοι) who wanted to be “like the world” (ὡς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη) “after their lusts and after the desires of their wickedness and fill their souls as they wish.”⁷¹ Thus the specific counsel to look at the fruits of such leaders was appropriate. Early Christians thus knew that true and false prophets could be distinguished by their way of life (ζωῆς)⁷² and the ways and means (τρόπων) they used to accomplish their objectives.⁷³

By locating the root of the problem in society with the leaders who led falsely, Jesus identifies them as accountable for the actions of the society they corrupt. Later in his ministry he was more explicit when he attributed the same problem to the scribes (γραμματεῖς) and Pharisees.⁷⁴

The Pharisees are perhaps the better known of these two classes. While it is often thought that Rabbinic Judaism is a descendent of the Pharisees, the Mishnah itself is somewhat ambivalent toward them. It notes that the Pharisees and the Sadducees opposed each other and took opposite positions, particularly on fine points concerning purity.⁷⁵ The Pharisees also opposed the Galilean heretic (presumably Jesus) on divorce.⁷⁶ They interpreted a number of situations pertaining to food as

64. Matthew 24:11.

65. Matthew 24:24; Mark 13:22.

66. Luke 6:26.

67. 2 Peter 2:1.

68. Didache 11:10.

69. Ibid., 16:3.

70. Shepherd of Hermas, Mandates 11:1.

71. Ibid., 11:2.

72. Ibid., 11:7.

73. Didache 11:8.

74. Matthew 23.

75. Mishnah Yadaim 4:6–7.

76. Ibid., 4:8.

doubtful.⁷⁷ The Pharisees seem to have regarded themselves as purer than the common folk, but for those engaged in the service at the temple, the Pharisees were unclean.⁷⁸ According to the Mishnah, the humiliations caused by the Pharisees weary the world.⁷⁹

While the Pharisees as a group are generally known, the role of the scribes in Jesus's day is worth considering. They are, after all, listed first. The tendency to think of scribes as principally responsible for the copying of books — which they were⁸⁰ — obscures their larger role in society. Scribes served as the bureaucracy and administrators of the ancient world. The existence of a scribal class depends on the need to keep records, and the greatest generator of records in ancient societies was the state. “The right hand man, so to speak, of the strategus was the royal scribe. After the royal scribes there were a series of lesser officials (district scribes, village scribes, village elders, magistrates and town councillors, liturgists) whose administrative responsibilities are rather clear.”⁸¹ As such, a scribe was seen as a very prestigious occupation.⁸² Scribes were used to collect taxes and draw up contracts. Even in a fairly large place, the number of scribes was probably very small.⁸³ Notaries were used in drawing up contracts.⁸⁴ Scribes working for the empire were “usually associated with documentation, such as the census and the land survey. They were however probably also responsible for receipts for taxes in kind.”⁸⁵ Work on census and land surveys could require extensive travel.⁸⁶ Scribes were also associated with tax farming:

“Each year in each tax district, the tax-farmers bid for the revenues of the tax, which went to the highest bidder. If

77. Mishnah Tohorot 4:12.

78. Mishnah Hagigah 2:7.

79. Mishnah Sotah 3:3 (3:4).

80. Lincoln Blumell, *Lettered Christians: Christians, Letters, and Late Antique Oxyrhynchus*, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 2012, 177.

81. *Ibid.*, 128.

82. Mishnah Nedarim 9:2.

83. Brian Muhs, *Receipts, Scribes, and Collectors in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011, 213; Carolin Arlt, “Die thebanischen Notare,” in *Actes du IXe Congrès International des Études Démotiques*, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle, Cairo: Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale du Caire, 2009, 30–32.

84. Mishnah Gittin 3:1; 7:2; 8:8; 9:8; Arlt, “Die thebanischen Notare,” 29–30.

85. Muhs, *Receipts, Scribes, and Collectors in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, 214; Blumell, *Lettered Christians*, 105.

86. Blumell, *Lettered Christians*, 106.

at the end of the year the revenues of the tax exceeded the winning bid, the tax farmer made a profit. If however the revenues were less than the winning bid, they had to pay the difference to the state. Tax-farmers were thus required to present securities worth more than their bid. The tax-farmers could hire as many tax-collectors as they wished, but they were required to pay the tax-collectors a fixed wage, which was deducted from the tax revenues. They could hire more tax-collectors to ensure a thorough collection of taxes, but the extra tax-collectors would cut into their profits. Tax farmers had to submit accounts of revenues collected and wages paid each month, and all accounts had to be balanced within ten days of the end of the tax-farming period.”⁸⁷

The tax collectors hired scribes to keep their accounts.⁸⁸ Another scribe (ἀντιγραφεύς) served the government as an auditor.⁸⁹ While some scribes were employed only as long as the tax farmer who employed them won the bid that year,⁹⁰ other sorts of scribes “seem to have had long term appointments, possibly lifelong and hereditary.”⁹¹ Scribes associated with the temple seem to have been from priestly families and functioned as scribes as part of other temple duties.⁹² Scribes were also involved in the banking industry.⁹³ Scribes were generally necessary even for the literate if one wanted to write a letter.⁹⁴ Thus, Paul notes when he personally adds an appendix to a dictated letter⁹⁵ and expresses some pride in writing a long letter with his own hand without the aid of a scribe.⁹⁶ Some scribes, however, have been known to change the sentiments and contents of what they wrote to suit their own predilections.⁹⁷ So a corrupt scribe could cause a great deal of mischief, and since he controlled both the

87. Muhs, *Receipts, Scribes, and Collectors in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, 219, 258 (I have tacitly corrected an obvious typo); Sherman L. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938, 286.

88. *Ibid.*, 220.

89. Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt*, 286.

90. Muhs, *Receipts, Scribes, and Collectors in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*, 232–33.

91. *Ibid.*, 237.

92. *Ibid.*, 239.

93. *Ibid.*, 254–55.

94. Blumell, *Lettered Christians*, 23.

95. 1 Corinthians 16:21–24.

96. Galatians 6:11.

97. Blumell, *Lettered Christians*, 23–25.

documents and the bureaucratic apparatus, there was often no recourse to the corruption of the scribe.

Therefore, an appropriate way to translate the term for scribe is *administrator or bureaucrat*. Jesus's condemnations make more sense in terms of their role as bureaucrats rather than their role as copyists. The scribes, after all, were in charge of the tithes of mint and anise and cumin⁹⁸ and responsible for recording the gifts laid on the altars⁹⁹ and exchanging them for the gold to decorate the temple.¹⁰⁰ Significantly, the more detailed exposition of the crimes of the scribes and Pharisees coincides with and matches the earlier condemnation of the false prophets.

So for Jesus, the corruption of the rulers and the bureaucracy causes the corruption of the people and thus he provides specific warning about how to recognize corrupt leaders.

Jesus's interpretation of the Song of the Vineyard was given in the Sermon on the Mount. Large crowds from all over the area had been present — Galilee, the Decapolis (on the other side of the Sea of Galilee), Judea, Jerusalem, and trans-Jordan are all explicitly mentioned.¹⁰¹ When Jesus went up the mount, however, only his disciples — those who had been baptized¹⁰² — followed him.¹⁰³ These are the group to which the instructions were given. This group was asked to beware of false prophets and told how to judge if a leader or purported leader was or had become a false prophet. Similarly in the Book of Mormon, the injunction was part of the Sermon at the Temple and was given “to the multitude,”¹⁰⁴ which consisted of those “gathered together, of the people of Nephi, round about the temple which was in the land Bountiful,”¹⁰⁵ and who were “the more righteous part of the people.”¹⁰⁶

In the Sermon on the Mount, this injunction comes between two other sections. It follows the observation that not many people follow the straight and narrow path to life, but most prefer the broad and easy way to destruction.¹⁰⁷ It precedes the warning that simply claiming to be a follower of Jesus will not be enough to secure entrance into the

98. Matthew 23:23.

99. Matthew 23:18–19.

100. Matthew 23:16–17.

101. Matthew 4:25.

102. Matthew 28:19.

103. Matthew 5:1.

104. 3 Nephi 14:1.

105. 3 Nephi 11:1.

106. 3 Nephi 10:12.

107. Matthew 7:13–14.

kingdom of heaven but that one must actually do the will of God.¹⁰⁸ Notably it describes the fate of the false prophets in the final judgment and underscores that they will have thought they were doing the will of God.¹⁰⁹ Elsewhere Jesus had warned his disciples that “whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.”¹¹⁰ The implication of the juxtapositions is that false prophets will lead individuals on the broad path to destruction and think they are serving God by doing so.

Another difference between the two passages is apparent in the larger context. As opposed to Isaiah, who prophesies that the society will be destroyed in this life, Jesus pushes the punishment to the next life. Church members are to discern true from false prophets by their works — though both will claim, and probably think, they are doing the will of God — but it is at the final judgment that the false prophets will discover, to their horror, that they were not doing the will of God after all. Isaiah was making a specific prophecy about ancient Israel, one that came to pass when Israel was exiled. Jesus is providing a more general application of Isaiah's parable.

Conclusion

We have seen how the Hebrew text of Isaiah's Song of the Vineyard was changed in the Septuagint. On the basis of a similar-sounding word, unpalatable grapes were changed to thorns. This image is taken over and elaborated by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus has the same message as Isaiah but shifts from a general condemnation of society to a condemnation of those administrators in charge of the society, who corrupt it. Jesus describes those who corrupt society as greedy individuals who seize money and property that does not belong to them. He points out that they may be detected by their works more than their words. He also shifts the comparison from a prophecy about a specific group at a specific time to a more general application whose fulfillment might not be in this life.

If we take this all as an academic exercise, then we are missing the point. We cannot simply look back at the corruption in Isaiah's day or Jesus's day and shake our heads. We must learn to be wiser than they

108. Matthew 7:21–23.

109. Matthew 7:22–23.

110. John 16:2 KJV.

have been.¹¹¹ We must bring forth fruits suitable for repentance¹¹² and not just sour grapes.

John Gee is the William (Bill) Gay Research Chair and a Senior Research Fellow at the Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship at Brigham Young University.

111. Mormon 9:31.

112. Matthew 3:8; Alma 12:15; 13:13; Moroni 6:1; D&C 84:58.

CELEBRATING THE WORK OF JOHN W. WELCH

Steven T. Densley Jr.

A review of Paul Y. Hoskisson & Daniel C. Peterson, eds., *To Seek the Law of the Lord: Essays in Honor of John W. Welch*, The Interpreter Foundation, 2017, 543 pages. \$24.95 (paperback).

Abstract: In this collection of articles gathered in honor of John W. Welch, a wide variety of subjects are explored by authors from many different disciplines. Like the work of Professor Welch himself, these articles draw on scholarship from varied fields of study and provide many interesting and valuable insights.

A *festschrift* is a collection of writings in honor of a respected scholar. The word itself is German and can be translated as “a celebratory writing.” This particular *festschrift* begins with a celebration of the life and work of John W. Welch by colleagues and friends of Professor Welch including James R. Rasband, Paul Y. Hoskisson, Daniel C. Peterson, and Stephen E. Robinson.

Known to many as Jack, Professor Welch has been a law professor at the J. Reuben Clark Law School since its founding in 1979. While he is an accomplished legal scholar, he is best-known for his discovery of chiasmus in the Book of Mormon while he was a missionary in Germany in 1967. While that was the discovery of a lifetime, Jack’s additional contributions are staggering. He instituted the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies (FARMS) in 1979. Since 1991, he has been the editor in chief of *BYU Studies*. He played a major role in the publication of the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*. In 2010, he was designated the Karl G. Maeser Distinguished Faculty Lecturer, the

most prestigious award given by BYU. And most recently, he oversaw the creation of Book of Mormon Central, a website dedicated to sharing the scholarship related to the Book of Mormon with lay audiences all over the world.

Aside from these major accomplishments, Welch has been instrumental in many other significant projects, such as forming the “Biblical Law and Latter-day Saints” and the “Bible” groups within the Society of Biblical Literature, helping to bring the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit to BYU, helping to organize the exhibition of Minerva Teichert paintings of the Book of Mormon as well as the Joseph Smith Bicentennial Conference at the Library of Congress, and he has published hundreds of books and articles. The final section of the *festschrift* is a 22-page bibliography compiled by Stephen O. Smoot, of just some of the works published by Welch.

The short essays that introduce the volume each provide helpful background information regarding the life and work of Welch and the purpose of the *festschrift*. On a personal note, I was interested to learn about how Rex Lee was able to talk Welch into coming to join the law faculty of the newly formed J. Reuben Clark Law School. He was told that if he would teach one business-related course, he would be free to teach anything else he wanted. Welch suggested, somewhat in jest, “How about a course on Babylonian law and the Book of Mormon?” Rex Lee responded, “That’s the kind of thing we want at this law school” (xvii). I loved reading this, as a main reason I chose to go to BYU’s law school myself was so I could take a class on Ancient Near Eastern Law from Jack Welch.

I also loved reading the personal reminiscences of Stephen Robinson. I have known Professor Robinson longer than I have known Jack Welch, but I had no idea that they grew up together in California and crossed paths many times while obtaining their schooling before they both ended up teaching at BYU. Given this long and close personal relationship, Robinson is able to provide a unique perspective on what made Jack Welch the man he is today, including the impressive tidbit that Jack attained a perfect SAT score before entering college.

After these insightful short essays come separate chapters presenting scholarly work from several top minds. In the first, Kevin L. Barney dives into an extensive examination of a single verse of the New Testament: 1 Corinthians 15:29, the scripture mentioning baptism for the dead. This verse has long been used by Mormons as evidence to support the practice of vicarious work for the dead. The Mormon interpretation of that scripture has long been rejected in favor of alternative interpretations.

It has been claimed that there have been as many as 200 alternative interpretations of the verse, none of which support the Mormon practice of baptism for the dead (22). Barney explores this claim in depth, first rejecting the notion that there are 200 alternative readings and instead settling on 54, still a staggering number. He takes a close look at the basis for each alternative reading, often exploring various ways of interpreting the Greek language itself. Barney approaches this analysis in a way that should satisfy experts in the field but with enough clarity that non-experts, such as I, can follow the arguments. He concludes in a convincing fashion that Joseph Smith's interpretation of this verse, which has only recently gained the support of the majority of scholars, is the correct interpretation.

In the next chapter, Jeffrey M. Bradshaw argues "that the scriptural triad of faith, hope, and charity should be understood as something more than a general set of personal attributes that must be developed in order for disciples to become like Christ" (59). Instead, Bradshaw contends that these three terms describe three distinct stages in the progression of a disciple of Christ toward eternal life. He explores various passages of scripture where prophets have admonished us to adopt these three virtues as we press forward along the path to eternal life. He also notes how this pattern of progression finds a symbolic representation in both ancient and modern temples. Bradshaw's analysis is, as always, intriguing and provides grounds for further exploration of this interesting hypothesis.

James E. Faulconer then explores, in the context of modern philosophy, how it can be said that we can come to know God when God is transcendent. This involves a discussion of human perception and the nature of divine transcendence. In part, we are able to know God because we are like Him in certain basic ways. We too are material beings. We too suffer. "We do not suffer because we are defective, but because we are like God" (132). Putting these similarities aside, we ultimately come to know God through revelation. While some have had an experience with God in the flesh,

even without direct experience of God as a being, we know him, as opposed to only knowing *of* him, by being in relationship with him. We know him by living the way, truth, and life that he is. That too is revelation. We know him in prayer and worship, more revelation. Like Abraham, we find ourselves called by God and we must respond "Here I am" (Genesis 22:1), announcing our readiness to be commanded by him (133).

Next, John Gee presents an essay that is appropriate to both the title and the subject of the *festschrift*. As Jack Welch's work has focused, to some degree, on ancient legal practices, Gee examines the law of the Roman courts and examines the Gospel of John in light of this law. Through examining the Greek language of both the Gospel of John and various ancient non-biblical sources, he draws fascinating parallels between legal disputes in the ancient Roman courts and the final judgment of God and concludes that "[i]n John's gospel, the individual is the defendant; Jesus is the judge; the devil is the prosecuting attorney; and the Holy Ghost is the defense attorney" (150).

Paul Y. Hoskisson submitted a study that also fits appropriately within a volume honoring the work of Jack Welch. In it, he explores the concept of Janus parallelism in the Hebrew Bible and examines a possible case of Janus parallelism in the Book of Mormon. Janus parallelism is an ancient Near Eastern literary form discovered in the 1970s by the American scholar of Near Eastern cultures, Cyrus Gordon. The structure turns on a word that has multiple meanings wherein the poetry preceding the word relates to one meaning, and the poetry following that word relates to a different meaning. It would be very difficult to identify this kind of poetic structure in a translated text since it depends upon a word in the native language that, when translated, almost certainly would not retain multiple meanings. Hoskisson provides an intriguing possibility of Janus parallelism in 1 Nephi 18:16 where the word "praise" could have been translated from a Hebrew word that can also mean "sing." Of course, we cannot be certain whether this is a genuine example of Janus Parallelism. However, like chiasmus, the concept deserves further attention.¹

Kent P. Jackson then provides a brief overview of some of the facts pertaining to Joseph Smith's translation of the Book of Moses. This article should prove helpful to those interested in some basic information regarding the process, including the names of the scribes, some of the dates when the revelations were recorded, and information regarding the paper used and changes in the color of ink or handwriting.

1. It should be noted that Jeff Lindsay also discussed Janus parallelism on his blog, proposing a number of possibilities of Janus parallelism in the Book of Mormon in a five-part series. Jeff Lindsay, "Janus Parallelism in the Hebrew Bible: Could It Also Be in the Book of Mormon?", *Mormanity* (blog), January 22, 2017, <http://mormanity.blogspot.com/2017/01/janus-parallelism-in-hebrew-bible-could.html>. See also Jeff Lindsay, "Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job: A Review of Scott B. Noegel's Work," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture*, 27 (2017): 213-20, in which Lindsay reviews Scott B. Noegel's, *Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009).

Louis Midgley next reviews some passages from Alexis de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* in light of the restoration of the gospel. De Tocqueville observed that due to the various characteristics of a democracy and the influences that exist among a people who live in a society that places a high value on equality, "[o]ne can foresee that democratic peoples will not readily believe in divine missions, that they will willingly laugh at new prophets, and that they will want to find the principal arbiter of their beliefs within the limits of humanity, not beyond it" (178–79). Although de Tocqueville wrote just after the founding of the Church, there is no evidence that he was aware of Joseph Smith or of his new religious movement. De Tocqueville's observations are nevertheless insightful and instructive, not only as they relate to the appearance of a new prophet on the earth, but also as they relate to the continued spread of that new religion throughout the world to other cultures that also value democracy and equality.

Robert L. Millet's essay examines what C. S. Lewis wrote about five doctrinal subjects. First, Lewis believed that there are so many similarities between Christianity and the myths and legends from around the world, not because Christianity is derived from these myths, but rather because these myths are reflective of what Lewis called the "true myth" — that Christ died, descended into Hell on our behalf, then came back to life. Second, Lewis believed we all share a longing for a higher existence; for another country, one not of this world, where we might feel more at home and more alive. Third, Lewis shared with Mormons similar beliefs regarding our fallen nature. Fourth, Lewis saw in human beings the potential to become like God. Fifth, regarding the nature of evil and suffering in the world, Lewis wrote that "free will, though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having" (201). Millet convincingly explains the parallels between each of these ideas and the teachings of the Church. Of course, the views of Lewis were not, in all ways, consistent with Mormon views. However, much like those souls Lewis describes who were slowly becoming Christians, Lewis seems to have been one who, in many ways, was slowly becoming Mormon.

Steven L. Olsen examines the overarching message of the Book of Mormon and the way in which three of its principal authors, Nephi, Mormon, and Moroni, advance that message. Olsen observes that the Book of Mormon "is not a history in the conventional academic sense" (244). Rather than document and describe the key events of the long history of the Jaredite and Nephite communities, Mormon and Moroni,

following the lead of Nephi, focus closely on the centrality of Christ and the importance of covenants with Him in the personal and collective lives of these people. Olsen's thesis is advanced through descriptions of the way in which individuals and communities made covenants and the consequences that followed from breaking these covenants. Olsen makes some important observations about the Book of Mormon as a whole. He does not, however, discuss the roles that long descriptions of wars and the activities of secret combinations play in a record with this specific focus. It would be interesting to see how Olsen might account for these elements of the narrative.

The next entry comes from Donald W. Parry, a member of the International Team of Translators of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In his article, he compares the text of the Great Isaiah Scroll, the most complete of the twenty-two copies of Isaiah among the Dead Sea Scrolls, to the text of Isaiah as it appears in the Masoretic text. He lays out a large number of textual variants, including accidental errors, intentional changes, synonymous readings, and differences among the stylistic approaches of the scribes. This is a highly technical article, unlikely to be appreciated by those who do not read Biblical Hebrew.

Daniel C. Peterson then examines the doctrine of the trinity as it exists in creedal Christianity and explores whether the teachings of restored Christianity can be reconciled with the traditional understanding of the trinity. Certainly, there are some traditional explanations of the trinity that do not square with Joseph Smith's teachings that God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ are separate beings. However, there is a strain of thought among creedal Christians, known as "social trinitarianism" that seems quite consistent with the Mormon understanding of the Godhead. According to social trinitarianism, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost are thought to be one in will, understanding, and love, and this "serves as a paradigm of what human community can and ought to be" (291). Mormons would agree with this kind of explication of the trinity; but Peterson moves beyond this to argue that there may even be a way to understand the Nicene Creed that is consistent with Mormonism. The chief objection Mormons have to the Nicene Creed is the concept that the Father and the Son are a single being. The word *homoousios*, used in the Nicene Creed, has been understood to mean "of the same substance." It is possible, however, for Mormons to accept that the Father and the Son are "of the same substance," as the phrase is used in the *Clementine Homilies*, where the apostle Peter taught that "The bodies of men have immortal souls, which have been clothed with the breath of

God; and having come forth from God, they are of the same substance” (303). With this understanding of *homoousios*, as well as a doctrine that is consistent with social trinitarianism, Mormonism may be much more consistent with mainstream Christianity than is commonly thought.

The next entry, from Dana M. Pike, examines Jeremiah’s call as a prophet and the distinctions between what occurred before Jeremiah entered the womb and what occurred while Jeremiah was still *in utero*. Pike compares various Bible verses that use the words “womb” and “knew” and concludes that we should not conflate the events described in Jeremiah 1:4–5. He emphasizes that Jeremiah was consecrated and appointed as a prophet before he was born. However, the Lord knew Jeremiah before he entered the womb, not just while he was in the womb. Pike observes that this raises interesting questions regarding election and our pre-earth life. Answers to those questions, however, must wait until we have more information.

In a most appropriate entry in honor of Jack Welch, Noel Reynolds examines the chiasmic structure of Second Nephi. He explains that when Jack Welch discovered chiasmus in the Book of Mormon, little was known regarding the broad range and depth of rhetorical principles and technics used by Hebrew writers around the time Lehi left Jerusalem. As more information has come to light, it has been discovered that “when longer texts are organized chiasmically, the ordered elements of that chiasm will consist of subordinate units of text that will themselves be delimited and organized according to some rhetorical principle” (334). While Reynolds has earlier argued that Second Nephi was “a random collection of teachings and prophecies that [does] not fit into First Nephi’s structure” (349), upon analyzing Second Nephi as a whole for its chiasmic structure, he discovered “a plausible division of the book into 13 sub-units that readily organize themselves chiasmically as a whole” (349). He further analyzed one of those sub-units, 2 Nephi 11:2–8, and found that it, too, contained chiasmic structure on two additional levels. Clearly, the hypothesis that the Book of Mormon contains high-level chiasmic structure and that sub-units of the book contain additional levels of subordinate chiasmic structure merits further exploration.

The next essay honors Jack Welch in a different way by providing evidence of the Hebrew language influence underlying four personal names that appear in the Book of Mormon and not in the Bible. Stephen D. Ricks convincingly examines the possible Hebrew roots of the names Zoram, Jarom, Omni, and Mosiah. He concludes that the evidence appearing in this essay as well as similar evidence produced

by the Book of Mormon Names Project, are “satisfying the aims and requirements of Book of Mormon scholarship in showing that the Book of Mormon is arguably an ancient document” (356).

David R. Seely then examines the prophecy of Deuteronomy 18:15–18, which indicates that God would raise up another prophet like Moses. He considers the early Jewish interpretations of this prophecy, the treatment of this scripture in the New Testament and similar language in the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as the prophecies about a future prophet that appear in the Book of Mormon. Does this prophecy refer to many prophets? Or does it just refer to one, and if so who? Elijah? Christ? Or a latter-day prophet such as Joseph Smith or Brigham Young? This prophecy has been viewed in different ways and perhaps is still being fulfilled through latter-day restoration of prophetic authority. Indeed, it could be said of each modern-day prophet that God will “put [His] words in his mouth and he will speak to [God’s people] all that [God] command[s] him.” (Deuteronomy 18:18)

In the most unusual and perhaps most interesting of the essays, Andrew C. Skinner examines the way the Hebrew language has been seen in the past as having magical powers. The Bible clearly indicates that magic of various sorts was practiced among the people of ancient Israel. Later, in the Talmud, “[t]he Rabbis did their utmost to combat superstitions which were forbidden by the Written Law, to eliminate the magic which smacked of idolatry, but they had to accept those charms which were sanctioned by the ‘scientists’ of that time” (380). The Talmud recognizes the Hebrew language as having a special status, as it was the original language of scripture and thus God’s language (380). Hebrew was seen as “the official language of God, Heaven, and angels” (381). Thus, Jews who had a secular name were also given a Hebrew name, “for the angels certainly could not be expected to recognize an individual by any other” (381). In order to invoke supernatural protection, the rabbis relied primarily upon the power of Hebrew words, names, letters, and numbers (381).

This tradition among the Jews was adopted later by Christian groups and is evident in Coptic, Syriac, European, and African texts. Hebrew words were used not only in magical incantations but also on amulets that were supposed to provide protection from the forces of evil. These traditions also influenced the development of Christian and Jewish mysticism. Skinner’s article highlights some fascinating information and emphasizes that the use of the Hebrew language by Christians during the Middle Ages in particular is a field that remains fairly open for exploration.

Another fascinating study of language has been undertaken by Royal Skousen in his attempt to reconstruct the original text of the Book of Mormon. He draws upon this research for an article that examines the phrase “pleasing bar of God” as it appears in the standard edition of Jacob 6:13 and Moroni 10:34. He argues that “the word *pleasing* does not really work as a descriptive adjective for the ‘bar of God’” (413). He suggests instead that “pleading bar of God” would make more sense. He speculates that perhaps Oliver Cowdery heard it wrong when taking dictation from Joseph Smith. John S. Welch, father of Jack Welch, criticized Skousen’s conclusions in a 2006 FARMS Review article that examined three earlier papers Skousen published promoting this theory.² While this more recent article of Skousen’s provides additional data regarding the use of the phrase “the pleading bar” as a legal term, it would have been helpful if Skousen were to more directly respond to the ten different points of criticism raised by Welch. Unfortunately, Skousen does not acknowledge Welch’s article. Skousen has thus provided further data regarding an interesting, but highly speculative, theory.

Robert F. Smith contributed an article that continues the exploration of language in the Book of Mormon. In addition to chiasmus, Smith shows that the Book of Mormon contains a wide variety of other ancient Hebrew poetic forms such as *parallelismus membrorum* (parallelism of members), numerical sequences, climactic tricola, tetracola, paired tricola, progressions, lyric poetry, and more. Smith builds upon the work of others who have identified poetic structure in the Book of Mormon, including Jack Welch, Don Parry, and Grant Hardy. Smith also compares some of the poetical forms to similar forms found not only in the Bible but also in the literature of the ancient Egyptians, Mesopotamians, Babylonians, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Most remarkably, Smith notes how in the case of poetry found in 3 Nephi 22:4 and 1 Nephi 20:1, the Book of Mormon quotes Isaiah in almost identical language. However, there are some lines in the Book of Mormon that do not appear in the Massoretic Text of the Bible. When this text is formatted in a way that highlights its *parallelismus membrorum*, it is revealed that the poetic structure fails when only the language of the Massoretic Text is available. When the additional language that appears only in the Book of Mormon is present, the poetic structure is complete. While there are other ways the language could be formatted, the fact that organizing the text as a *parallelismus membrorum* completes a poetic form that is incomplete

2. John S. Welch, “Keep the Old Wine in Old Wineskins: The Pleasing (Not Pleading) Bar of God,” *FARMS Review of Books* 18/1 (2006): 139–47.

without the unique Book of Mormon language makes this a significant and exciting discovery.

The next chapter resulted from a collaboration between Richard E. Turley Jr. and Stephen O. Smoot. In it, they note the important role record-keeping has played throughout history, especially with regard to the history of God's dealings with mankind upon the earth. Records are made not only of events but also of saving ordinances, the recording of which is so essential that if ordinances are not recorded on earth, they "shall not be recorded in heaven" (D&C 128:8). The oldest records we have were preserved on stone. We also have ancient records on metal, wood, animal skins, papyrus, and on pottery sherds. Similar media, such as paper and metal, have been used in modern times. In addition, records of the Church have been kept on glass, plastic, wax, shellac, vinyl, and more recently, on tape, magnetic discs, CDs, DVDs and flash drives. Turley and Smoot opine that both old and new technologies will continue to be used in preserving the essential records of the Church.

The final chapter, written by John Tvedtnes, explores various appearances of tree of life imagery, along with its associated fruit, water, and wood, as these images appear in the scriptures as well as in non-scriptural, ancient sources. It is a fascinating overview of Christological symbolism.

Conclusion

This is a strong collection of articles from scholars at the top of their fields. It should serve as a resource for advancing the scholarship in the various fields covered. However, some will observe that it would be even more useful if it had a subject index and scripture index.

In a work honoring Jack Welch, it is appropriate that this book covers a wide range of topics, including ancient law, language studies, and the temple. Of course, true to the nature of a collection such as this, not everyone will be interested to the same degree in every chapter. Furthermore, while it is clear in many cases how the subject of the chapter is related to and inspired by the work of Jack Welch, in other cases, it is less apparent. Nevertheless, there is sufficient material to allow all readers to discover something personally satisfying and enriching.

Steve Densley, Jr. *is a Utah attorney and graduated with University Honors from Brigham Young University with a combined Bachelors and Masters degree in Public Policy and Political Science. As an undergraduate, he was an assistant editor on the Pi Sigma Alpha Review. He received his*

law degree from Brigham Young University, where he was a member of the Law Review and the National Moot Court team. He has published articles in the Utah Bar Journal, the Journal of Law and Family Studies, and Meridian Magazine. He has been recognized in SuperLawyers Magazine as one of the Mountain States Rising Stars and has been listed numerous times in Utah Business Magazine as among the Utah Legal Elite. He was the executive vice-president of FairMormon from 2013–15, recipient of the John Taylor Defender of the Faith Award, and was a producer of FairMormon’s podcast when it twice won the People’s Choice Award for Best Podcast in the Religion & Spirituality category.

CHANGING CRITICS' CRITICISMS OF BOOK OF MORMON CHANGES

Brian C. Hales

Abstract: In early 1830 Joseph Smith published the Book of Mormon, a 269,938-word volume that discusses religious themes intermingled with a history of ancient American peoples.¹ Claiming it was scripture like the Bible,² in 1841 he declared it to be “the most correct of any book on earth and the keystone of our religion.”³ Yet, many changes in the text of the Book of Mormon can be detected when comparing the original manuscript to the version available today. These changes have served as a lightning rod for some critics who imply that a divinely inspired book should not require any alterations. This article examines the types of changes that have occurred while trying to assign levels of significance and identify Joseph’s motives in making those alterations in the 1837 and 1840 reprintings of the book.

Joseph Smith reported receiving the golden plates on September 22, 1827, while living with his parents in Manchester, New York. Within weeks, local persecution and attempts to steal the plates prompted Joseph and Emma to move to be with her family, the Hales, in Harmony, Pennsylvania.⁴

1. This word count was calculated using Microsoft Word and the text from <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/book-of-mormon-1830/1>, after removing the witnesses’ testimonies, copyright page, and bracketed insertions.

2. D&C 42:12, Articles of Faith 1:8.

3. *Wilford Woodruff’s Journal, 1833–1898: TS*, ed. Scott G. Kenney, vol. 2, 1841–1845 (Midvale, UT: Signature Books, 1983), 139.

4. “History, circa Summer 1832,” *The Joseph Smith Papers*, accessed November 15, 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-circa-summer-1832/6>.

Joseph eventually purchased a home close to the Hale residence, where he and Emma lived for the next two and a half years.⁵ Though small, it allowed some privacy for Joseph and his scribes. There the 116-page Book of Lehi and a large portion of the Book of Mormon text were translated. The Book of Lehi manuscript pages were lost by Martin Harris, and Joseph reported God withdrew his privilege to translate for a season.⁶

Oliver Cowdery visited the Smiths in Harmony on April 5, 1829. Two days later, the two began the translation of the Book of Mormon, which proceeded at a more rapid pace.⁷ Due to persecution arising from rumors regarding the translation, during the first week of June, the Smiths and Oliver Cowdery moved by buckboard over 100 miles to the Peter Whitmer farm in Fayette, New York.⁸ By the end of the month, the final 150 pages were translated, with some of the Whitmers also acting as scribes.⁹

The words dictated by Joseph Smith between April 7 and June 30, 1829, were published with few alterations. However, Joseph intervened in the 1837 and 1840 printings to make multiple changes in the previously published wordings. Other emendations have been authorized by subsequent Church leaders. Several authors have documented different tallies of alternations made in the various versions of the Book of Mormon (see below). Understanding the quantity and quality of these emendations may be helpful in understanding how Joseph Smith created the text in the first place.

How Many Changes in the Book of Mormons?

While early critics noticed changes between various editions of the Book of Mormon, the first book to focus strictly upon those changes was Lamoni Call's 1898, *2000 Changes in the Book of Mormon*. The methodology employed by Call was unsophisticated: "[T]he work of comparing the

5. Mark Staker, "Isaac and Elizabeth Hale in Their Endless Mountain Home," *Mormon Historical Studies* 15, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 82, <http://mormonhistoricsites.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Isaac-and-Elizabeth-Hale.pdf>.

6. "History, circa Summer 1832," The Joseph Smith Papers, accessed November 15, 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-circa-summer-1832/6>.

7. Joseph Smith History 1:66–67.

8. "History, circa June–October 1839 [Draft 1]," The Joseph Smith Papers, accessed November 14, 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-circa-june-october-1839-draft-1/3>.

9. John W. Welch, ed., *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations 1820–1844*, 2nd ed. (Provo, UT: BYU Press/Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2017), 108–10.

books was a long, tedious job for a working man. Many hours were spent at the work when the eyes refused to stand guard as they should, desiring more to be locked in slumber."¹⁰ Subsequently, other authors pointed to his work in their critiques of the Book of Mormon.¹¹

Jerald and Sandra Tanner's 1965 publication, *3,913 Changes in the Book of Mormon*, has probably had a greater influence. Much like Lamoni Call's approach in the 1890s, Jerald Tanner sat down eighty years later with an 1830 edition and a 1964 edition of the Book of Mormon and annotated all changes he could identify. His count almost doubled Call's. In their introduction, the Tanners also allege a conspiracy by Church leaders to conceal the changes: "The changes made in the Book of Mormon and in Joseph Smith's revelations have apparently caused the Mormon Church leaders some concern, for they fear that their people will find out about them."¹²

In the last two decades, digitalization of the texts has allowed a much more nuanced analysis of the words and word substitutions by a team of scholars in the Book of Mormon Critical Text Project led by BYU professor Royal Skousen.¹³ When he was asked, "How many changes are there in the Book of Mormon text?" Skousen replied:

I don't know for sure, and I'll tell you why it's hard to count them. In my computerized collation of the two manuscripts and 20 significant editions of the Book of Mormon, I can count the number of places of variation. These are places where there's a textual variant. The variant itself can involve spelling, punctuation, words missing or added, a grammatical change, and so on. In all, there are about 105,000 places of variation in the computerized collation.¹⁴

10. Lamoni Call, *2000 Changes in the Book of Mormon* (Bountiful, UT: L. Call, 1898), 41, <https://archive.org/details/2000changesinboo00callrich>.

11. See Woodbridge Riley, *The Founder of Mormonism: A Psychological Study of Joseph Smith, Jr.* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co, 1902), 95, <https://archive.org/details/foundermormonism00rilerich>.

12. Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *3,913 Changes in the Book of Mormon*, rev. ed. (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1996), 15.

13. See Royal Skousen, "Online Access to the Book of Mormon Critical Text Project," The Book of Mormon Critical Text Project, accessed August 15, 2017, <http://criticaltext.byustudies.byu.edu/>.

14. Royal Skousen, "Changes in the Book of Mormon," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 11 (2014): 161–62, <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/changes-in-the-book-of-mormon/>. See also Royal Skousen, *The History of the Text*

It appears that early critics Lamoni Call and Jerald Tanner underestimated the number of changes that could be identified in the various versions of the Book of Mormon when compared to the original copy penned by Joseph Smith's scribes.

Claiming That the Book of Mormon Dictation Must be Flawless

For some observers, the fact that any changes have been made in the original Book of Mormon text is evidence of the falseness of the book.¹⁵ This argument assumes Joseph Smith simply read the English text of the Reformed Egyptian engravings as it flashed upon the seer stone. Several recollections support this interpretation. Martin Harris reported, "By aid of the seer stone, sentences would appear and were read by the Prophet and written by Martin."¹⁶ David Whitmer recalled similarly: "The Seer Stone ... was placed in the crown of a hat, into which Joseph put his face, so as to exclude the external light. Then, a spiritual light would shine forth, and parchment would appear before Joseph, upon which was a line of characters from the plates, and under it, the translation in English."¹⁷

Assuming God (through the seer stone) was responsible for every word in the Book of Mormon, Lamoni Call lamented, "God's way may not be as man's ways, but so far as the writer is concerned, he would have had more faith in the work if it had been 'correct in every particular,' a model of simplicity in English, and not need more than 3,000 amendments to make it passable among even scrub English scholars. ... We do not claim that this proves the Book of Mormon untrue, but we do think it goes a long way toward it."¹⁸

Floyd C. McElveen, author of *The Mormon Illusion*, further explains:

Joseph Smith declared that God gave him the power to translate the reformed Egyptian hieroglyphics into English

of the Book of Mormon: Part One Grammatical Variation (Provo, UT: FARMS and BYU Studies, 2016) 11.

15. See Tanner, 3,913 *Changes in the Book of Mormon*, <http://www.utlm.org/onlinebooks/3913intro.htm>. See also "Book of Mormon Problems," MormonThink, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.mormonthink.com/book-of-mormon-problems.htm>.

16. Edward Stevenson, "One of the Three Witnesses: Incidents in the Life of Martin Harris," *Latter-day Saints' Millennial Star*, 6 February 1882, 86–87.

17. L. Traughber Jr., "Testimony of David Whitmer," *Saints' Herald* 26, no. 22 (November 15, 1879), <http://www.sidneyrigdon.com/dbroadhu/IL/sain1872.htm#111579>.

18. Call, 2000 *Changes in the Book of Mormon*, 30, 128.

and produce the *Book of Mormon*. ... This means that every letter, every character, was exactly what God said, letter-by-letter and word-for-word. ... The written word was perfect.¹⁹

McElveen then asks, “If the translated word were perfect, why have the Mormons made some 4,000 changes in grammar, punctuation and word structure in the perfect *Book of Mormon*?”²⁰ He declares, “If the Mormons claim that God directed Joseph Smith in translating the *Book of Mormon* they accuse God of using faulty grammar and of making other mistakes that later needed to be corrected.”²¹

The problem with these criticisms is that they are based upon a false premise. Although Martin Harris and David Whitmer were positioned to observe, they did not personally translate and could describe only what they saw and heard. Their narratives depict the seer stone as little more than a teleprompter and relegate Joseph Smith’s participation to that of a *reader* devoid of any role as *translator*. In contrast, Oliver Cowdery did attempt to translate (D&C 8, 9). He consistently described Joseph looking into the seer stone(s) “to translate,” not to *read* “what was on the plates.”²² Oliver’s accounts do not portray Joseph simply reciting words scrolling across the seer stone(s).²³

19. Floyd C. McElveen, *The Mormon Illusion: What the Bible Says About the Latter-day Saints* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1979) 44–45.

20. *Ibid.*, 46.

21. *Ibid.*, 48.

22. Josiah Jones, “History of the Mormonites,” *The Evangelist* 9 (June 1, 1841): 132–34, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.boap.org/LDS/Early-Saints/JJones.html>. See also “Last Days of Oliver Cowdery,” *Deseret News*, (Salt Lake City, UT), April 13, 1859, <https://newspapers.lib.utah.edu/details?id=2590800>. See also Oliver Cowdery to W. W. Phelps, September 7, 1834 in *Messenger and Advocate* 1 (October 1834): 14–15, <http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/cdm/ref/collection/NCMP1820-1846/id/7160>.

23. See John W. Welch, ed., *Opening the Heavens: Accounts of Divine Manifestations 1820–1844*, 2nd ed. (Provo, UT: BYU Press/Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2017), 157–62. One possible exception is found in a late 1907 recollection from conversations between Samuel W. Richards and Oliver Cowdery in the “fall of 1848.” Richards wrote that “by holding the translators over the words of the written record, and the translation appears distinctly in the instrument. ... Every word was made distinctly visible even to every letter.” (Samuel W. Richards [statement, May 21, 1907] 2–3, https://dcms.lds.org/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE4987076.) Eyewitnesses testified differently saying that a seer stone, rather than the “translators,” was used and the plates were not involved. Perhaps, Richards’ somewhat garbled report was actually referring to proper names consistently spelled out rather than all 269,938 words of the 1830 Book of Mormon.

Joseph Smith left no description of how the words came to him as he dictated. At a Church conference in 1831, Hyrum Smith invited the Prophet to explain how the Book of Mormon came forth. Joseph's response was that "it was not intended to tell the world all the particulars of the coming forth of the Book of Mormon, and . . . it was not expedient for him to relate these things."²⁴ His only answer was that it came "by the gift and power of God."²⁵

That Joseph contributed to the process in an undefined but necessary way was demonstrated in 1829 when Oliver Cowdery attempted to translate but failed. The Lord explained why: "Behold, you have not understood; you have supposed that I would give it unto you, when you took no thought save it was to ask me. But, behold, I say unto you, that you must study it out in your mind; then you must ask." (D&C 9:7–8). It appears that translating involved more than mimicking a court recorder reading back previous testimony.

Joseph's revelations describe the Book of Mormon as containing "the truth and word of God" (D&C 19:26) but not necessarily words from God's own mouth. It is true that Joseph Smith said "the Book of Mormon was the most correct of any book on earth," but the context was not in grammatical accuracy, rather in its power to teach truth. He went on to say that "a man would get nearer to God by abiding by its precepts, than by any other book."²⁶

According to the book's own history, the text was not perfect when recorded by Mormon and Moroni²⁷ or when dictated by Joseph to his

24. Donald Q. Cannon and Lyndon W. Cook, eds. *Far West Record: Minutes of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1830–1844* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1983), 23.

25. "History, 1838–1856, volume E-1 [1 July 1843–30 April 1844]", The Joseph Smith Papers, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/history-1838-1856-volume-e-1-1-july-1843-30-april-1844/431>. See also *Times and Seasons* 5 (1 March 1842): 707, accessed November 27, 2017, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/times-and-seasons-1-march-1842/5>. See also "Testimony of Three Witnesses," *Book of Mormon*, (Palmyra, NY: E. B. Grandin, 1830), 589.

26. Kenney, ed. *Wilford Woodruff's Journal, 1833–1898*, 2:139. This comment was made by Joseph Smith, Sunday, November 28, 1841, at Brigham Young's home, with the Apostles present.

27. See Mormon 9:31. Moroni explained, "If there are faults they are the mistakes of men; wherefore, condemn not the things of God" (Book of Mormon, title page).

scribes.²⁸ Expecting the text to be perfect and then claiming God made mistakes because of subsequent changes is a straw man argument because the original expectation is not representative of Joseph's teachings.

Understanding the "Changes" and "Variants"

The Book of Mormon is "a literary feat for the ages," writes Huffington Post blogger Jack Kelly. That Joseph Smith "dictated most of it in a period of less than three months and did not revise a single word before its initial printing is even more jaw-dropping."²⁹ So Joseph did not revise the original manuscript of the Book of Mormon before it went to print, but as Lamoni Call and the Tanners have documented, changes were made in subsequent printings.

If numerous revisions, rewritings, edits, and modifications were needed in a second edition, then the question is why? Did the original Book of Mormon manuscript contain many errors that needed correction like the early draft of most books that are eventually printed? If so, its creation might not have required divine intervention or have been significantly different from other publications. But if the changes constituted minor letter and word substitutions to upgrade the dialect and grammar without changing the primary story line or message, then Joseph's creation would retain an important uniqueness.

Royal Skousen has recently published "all of the cases of grammatical variation in the history of the Book of Mormon text."³⁰ His study identifies 106,508 "accidentals" in the different versions of the Book of Mormon.³¹

Skousen's research supports that none of the general categories of changes indicates the presence of glaring problems within the Book of Mormon narrative.

28. Dan Vogel wrote, "Smith may have sometimes made stylistic changes in the manuscript and passed them off as scribal errors." (Dan Vogel, *Joseph Smith: The Making of a Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2004), 124, <http://signaturebookslibrary.org/joseph-smith-the-making-of-a-prophet/>.) This is purely speculative. See Royal Skousen ed., *The Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon: Typographical Facsimile of the Extant Text* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2001).

29. Jack Kelley, "Joseph Smith: Genius," *The Blog, Huffington Post*, December 06, 2017, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thought-matters/joseph-smith-genius_b_10773964.html.

30. Skousen, *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: Part One Grammatical Variation*, 11.

31. Skousen, "Changes in the Book of Mormon," 174.

Category of Change	Number
Adding the word <i>change</i>	273
Adding chapter and verse numbers	9,677
Paragraphing	1,420
Punctuation	41,619
Periods for numbers	6,620
Spelling ampersands	15,577
Spelling of etc.	18
Spelling of common English words	7,982
Scribal slips in manuscripts	1,780
Typos in editions	2,087
Capitalization	19,455
	106,508

Early Modern English

While some of the textual modifications in the chart above are easy to comprehend, the sheer number of changes raises questions of why, if God was involved with the translation process, are there are so many? Recent research by Skousen and Stanford Carmack provides important clues. “In quite a few cases,” writes Skousen, “the Book of Mormon usage is restricted to Early Modern English and died out by the 1700s. One surprising finding is that nearly all the Book of Mormon usage that many have thought to be simply Joseph Smith’s Upstate New York dialect has actually been identified as Early Modern English. In other words, the original Book of Mormon text is archaic English (dating from Early Modern English) rather than Joseph Smith’s dialectal English.”³²

Word substitutions comprised a large part of the transition from old English to a newer version. “The most prominent of these changes has been to replace *which* with *who* (or *whom* or *that*) when it refers to people. ... Similarly, *because that* was changed in the 1837 edition to simply *because*. Further, instances of the historical present tense have been removed from the Book of Mormon, such as the many instances of original *saith* rather than *said*.”³³ It could be argued that the primary

32. Royal Skousen, *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: Part One Grammatical Variation*, 13.

33. Royal Skousen, “Changes in the Book of Mormon,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture*, vol. 11, 2014, 167.

driving force through all the textual alterations was improving the readability and clarity of the message of the Book of Mormon.

Stanford Carmack, who has a linguistics and law degree from Stanford University, sums up the most recent findings:

When Book of Mormon language deviates from biblical modes of expression, it is easy to view these differences as nonstandard, even ungrammatical. And from the perspective of modern English, the earliest text of the Book of Mormon certainly often reads that way. But because much of its language is independent of the King James Bible, even reaching back in time to the transition period from late Middle English into Early Modern English, it needs to be compared broadly to those earlier stages of English. ... [I]t is no longer possible to argue that the earliest text of the Book of Mormon is defective and substandard in its grammar.³⁴

Carmack continues, “We need to disabuse ourselves of the idea that the Book of Mormon is full of ‘errors of grammar and diction’ and appreciate the text for what it is — a richly embroidered linguistic work that demonstrates natural language variation appropriately and whose forms and patterns of use are strikingly like those found in the Early Modern English period.”³⁵

The reasons why the seer stone would have produced a text in an earlier form of English is impossible to answer given our current state of knowledge. Without more information regarding God’s involvement with the process, declaring definitively that an acceptable text would have been in pure King James English, or in nineteenth century English, or in twenty-first century English, is simply impossible.

It might be argued that since the original dialect came through the seer stone, it should remain unchanged and not be updated. Skousen explains that “keeping the original, nonstandard language in the current

34. Stanford Carmack, “The Nature of the Nonstandard English in the Book of Mormon,” quoted in Skousen, *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: Part One Grammatical Variation*, 95. See also, Stanford Carmack, “A Look at Some ‘Nonstandard’ Book of Mormon Grammar,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 11, (2014): 209–62, <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/a-look-at-some-nonstandard-book-of-mormon-grammar/>.

35. *Ibid*, 95.

text would only bring attention to itself and get in the way of reading the book for its message.”³⁶

Critics Identify the Most Egregious Changes

Several critical authors have provided samples of changes that they apparently consider to be the most egregious.³⁷ In 2006, Jerald and Sandra Tanner wrote, “Besides the approximately 4,000 [3,913] grammatical and spelling changes that have been made in the Book of Mormon, there have been both historical changes and doctrinal changes.”³⁸ What “historical and doctrinal” changes did they immediately mention? They highlighted two.

In the 1837 edition of the Book of Mormon Joseph Smith replaced the name *Benjamin* with *Mosiah* in Mosiah 21:28 and Ether 4:1.

Concerning these word substitutions, Skousen explains, “The problem has to do with how the chronology is interpreted in the books of Mosiah. The two original readings with *Benjamin* are very likely correct. Although *Benjamin* is unexpected, it appears that king Benjamin lived long enough to be still alive when Ammon and his men returned to Zarahemla with the people of king Limhi (in Mosiah 22).³⁹

More recently Don Bradley has pointed out that king Benjamin’s father — also named Mosiah — translated a “large stone brought unto him with engravings” by using “the gift and power of God” (Omni, 1:20). Bradley’s research into the lost 116 pages indicates the elder Mosiah actually found the interpreters (later called Urim and Thummim), which were passed to Benjamin and then to his son Mosiah.⁴⁰ If correct, then

36. Skousen, *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: Part One Grammatical Variation*, 11.

37. See Earl M. Wunderli, *An Imperfect Book: What the Book of Mormon Tells Us About Itself* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2013), 9, 30, 32, 202. Wunderli also mentioned changing “Jesus Christ” to “Messiah” in 1 Nephi 12:18 (46n88). See also “Book of Mormon Problems,” Mormon Think, accessed November 18, 2017, <http://www.mormonthink.com/book-of-mormon-problems.htm>.

38. Jerald and Sandra Tanner, “The Challenge the Book of Mormon Makes to the World,” *Salt Lake Messenger* 107, (October 2006), <http://www.utlm.org/newsletters/no107.htm>.

39. Skousen, “Changes in the Book of Mormon,” 171.

40. Don Bradley, *The Lost 116 Pages: Rediscovering the Book of Lehi* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books), forthcoming.

	1830 Edition	1867 Edition
Mosiah 21:28	And now Limhi was again filled with joy on learning from the mouth of Ammon that king <u>Benjamin</u> had a gift from God, whereby he could interpret such engravings; yea, and Ammon also did rejoice.	And now Limhi was again filled with joy on learning from the mouth of Ammon that king <u>Mosiah</u> had a gift from God, whereby he could interpret such engravings; yea, and Ammon also did rejoice
Ether 4:1	And the Lord commanded the brother of Jared to go down out of the mount from the presence of the Lord, and write the things which he had seen: and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men, until after that he should be lifted up upon the cross: and for this cause did king <u>Benjamin</u> keep them, that they should not come unto the world until after Christ should shew himself unto his people.	And the Lord commanded the brother of Jared to go down out of the mount from the presence of the Lord, and write the things which he had seen; and they were forbidden to come unto the children of men until after that he should be lifted up upon the cross; and for this cause did king <u>Mosiah</u> keep them, that they should not come unto the world until after Christ should show himself unto his people.

all three names could be accurately substituted in the Ether reference and the latter two names in the Mosiah verse. Within the context of the Book of Mormon narrative, this substitution seems insignificant.

The other change the Tanners discuss involves the addition of “the son of” to four original verses (now 1 Nephi 11:18, 21, 32, 13:40) to clarify Christ was the son of God. They consider these four substitutions as “the four most important changes” in the Book of Mormon.⁴¹

41. Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Major Problems of Mormonism* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1989), 160.

	1830 Edition	1837 Edition
1 Nephi 11:18	“And he said unto me, Behold, the virgin which thou seest, is the mother of God, after the manner of the flesh	“And he said unto me: Behold, the virgin whom thou seest is the mother of the Son of God, after the manner of the flesh.”
1 Nephi 11:21	“And the angel said unto me, behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Eternal Father! ...”	“And the angel said unto me: Behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Son of the Eternal Father! ...”
1 Nephi 11:32	“... And I looked and beheld the Lamb of God, that he was taken by the people; yea, the Everlasting God, was judged of the world ...”	“... And I looked and beheld the Lamb of God, that he was taken by the people; yea, the Son of the everlasting God was judged of the world ...”
1 Nephi 13:40	“... and shall make known to all kindreds, tongues, and people, that the Lamb of God is the Eternal Father and the Savior of the world ...”	“... and shall make known to all kindreds, tongues, and people that the Lamb of God is the Son of the Eternal Father, and the Savior of the World ...”

In Joseph’s early teachings, Christ was both God and the son of God, so either rendition was accurate.⁴² It could be reasoned that this highlighted change did not alter any doctrine or teaching, but the additional words served to more clearly distinguish the teaching from Trinitarian views popular in other religious traditions. Skousen speculates, “Perhaps he didn’t like the Catholic sounding expression” and that the addition was simply a “clarification.”⁴³

It appears that of all the possibilities, these two emendations were the most significant changes the Tanners could identify. If more important historical or doctrinal alterations had been encountered in their research, it is probable those would have been mentioned first.

42. See D&C 6:2, 37; 76:22–23.

43. Skousen, “Changes in the Book of Mormon,” 169.

The significance of all the changes will likely remain controversial, but a couple of observations can be made. First, these two do not seem to represent an attempt to correct sweeping contradictions or blunders in the text but rather provide clarification to potential ambiguities. Second, if these are the most egregious changes critics can identify, the Book of Mormon narrative, as it fell from Joseph's lips, was remarkably free from significant errors.

Book of Mormon Changes Do Not Represent Revising or Rewriting

As discussed above, the changes identified by Skousen and Carmack do not refer to major modifications or corrections to sections of the Book of Mormon's original wording. Historian Dan Vogel acknowledged, "Smith's method of dictation did not allow for rewriting. It was a more-or-less stream-of-consciousness composition," adding, "It is not that the manuscript went through a major rewrite."⁴⁴ Normal content editing, which involves revising and reworking parts of the text, did not occur in the original or in subsequent editions of the Book of Mormon.

Many naturalists consider Joseph Smith to have been a first-time novelist in 1829 as he created the Book of Mormon, so the lack of revisions is unexpected.⁴⁵ Professional writers and instructors generally emphasize the need for rewriting in order to create a finished manuscript. Betty Mattix Dietsch, author of *Reasoning & Writing Well*, addresses the plight of first-time novelists: "Some inexperienced writers seem to think they have hit the jackpot on their first draft. They evade the fact that every exploratory draft needs more work."⁴⁶ "I usually write about ten more or less complete drafts" confides Pulitzer Prize winner Tracy Kidder, "each one usually though not always closer to the final thing."⁴⁷ In her college

44. Vogel, *Joseph Smith: The Making of a Prophet*, xix, 383.

45. A few of the writers who have published books that portray Joseph Smith as the unassisted author of the Book of Mormon include: David Persuitte, *Joseph Smith and the Origins of The Book of Mormon*, 2nd ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2000); Dan Vogel, *Joseph Smith: The Making of a Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2004); Jerald and Sandra Tanner, *Joseph Smith's Plagiarism of the Bible in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 2010); Earl M. Wunderli, *An Imperfect Book: What the Book of Mormon Tells Us About Itself* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2013).

46. Betty Mattix Dietsch, *Reasoning & Writing Well: A Rhetoric, Research Guide, Reader, and Handbook*, 4th ed. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2006), 62.

47. Tracy Kidder and Richard Todd, *Good Prose: The Art of Nonfiction* (New York: Random House, 2013), 147.

textbook, *Steps to Writing Well*, Jean Wyrick emphasizes the importance of rewriting:

The absolute necessity of revision cannot be overemphasized. All good writers rethink, rearrange, and rewrite large portions of their prose. ... Revision is a *thinking process* that occurs any time you are working on a writing project. It means looking at your writing with a “fresh eye”—that is, reseeing your writing in ways that will enable you to make more effective choices throughout your essay. ... Revision means making important decisions about the best ways to focus, organize, develop, clarify, and emphasize your ideas. ... Virtually all writers revise after “reseeing” a draft in its entirety.⁴⁸

Louis Brandeis, who served as an associate justice on the Supreme Court of the United States from 1916 to 1939, coined a common maxim for authors: “There is no good writing; there is only good rewriting.” That changes have been made in the Book of Mormon text should not be confused with the idea that *revisions* or rewriting occurred. They did not, which is surprising for a frontier-schooled twenty-three-year-old farm boy who is listed as “author.”⁴⁹

Potential Propaganda

A review of critical literature regarding the Book of Mormon identifies two classes of critics. There are those who tell their audiences that many changes have been made and provide examples (like the Tanners). There are others who report “upwards of 4,000” changes without any further discussion.⁵⁰

On the surface, voices that stress the thousands of emendations could easily generate a mental picture of a book that underwent significant revisions and rewriting after its first edition. If the overall insignificance of the changes is not disclosed, the number of 2,000 or 3,913 changes

48. Jean Wyrick, *Steps to Writing Well*, 12th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth, 2014), 91–92.

49. See William Davis, “Reassessing Joseph Smith Jr.’s Formal Education,” *Dialogue*, (Winter 2016): 1–58. Davis concluded that Joseph Smith may have had seven years of schooling. However, Davis’s methodology is problematic, and his research fails to take into account contemporaneous sources that contradict his conclusions. See also Brian C. Hales, “Curiously Unique: Joseph Smith as ‘Author’ of the Book of Mormon,” forthcoming.

50. David Persuitte, *Joseph Smith and the Origins of the Book of Mormon*, 2nd ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2000), 86.

could be used by critics to mislead their audiences, as propaganda is designed to do.

Jerald and Sandra Tanners have sold many copies of their book *3,913 Changes in the Book of Mormon*, since first released in 1965. The title of the book is technically accurate. But how many unsuspecting observers have read (and continue to read) the title and assume the Book of Mormon manuscript required thousands of corrections to compensate for significant mistakes in Joseph Smith's dictation? The perception created by the title might be misleading because readers may impute more significance to the word "changes" than actually justified. If transparency is sought, then adding a subtitle might be useful: *3,913 Changes in the Book of Mormon: But None are Really Significant*.

Royal Skousen summarized his research: "Errors have crept into the text, but no errors significantly interfere with either the message of the book or its doctrine. ... Ultimately, all of this worry over the number of changes is specious."⁵¹

Brian C. Hales is the author of six books dealing with polygamy, most recently the three-volume *Joseph Smith's Polygamy: History and Theology* (Greg Kofford Books, 2013). His *Modern Polygamy and Mormon Fundamentalism: The Generations after the Manifesto* received the "Best Book of 2007 Award" from the John Whitmer Historical Association. He has presented at numerous meetings and symposia and published articles in *The Journal of Mormon History*, *Mormon Historical Studies*, and *Dialogue* as well as contributing chapters to *The Persistence of Polygamy* series. Brian works as an anesthesiologist at the Davis Hospital and Medical Center in Layton, Utah, and has served as the president of the Utah Medical Association.

51. Skousen, "Changes in the Book of Mormon," 172.

PLAYING TO AN AUDIENCE: A REVIEW OF REVELATORY EVENTS

Kevin Christensen

Review of Ann Taves, *Revelatory Events: Three Case Studies in the Emergence of New Spiritual Paths* Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2016, 366 pages with notes and index \$29.93 (paperback).

Abstract: Ann Taves's book offers a comparative look at the origins of three groups, among them Mormonism. While she does not address the issue of competing explanations by each group about their origins or how to best navigate among them in terms that are not self-referential, that crucial circumstance is modeled by Thomas Kuhn in The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. So I, too, have a pattern that applies to my arguments just as much it does to those offered by Professor Taves. Where her book attempts to solve the puzzle of Joseph Smith, my review offers a test of her rules for puzzle solving. This includes comparisons with the standard approach to document testing cited by Hugh Nibley, looking at key aspects of her argument and treatment of sources, and by considering Richard L. Anderson's crucially relevant study of imitation gospels compared to the Book of Mormon. My own response should be tested not just as secular or religious, but against standards that are dependent on neither secular nor religious grounds. That is, to be valid, my response should argue "Why us?" in comparison to her case, rather than just declare that what she offers is "Not us."

We can decide situationally whether to define key concepts such as religion, spirituality, theology, and ministry or sit back and track how others are defining them. Either stance has its strengths and liabilities. Each allows us to see some

things while obscuring others. The key is to figure out what we want to see under any given circumstances.¹

The current paradigm is going toward a non-faith-based study, which has no future. By this I do not mean simply that the study is not faith-based; it is based on non-faith, so criticism does not mean close study; it so often means destructive study. New paradigms emerge from those aware of the crisis, who recognize the situation is not likely to be remedied by the methods that caused it.²

Ann Taves's new book offers a comparative look at the origins of three different groups: Joseph Smith and Mormonism, Bill Wilson and Alcoholics Anonymous, and Helen Schucman and the people involved in producing *A Course in Miracles*. While the groups have important differences, what they have in common are claims to revelation, an initial group of believers coming to grips with those claims, and the production of both a founding narrative and a large spiritual book. She explains that this "book reconstructs the historical process whereby small groups coalesced around the sense of a guiding presence and accounts for this process in naturalistic rather than supernatural terms" (xi). She says, "My goal in doing so is not to debunk or explain away the group's claims but to learn about the interactive process, the mental mechanisms underlying the unusual experiences, and the interplay between individual differences and group processes" (xii).

She also says, "I hope that this book models a way of playing fair with deeply held beliefs, whether religious or not, without having to bracket one's own" (9). That is, she wants her approach to these three subjects to provide a paradigmatic model, a "standard example of scientific work" that models a set of assumptions, method, problem-field, and standard of solution that works everywhere.³ She provides a lengthy appendix for this specific purpose, as a model approach to religious studies.

1. Ann Taves, "Negotiating the Boundaries in Religious Studies" (lecture, Graduate Theological Union Convocation, Berkeley, CA, September 21, 2005), <http://www.religion.ucsb.edu/Faculty/taves/GTU-FinalLecture.pdf>.

2. Margaret Barker, "Being an Independent Scholar," *Providence, Divine Action and the Church* (blog), November 15, 2012, <http://christpantokrator.blogspot.com/search/label/Barker%3A%20%27Being%20an%20Independent%20Scholar%27>.

3. Ian Barbour, *Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Science and Religion* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), 8.

As discussed in the introduction, the book presupposes that scholars can both analyze and reconstruct phenomena as they seemed from the point of view of historical or ethnographic subjects, and also attempt to explain the processes that produced the phenomena in naturalistic terms.⁴

As Kuhn says, “[P]aradigms guide research through direct modeling as well as through abstracted rules. Normal science can proceed without rules only so long as the relevant scientific community accepts without question the particular problem-solutions already achieved.”⁵

I come to her book from a different audience than intended, a member of a different community. I’m not a secular reader but an LDS believer with a long-held fondness for what Joseph Smith called “proving contraries,” since that process, he affirms, is one way that “truth is made manifest,” where truth is defined as “knowledge of things as they are, as they were, and as they are to come.”⁶ I am deeply concerned about models and rules and their implications for perception and understanding. And I have become more and more interested in the effects of ideological frames, paradigmatic examples, underlying metaphors, controlling narratives, socially defining myths, parables, dubious tweets, and sound bites that become the source of the rules accepted and applied by different communities.

Rules should therefore become important, and the characteristic unconcern about them should vanish whenever paradigms or models are felt to be insecure. That is, moreover, exactly what does occur. The pre-paradigm period, in particular, is regularly marked by frequent and deep debates over legitimate methods, problems, and standards of solution, though these serve rather to define schools [that is, different communities] than to produce agreement.”⁷

Although her personal background is both Catholic and academic, her book is expressly directed to “[s]cientific explanations [that] presuppose a naturalistic worldview and adopt the most economical explanations,” (9) at least relative to the problem field permitted by and the standards of solution accepted by a secular readership. That is, she knows her secular audience and plays the game according to the rules,

4. Taves, Appendix, 297.

5. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* 2nd ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), 47.

6. Joseph Smith to Daniel Rupp, 1842, and D&C 93:24.

7. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 47–48.

playing field, questions asked, answers desired, and the social protocols they accept. There is nothing wrong with this any more than there is anything wrong with a Primary lesson, Gospel Doctrine lesson, *Sunstone* presentation, *Interpreter* essay, Republican or Democratic convention speech, Fox News commentary, or a Politifact investigation directed to a particular audience. There is no need to debunk or explain away LDS claims to a secular audience that presupposes a naturalistic approach is sufficient and that Professor Taves can be relied upon to provide one that satisfies their requirements. But the existence of a specific audience with a given set of expectations *always has implications* no one should ignore because of its effects regarding what questions are asked and not asked and therefore what is seen and not seen and therefore not explained under the “circumstances” Professor Taves organizes.

In an interview with Spencer Fluhman, Professor Taves commented that:

In general and as holder of a chair in Catholic studies at a public university, I stress our ability to shift our voice to one that is appropriate relative to a given audience or constituency. I often find myself explaining the difference between teaching Catholic studies courses at a public university and at a Catholic university. In the former, the aim of the institution is not religious formation but formation in the liberal arts as well as the formation of educated citizens (or something like that). In private universities with a religious mission, the institution often aims to combine formation in the liberal arts with religious formation. Within any of these institutional contexts, we may want to teach students to distinguish different voices, for example, the voice of the historian who speaks in light of approaches and methods shared by historians and the voice of a religious (or nonreligious) person when speaking in light of beliefs shared with cobelievers.⁸

This is all good sense. I do not measure a good Primary lesson for seven-year-olds in the same way I measure a good approach to Joseph Smith in a class for mature adults or in a scholarly paper I submit for publication. That is akin to saying that while Melville’s *Moby Dick* may be a terrible limerick, haiku, children’s book, Primary talk, Sunday

8. Ann Taves, “Mormon Studies in the Academy: A Conversation between Ann Taves and Spencer Fluhman,” interview by Spencer Fluhman, *Mormon Studies Review* v1 (2014), <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=2402&index=2>.

sermon, film script, or inauguration speech, it remains a masterpiece of literature by the standards of literature. I again note that different questions arise, different standards apply, different observations enter, and different measurements come into play, even when we consider the same subjects. And that, I think, is a crucial issue in approaching such books as *Revelatory Events*, which build their case and make their arguments on secular presumptions. It turns out to be just as crucial for when I read books such as, say, *Illuminating the Sermon at the Temple and the Sermon on the Mount*, or *The Great Angel: A Study of Israel's Second God*, which do not build their cases and make their arguments on secular presumptions but which do offer new paradigms for viewing familiar texts.

She assures readers, “Explaining things scientifically neither explains them away nor destroys their value” (10). Then at the very end of her book, she assures readers that she has provided a secular explanation of “[t]he Lord of Mormonism, the Higher Power of AA, and the Voice of the Course as creations, they were — as I have been saying — motivated collective subjectivities that envisioned spiritual paths that can and do transform people towards these particular ends (salvation, sobriety, reality). These goals must, of course be evaluated. While people continue to disagree regarding their validity and value, the power of the paths to transform is — in my view — quite apparent” (295).

In this naturalistic context, her reference to a “power to transform” comes across like saying “placebos can at times help people in pain” — though not, of course, the people who know what is really going on, who know the placebo is not real medicine, that is, her intended secular audience, who have their own pre-existing and unquestioned group assessment of the true value of religion.

Taves refers to “Methodological Transparency,” which involves being “open and clear about the methods and presuppositions we are bringing to our analysis” (10). To her credit, Taves is open and clear in stating she adopts a secular approach to her subjects. That makes it easy for me to account for the differences with my approach. But what is not addressed in her account is how one should go about deciding which approach is better and not just “better” for the needs and expectations of a particular audience (when agreement with a given ideological position defines “better”) but a better explanation of the subject regardless of the audience.

What drew my attention to Taves’s book were comments by an LDS reader on an Internet board who reported that *Revelatory Events* gave her a way to explain away the claims of Joseph Smith and all other religious claims in purely secular terms and let her walk away from the

community, assured she was leaving behind nothing valid or of value or with worthwhile power to transform. As Archimedes famously observed, “Give me a lever and a place to stand, and I can move the world.” So the welcome attempts at politeness, courtesy, and fairness that Taves includes do not counter the reality that her secular book offers a way to explain away religious faith, a lever and a place to stand, for those who might be seeking such explanations.

Like the choice between competing political institutions, the choice between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life. Because it has that character, the choice is not and cannot be determined by the evaluative procedures of normal science, for these depend on a particular paradigm, and that paradigm is at issue.⁹

My own response should not be tested not in terms of secular according to religious standards, but against standards dependent on neither secular nor religious grounds. That is, to be valid my response should argue “Why us?” in comparison to her case, rather than just declare that what she offers is “Not us.” And the same should apply in the opposite direction. Those who share her secular views can easily dismiss my approach as “Not us,” rather than engage my attempt to explain “Why us.” I long ago learned that anyone can dismiss what LDS believers such as myself offer as polemical and apologetic rather than valid scholarship, as if the existence of faith commitments cancel the possibility of a better case and as if a secular approach is inherently objective and beyond criticism.

Ian Barbour explains that “the possibility of assessing a religious paradigm must in practice be compared with the possibility of assessing alternative religious or naturalistic paradigms — regardless of what the possibility of assessment in science may be. The most one can expect of any set of beliefs is that it will make more sense of all of the available evidence than alternative beliefs. . . . [S]elf-criticism of one’s own basic beliefs is only possible if there are criteria which are not totally paradigm dependent.”¹⁰

While she does not address the issue of competing explanations and how to best navigate among them, that crucial circumstance is modeled by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. So I too have a pattern to follow, and — this is key — the pattern applies to my

9. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 94.

10. Barbour, *Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Science and Religion*, 145.

arguments just as much it does to those offered by Professor Taves. The values Kuhn reports as most useful in judging theories include puzzle definition and solution, accuracy of key predictions, comprehensiveness and coherence (breadth and depth as well as internal and external consistency), fruitfulness, simplicity and aesthetics, and future promise. And it is important that this approach is not derived from LDS culture and therefore is not self-referential in discussing our culture. Part of my task is to point out available evidence that Taves does not consider and to make sense of it in terms of criteria not paradigm-dependent.

Regarding “Methodological Fairness,” Taves comments:

Research becomes polemical when we apply methods and theories to others that we are unwilling to apply to our own beliefs and practices. It is good to test our methods and theories on ourselves to see what it is like to be studied in this way. (10)

It strikes me that the issue here is not that research becomes polemical in this case of an unwillingness to be tested by the methods and theories we point at others, but hypocritical. A polemical method and theory — for example, “political correctness,” which originally applied to Marxist thought — is just as polemical whether applied to oneself, the subject of one’s inquiries, or one’s critics. In recent politics, we have seen the spectacle of Republican senators defending a closed-door approach to legislation on healthcare that matches in several ways and in others far exceeds the behavior they bitterly complained about seven years previously during the year in which the Affordable Care Act was debated and enacted in Congress and the Senate. The hypocrisy in that case is palpable, as is the predominant role of ideology in controlling the arguments raised or dismissed. In the case of Taves’s book, the method and theory is secular. I do not imagine that self-examination in light of secular theory would cause her any personal discomfort, inspire charges of hypocrisy, or lead to any startling revelations with respect to the Book of Mormon. As Kuhn observes, “[T]he decision to employ a particular piece of apparatus and to use it in a particular way carries an assumption that only certain sorts of circumstances will arise.”¹¹

It is fair to ask whether and how her secular approach would serve to identify a real revelatory event within the historical records we have if she were looking at one. We can also ask whether her approach could allow her to identify and evaluate potential eyewitness details in the

11. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 59.

Book of Mormon. For example, the Book of Mormon is claimed not only to be the product of the religious experience of Joseph Smith, but the text itself purports to be set in an actual time and place:

For it came to pass in the commencement of the first year of the reign of Zedekiah, King of Judah, (my father having dwelt at Jerusalem in all his days); and in that same year there came many prophets prophesying unto the people that they must repent, or the great city Jerusalem must be destroyed. (1 Nephi 1:4)

In setting the Book of Mormon in real places in ancient times, Joseph Smith's large and complex book immediately does something the other two books do not. But Taves largely ignores the actual content and claims of the Book of Mormon. While it is true Joseph Smith, Bill Wilson, and Helen Schucman all produced large inspirational books, there are clear differences that don't emerge when the only mode of measurement and comparison amounts to describing the three very different books as "large" and "complex" with perhaps some poetry or distinctive language. She does not confront the scholarship and arguments by LDS scholars that make the opposing case. For a secular audience, she does not even have to raise the question because that audience presumes from the start that the authenticity of the text is not a serious question, deserving any in-depth inquiry. But again, I am not a part of her intended audience, and I therefore, come to her text with a different bibliography in my head and different questions on my lips. Nevertheless, for her and for her target audience, all of this kind of thing can be blanketed over, not by exploring the text of the Book of Mormon, but by an appeal to storytelling talent.

At the same time, insider accounts acknowledge factors that they do not stress, such as Smith's storytelling abilities and Schucman's lifelong attraction to Catholicism and her exposure to the American metaphysical traditions, including Christian Science. (243)

Her assertion that Joseph Smith created the Book of Mormon out of his imagination is not itself a test of her starting premise that he did so. She focuses on differences between early and late historical accounts, group dynamics, comparison of the translation accounts by Smith and Schucman, and research into dissociation and automaticity as behind other examples of "spirit writing," studies of highly hypnotizable people, and examples of artistic creativity, such as Enid Blyton, a noted and prolific author of children's books. When comparing a student in a

hypnosis experiment with Joseph Smith, she cites the famous quotation from Lucy Mack Smith's history regarding Joseph's early "recitals," and juxtaposes that with selected comments from neighbors to emphasize his ability as a storyteller.

Both the student and Smith recounted narratives of great vividness in two modes: the student in an ordinary and a hypnotized mode and Smith in an ordinary and a translating mode. Lucy Smith similarly attests to the vividness of Joseph's "recitals" in which he described the "ancient inhabitants of this continent" to his family after his initial discovery of the plates in 1823. According to Lucy (EMD 1: 295–96), he described "their dress[,] their maner [sic] of traveling[,] the animals which they rode[,] The cities that were built by them[,] the structure of their later buildings[,] with every particular of their mode of warfare[,] their religious worship — as particularly as though he had spent his life with them[.]" Accounts of neighbors from the early thirties refer to his "marvellous stories" (EMD 2: 27, 60–61) and later accounts describe his "fertile imagination" (EMD 3: 211) and ability to "utter the most palpable exaggeration or marvellous absurdity with the utmost apparent gravity" (EMD 3: 93). Writing in 1834, Eber Howe concluded that "a natural genius, strong inventive powers of mind, a deep study, and an unusually correct estimate of the human passions and feelings" more than made up for any deficiencies in Smith's formal education ([1834] 2015, 20; EMD 3: 303–4). (252)

There are some unexamined oddities about the Lucy Smith quote. Before I would take it as an interpretive foundation, I must consider that, even though a first-hand account, it is not an autograph account, and it is late,¹² dating to an 1844 dictation in Nauvoo to the non-LDS, 24-year-old

12. Lucy Mack Smith's *A History of Joseph Smith by His Mother* was dictated to a Nauvoo school teacher, Martha Jane Coray in 1845. Coray and her husband compiled the notes and other sources into a manuscript that was later published in 1853. Sharalynn D. Howcroft (an editor of Oxford University Press' forthcoming *Foundational Texts of Mormonism*) stated "For example, Lucy Mack Smith reportedly dictated her history to Martha Jane Coray; however, the extant manuscript doesn't show evidence of dictation and there are other clues in the manuscript that suggest what we have is a few generations removed from a dictated text. Additionally, scholars have presumed the fair copy was a contiguous history, but physical clues indicate it was two separate copies of the history that were combined. This kind

Martha Jane Coray regarding events in Palmyra 1823 and then not published until 1853. That is, the quote is six years older than Joseph Smith's official history from 1838, which Taves takes notable interest in dissecting and comparing with earlier sources. In her discussion of method and sources for Mormonism, she observes:

Apart from the 1825 agreement with Josiah Stowell and the 1826 court record, both of which are preserved in later versions, we have no real-time access to events until July 1828, when D&C 3 — the first real-time recorded revelation — opens a window in the wake of the loss of the first 116 pages of the manuscript. Chapter 1 thus opens with an in-depth analysis of D&C 3, read as a window on that moment rather than as it was interpreted and reinterpreted in later accounts. (21)

The Lucy Smith quote, aside from being a late account, rather than early and contemporary (not “real time access,” not a direct “window on the moment”), turns out to be notably odd and unique with respect to Joseph Smith, rather than well supported from a range of sources. Certainly much in Lucy's biography is well supported, but let us recognize the anomaly here. Odd accounts do occur in history, yes, but the account raises questions that should be faced and mentioned before building one's structure there. First of all, the Book of Mormon we have has no descriptions of people riding animals in over 500 pages that include several major migrations and 100 distinct wars. It provides no notably detailed descriptions of clothing (other than armor) and no detailed descriptions of the structure of later buildings. The most detail we get involves descriptions of fortifications with palisaded walls and ditches.

Then there is the unasked question as to why — if Joseph Smith as a youth was capable of this kind of detailed, immersive, evening-filling recital on the everyday particulars of Book of Mormon peoples and culture — do we have no further record anywhere of his performing the same service as an adult? Perhaps the closest circumstance on this topic involves the Zelph story on Zion's Camp, but in that case the notable differences in the details recorded by the different people who reported it, even those writing close to the event, should give pause to a person

of analysis and discovery extends our understanding beyond what the content of a historical source divulges.” See <https://bycommonconsent.com/2018/01/10/qa-with-foundational-texts-of-mormonism-editors/>.

trying to build an interpretive foundation on an isolated, late, anomalous account related to far longer and complex narrative than the Zelfh gossip.¹³ It bears mentioning that if Joseph Smith had been telling stories about the Book of Mormon peoples, animals, clothing, and culture, such stories should have had an obvious influence on Abner Cole's 1830 parody version, the *Book of Pukei*, which "tells in mocking fashion about the sorts of things that Joseph's neighbors expected to find in the Book of Mormon."¹⁴ Yet the most notable thing about the Book of Pukei is how utterly different it is from the actual Book of Mormon.¹⁵ The book Joseph Smith produced was emphatically not what his neighbors expected.

It is true the Book of Mormon does contain abundant details about "their religious worship" and their "modes of warfare," but we have no other accounts of Joseph Smith's filling anyone's evening or afternoon with amusing or serious recitals on those topics either. Again, why not? This is not a frivolous question but one addressed to a foundation stone upon which Taves chooses to build.

The one notable discussion of ancient buildings from Joseph Smith comes as his surprised and delighted review of John Lloyd Stephens's *Incidents of Travels Central America* as expressed in two articles in the *Times and Seasons* in Nauvoo.¹⁶ I find Michael Coe's report of Joseph Smith's encounter with the Stephens's book particularly telling:

In 1841 — after the Book of Mormon, actually — there was a publication in New York and London of a wonderful two-volume work called *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* by John Lloyd Stephens, an American diplomat, and his artist-companion, the British topographical artist Frederick Catherwood, with wonderful illustrations by Catherwood of the Maya ruins. This was the beginning of Maya archaeology, ... and we who worked with

13. See Kenneth Godfrey, "What is the Significance of Zelfh in the Study of Book of Mormon Geography" in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 8/2 (1999): 7–19, 88, <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1398&index=11>.

14. John Gee, "The Wrong Type of Book" in Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, John W. Welch, eds., *Echoes and Evidences of the Book of Mormon* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2002), 310, <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1082&index=10>.

15. *Ibid.*, 307–29.

16. See Matt Roper, Paul J. Fields, and Atul Nepal, "Joseph Smith, the Times and Seasons and Central American Ruins" *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 22/2 (2013), https://publications.mi.byu.edu/publications/jbms/22/2/7RoperFieldsNepal_JS%20Times%20and%20Seasons%20and%20CA%20Ruins.pdf.

the Maya civilization consider Stephens and Catherwood the kind of patron saints of the whole thing.

Well, Joseph Smith read these two volumes, and he was flabbergasted, because what he had dictated about the ancient his mind, these were the ancient cities that he was talking about. They weren't in South America, as he originally thought; they were in Central America and neighboring Mexico.¹⁷

It happens that there are over 500 passages with geographic details for the New World portions of the Book of Mormon, and they have a remarkable internal consistency.¹⁸ But they are not at all consistent with any location in South America, and more particularly, there is no way to fit the internal travel accounts required to a New York Cumorah and a Land South that includes South America. Coe doesn't bother to explain how Joseph managed to describe in detail and at length something so very different than he originally imagined, or more accurately, what Coe imagines Joseph imagined. Taves avoids these issues the same way Coe does: by not exploring the Book of Mormon text or Joseph Smith's history or believing Mormon scholarship in enough detail to encounter or generate such problems. In her account, the Book of Mormon is Biblical sounding, has a bit of distinctive language in chiasmus, and has a story of "shining stones" and divine rebuke she reads as analogous to Joseph Smith and the plates. But for purposes of her discussion, it can be defined simply as "large" and "complex," just as *The Big Book of AA* is, and as Schucman's *A Course in Miracles* is, and as a range of other automatic writings are. Personally, I find the superficiality of her approach to the Book of Mormon to be astonishing in a book that purports to authoritatively account for its existence. And this is true even considering the comment of another sympathetic Catholic scholar, Thomas O'Dea, who famously observed, "The Book of Mormon is not one of those books that one must read in order to have an opinion of it."¹⁹

It is not just the story of the Book of Mormon's publication but the experience of people in actually reading it that to this day defines and binds the community of Mormons. Grant Underwood's important

17. Michael Coe, interview, *American Experience: The Mormons*, Frontline, May 16, 2006, <http://www.pbs.org/mormons/interviews/coe.html>.

18. See John Sorenson, *Mormon's Map* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2000) and John Clark, "A Key for Evaluating Nephite Geographies" *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon*, v1 (1989): 20–70.

19. Thomas F. O'Dea, *The Mormons* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 26.

surveys of early Mormon use of the Book of Mormon demonstrate that “[p]rophesies relating to the fate of the gentiles and the restoration of Israel were by far the principle interests of the early Saints.”²⁰ I notice that Lucy Smith did not mention those themes as part of her late dictated memory. Comparison of the set of common themes that emerge in Underwood’s survey, which includes Joseph Smith’s surprisingly rare comments on the Book of Mormon text and those published by Lucy Smith on Joseph Smith’s evening recitals, shows little overlap, if any. This circumstance ought to be mentioned as a puzzle, even if we have no way of definitively resolving it in light of current records.

Taves also avoids dealing with the contrast between the skeptical neighbors who wanted an appropriately dismissive explanation for the unwieldy book, the associated angel stories, and the growing religious community Joseph had somehow attracted and the family, who, according to William Smith’s account, viewed Joseph quite differently from the picture she paints from selected comments of neighbors (from many contradictory possibilities²¹) of Joseph as a storyteller. William reports that:

Knowing that he was very young, that he had not enjoyed the advantages of a common education; and knowing too, his whole character and disposition, they were convinced that he was totally incapable of arising before his aged parents, his brothers and sisters, and so solemnly giving utterance of anything but the truth.²²

William also noted that after Joseph’s vision became known, “We never knew we were bad folks, until Joseph told his vision. We were considered respectable till then, but at once people began to circulate falsehoods and stories in a wonderful way.”²³ Notice that the reports

20. Grant Underwood, “Book of Mormon Usage in Early LDS Theology,” in *Dialogue* 17/3 (Autumn 1984): 60, https://www.dialoguejournal.com/wp-content/uploads/sbi/articles/Dialogue_V17N03_37.pdf.

21. See Hugh Nibley, “Portrait of a Prophet” in *Collected Works of Hugh Nibley, Vol. 11: Tinkling Cymbals and Sounding Brass* (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1991), 175–88.

22. “William Smith on Mormonism,” quoted in Francis Kirkham, *A New Witness for Christ in America*, vol. 2 (Independence, MO: Zions Printing and Publishing Company, 1951), 416.

23. William Smith, quoted in Daniel Peterson and Donald Enders, “Can the 1834 Affidavits Attacking the Smith Family Be Trusted?” in John W. Welch and Melvin J. Thorne, eds., *Pressing Forward with the Book of Mormon* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 1999), 287. See also Donald L. Enders, “The

from neighbors that Taves selects to characterize Joseph Smith as a wildly imaginative storyteller all happen to be ideologically saturated, reflexively skeptical judgements, rather than cool, objective reporting, providing specific accounts and details of what Joseph Smith said and did on specific occasions.

Taves emphatically wants readers to picture Joseph Smith as creative and suitably educated through proximity to the King James Bible to produce such a work as the Book of Mormon, and she makes explicit comparisons with Schucman's preparation, as a PhD with a religious background, training as a philosopher, and experience as a Shakespeare scholar:

Both Joseph and Lucy Smith's accounts indicate that the angel had been telling Smith about the contents of the plates and that he had been recounting these stories to his family prior to recovering the plates. As Wapnick indicates, it is clear that Schucman was conveying ideas that would be central to the Course in the letters she wrote to Thetford in her own voice the summer before. (253)

This is to convey a period of preparation and incubation, to get around the problem of Joseph composing a large and complex document in just the two months of final dictation without recourse to anything like Schucman's decades of formal education and then taking a decade more to write down the course. But since Joseph Smith was immersed in the King James Bible, Taves writes as though there is nothing particularly difficult to explain.

Both Smith and Schucman were steeped in the genres of their respective texts. Smith was immersed in the King James Version of the Bible; Schucman was a philosophy major in college and loved Plato and Shakespeare. Schucman also knew the Bible very well, quoting from it "almost as readily as she could from Shakespeare." She was a psychologist trained in Freudian psychology, who did research on ego development, and an educator. (243)

After all, Bill Wilson and Helen Schucman also produced large and complex books, and she can compare some descriptions of Smith's translation process with accounts of how Schucman worked.

Joseph Smith, Sr., Family: Farmers of the Genesee," in *Joseph Smith: The Prophet, The Man*, ed. Susan Easton Black and Charles D. Tate Jr. (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1993), 213–25, <https://rsc.byu.edu/archived/joseph-smith-prophet-man/16-joseph-smith-sr-family-farmers-genesee>.

In terms of their subjective experience, this suggests that we need to compare what it was like for Smith to experience the Lord “tell[ing] [him] in [his] mind & in [his] heart by the Holy Ghost” and Schucman hearing the voice of Jesus. (247)

Taves also cites Scott Dunn’s interesting essay on “Automaticity and the Dictation of the Book of Mormon.”²⁴ She adds further discussions of the experiences of highly hypnotizable individuals and examples of creativity, including those that bear comparison with examples of what has been called “spirit writing.”

To move a step closer to an explanation, I want to introduce a third person with unusual abilities, a college student described by psychologist Ernest Hilgard, who, with his wife Josephine established the Laboratory of Hypnosis Research at Stanford University and directed it for many years. The student in question showed up at their lab after having been hypnotized at a social gathering, during which time he recounted incidents from what he and others believed was a past life in Victorian England. He came to the laboratory, Hilgard writes, believing it was “a genuine reincarnation experience, but ... willing to have it subjected to criticism.” After interviewing the student, the Hilgards learned he had made “an intensive study of the British Royal family” many years earlier that he had subsequently forgotten. “Although the evidence is against the reincarnation interpretation,” Hilgard writes, “it is interesting in its own right because it shows that memories may be captured without identification (as in source amnesia) and woven into a realistic story that is believed under hypnosis by the inventor of the story.” (250–51)

Many years ago I acquired and read a very good book by Ian Wilson called *All in the Mind: Reincarnation, Hypnotic Regression, Stigmata, Multiple Personality, and Other Little-Understood Powers of the Mind*.²⁵ Wilson’s book mentions the work by Hilgard and others, so I had a preview of the ideas and research that Taves and would bring to her investigation

24. Scott Dunn, “Automaticity and the Dictation of the Book of Mormon” in Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002).

25. Ian Wilson, *All in the Mind: Reincarnation, Hypnotic Regression, Stigmata, Multiple Personality, and Other Little-Understood Powers of the Mind* (New York: Doubleday, 1982).

of Joseph Smith. But one notable difference is that Wilson is far more interested in tracking down the sources of information that emerge in cases of purported hypnotic regression. Taves introduces the notion of highly hypnotizable individuals and makes comparisons with Scott Dunn's *Sunstone/American Apocrypha* essay on spirit writing. She makes a case that the Book of Mormon translation can be explained as one more case of spirit writing, based on the notion that self-hypnosis/dissociation provides a way to attain the altered state of consciousness required. She also suggests that the experiences of the witnesses can be explained via hypnosis theory, including spontaneous self-hypnosis.

H[ighly]H[y]pn[otizable]s are people who can most readily alter their perceptions in accord with the hypnotist's suggestions (that is, generate hypnosis-as-product). In the words of psychologist Auke Tellegen, they are people who have the ability to "represent suggested events and states imaginatively and enactively in such a manner that they are experienced as real." In the terms I have been using, the "procedure" is a small-scale social interaction and the "product" is a change in experience or behavior, such that the subjects (and oftentimes others) experience the suggested events as real. (254)

So this line of argument produces an explanation of Joseph Smith and the witnesses, a secular explanation by design, but is it the best explanation? "Best" requires comparison, and not just against something designed to make one's case look good in the absence of cross examination, but rather, something designed to stress the capacity of that explanation to the utmost. And how do we measure "best" in a way not ideologically determined? That is, that the argument is either secular or faithful should not carry the judgment of "best." Fortunately, Thomas Kuhn explains that "there are also, however, values to be used in judging whole theories: they must, first and foremost, permit puzzle-formulation and solution; where possible they should be simple, self-consistent, and plausible, compatible, that is, with other theories currently deployed."²⁶

To shift the metaphor somewhat, consider the problem that Edgar Allen Poe lays out in his famous detective story, *The Purloined Letter*. In such a situation, Taves could attempt to locate and identify the purloined letter by herself, as the detective does in the story, famously reasoning that the letter had not been hidden but placed in plain sight

26. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 185.

in such a manner that it would not be recognized for what it was.²⁷ But rather than locate the letter, her secular solution for the Book of Mormon is to assert that we can safely presume there is nothing to see, nothing to find, certainly not hidden because some official investigators are said to have looked carefully everywhere (except in plain sight in the right place), and therefore, the alleged letter is an imaginative fiction and that the proper subject of inquiry is how such a fiction came to be and what purposes it serves for the interested community.

For instance, regarding the plates, she says:

To get at this, I will assume for the sake of argument that there were no plates, or at least no ancient golden plates, and at the same time take seriously believers' claim that Smith was not a fraud. If we start with those premises, then we have to explain how the plates might have become real for Smith as well as his followers. The challenge, however, is not just to explain how they might have become real for Smith, but how they might have become real for *him in some non-delusory sense*. (51)

Her solution to the issue of Smith's dedication and sincerity, reached after navigating through stories of money-digging, spirits or angels, legal and personal trials, and encounters with both family and skeptics is this:

I am hypothesizing, involved creating what was in effect a representation of the plates, perhaps using sand and later tin or lead, as detractors claimed, in the knowledge that they

27. John Clark, incidentally, has said that Nephite and Lamanite artifacts are already in museums, not recognized for what they are. "The logical challenges with the first assertion, that no 'cities have been located,' are more subtle. Book of Mormon cities have been found, they are well known, and their artifacts grace the finest museums. They are merely masked by archaeological labels such as 'Maya,' 'Olmec,' and so on. The problem, then, is not that Book of Mormon artifacts have not been found, only that they have not been recognized for what they are. Again, if we stumbled onto Zarahemla, how would we know? The difficulty is not with evidence but with epistemology." (John Clark, "Archeology, Relics, and the Book of Mormon," in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 14/2 (2005): 42, <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1383&index=6>.) Many critics state that if the Book of Mormon were true, we would see a distinctly Ancient Near Eastern culture in Mesoamerica. Brant Gardner has argued that the small influx of immigrants would adopt the material culture they found among pre-existing population. (Brant Gardner, "The Social History of the Early Nephites," (presentation, FairMormon Conference, Provo, UT, 2001) <https://www.fairmormon.org/conference/august-2001/a-social-history-of-the-early-nephites>.) So the expectations are clearly different, which accounts for the very different tests and consequent perceptions.

would become the sacred reality the Smith family believed them to be only insofar as the angel made them so. (59)

She suggests that the experiences of the family and the witnesses can be explained by making an analogy to the Catholic view of transubstantiation. That is, fake or non-existent plates become a sacred record in the same way the wafer and the wine become, the actual flesh and blood of Christ in the Catholic Mass.

In comparing the gold plates and the Eucharistic wafer, I am not making an argument for the reality of ancient plates (or the real presence of Christ) but raising the possibility that when materializing the plates, Smith might have been thinking more like a good Catholic than a good Calvinist. The comparison, in other words, allows us to consider the possibility that Smith viewed something that he had made (metal plates) as a vehicle through which something sacred — the ancient golden plates — could be made (really) present. In both the Catholic and Mormon case, the sacred character is visible only to those who believe. (63)

In making the suggestion that such a mode of thinking was fundamental to the founding stories of the restoration, she does not consider why the LDS do not view the sacrament itself in these terms. Our bread and water are not literally the flesh and blood and Christ, but bread and wine (and now water) used as symbols.²⁸ We use water rather than wine because it can just as easily serve as a symbol as wine. The metaphors of identity are not a metaphysics of identity.

Lacking that much more direct analogy to support her thesis, she also cites the story of the shining stones from Ether as a possible precedent for the kind of thinking that could transform a fabricated set of plates into a sacred record (62–63). Such a reading of the Ether story (her only attempt at reading a story from the Book of Mormon) makes Joseph equivalent to the Brother of Jared and makes the shining stones equivalent to both a set of fabricated plates and transubstantiation in the Catholic view of the Eucharist. This strikes me as more an unlikely leap than plausible stretch, particularly since the LDS view of the Eucharist is plainly different. The illuminated stones were still stones, not divinity. The stories of the Brass Plates and Nephi's plates and the 24 plates of the Jaredite record do nothing to support her transformation by faith

28. See Moroni 4 and 5, D&C 27:2.

hypothesis.²⁹ Nor does the 1 Nephi 13:39–41 prophecy of other records to come after the publication of the Book of Mormon that will support the Bible and restore plain and precious things that had been lost.³⁰ Ancient literary precedents for the Jaredite stones provide believing LDS with other approaches to the Ether account not mentioned by Taves.³¹

Taves demonstrates far more interest in the LDS scholarship on the translation methods and accounts than on the content of the Book of Mormon. While she cites Brant Gardner, Stephen Ricks, and others on the translation, she seems most impressed by Scott Dunn's essay on automatic writing and the Book of Mormon, clearly because his approach closely resembles hers. Certainly, this kind of proposal is legitimate in the market place of ideas, but it also has implications for the direction her investigations take and avoid and the kind of explanations she proposes and ignores.

Science does not deal in all possible laboratory manipulations. Instead, it selects those relevant to the juxtaposition of a paradigm with the immediate experience that that paradigm has partially determined. As a result, scientists with different paradigms engage indifferent concrete laboratory manipulations.³²

In formulating the puzzle of Joseph Smith this way, around notions of automaticity and hypnosis and deliberately designing her investigation to satisfy a secular audience as consistent and plausible from that perspective, it's easy to see that Taves has grounds for believing she has succeeded in explaining him. Arthur Conan Doyle has Sherlock Holmes famously say, "When you have eliminated the impossible [in this case, real angels and plates], whatever remains, no matter how improbable, must be the truth."³³ As an archetype of the brilliant

29. See 1 Nephi 4:20, 5:10, 19:1–6, Mosiah 8:9.

30. See 1 Nephi 13:23–41. Compare these specific Book of Mormon passages to Margaret Barker, "Text and Context" (paper, 2002), <http://www.margaretbarker.com/Papers/TextAndContext.pdf>.

31. See John Tvedtnes, "Ancient Literary Texts in Support of the Book of Mormon," in Donald W. Parry, Daniel C. Peterson, John W. Welch, eds., *Echoes and Evidences of the Book of Mormon* (Provo, UT: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, 2002), 246–47.

32. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 126.

33. Arthur Conan Doyle, *Sign of the Four* (1890): 111, quoted in "Sherlock Holmes," Wikiquote, last edited 5 August 2017, https://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Sherlock_Holmes#The_Sign_of_the_Four_.281890.29.

investigator, assembling the clues with perfect logic, Holmes's attitude in fiction reflected the logical positivism of the 20th century. However, Dorothy Sayers observed the effects of this dominant image of "the infallible sleuth with his cut-and-dried clues — and cast iron deductions ... and always right" and notes the shock and awe generated among both readers and writers when E. C. Bentley produced *Trent's Last Case*, in which, she reports, "The marvelous deductions might, he thought, quite easily go wrong — and in the book they go completely wrong from start to finish."³⁴ Investigators should always consider that making mistakes "in eliminating the impossible" is always possible.

Kuhn observes that:

Insofar as he is engaged in normal science, the research worker is a solver of puzzles, not a tester of paradigms. ... [H]e is like the chess player who, with a problem stated and the board physically or mentally before him, tries out various alternate moves in search for a solution. These trial attempts, whether by the chess player or the scientist, are trials only of themselves, not of the rules of the game.³⁵

What Taves produces is a hypothesis, a set of trial descriptions, but the book does not engage in a rigorous test of the validity of the rules she applies. She largely ignores both the content of the Book of Mormon and the scholarship produced by believers. Taves contextualizes her examples of Smith, Wilson, and Schucman with research on automaticity and dissociation and formally attempts to solve the puzzle they represent in strictly secular terms in that framework.

Toward the end of the emergence process, each group coalesced around an overall understanding of what had happened, which they captured in more or less official narratives of their group's emergence. These quasi-official origin accounts not only defined what it meant to be a member of the group, but also *constituted the group as a social formation*. (14)

It should not go without saying that her secular audience functions as a group that also "coalesced around an overall understanding of what happened" with respect to religious belief in general. For a target audience that shares her assumptions regarding the "rules of the game" as necessarily secular and naturalistic, this will do. This is what they paid

34. Dorothy L. Sayers, introduction to *Trent's Last Case*, by E. C. Bentley (New York: Harper and Row, 1978), x–xi.

35. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 144–45.

good money for when they purchased the book. A different audience may have different assumptions, different background information on Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon, and different questions. For instance, one of the things I think is important regarding the possibility of real plates are the two Mesoamerican cylinder seals, dating to Book of Mormon times, that have symbols on them that correspond to the characters Joseph Smith copied from the plates.³⁶ So for me, a question not addressed by the explanation Taves offers is, “How do I explain that circumstance without authentic plates?” Is coincidence good enough? I also think about the First Temple Judaism and the Book of Mormon, a notable field of exploration that post-dates the 2002 *By the Hand of Mormon* by Terryl Givens, Taves’s only serious bibliographic source on Mormon scholarship, and about Nibley on qasida and the Astons on Lehi’s journey, and Sorenson, and Gardner and Larry Poulson and John Clark on the New World setting, and much more. But the kinds of questions and information that occur to those familiar with a range of the best Mormon scholarship simply do not come up with her method, problem field, and standard of solution. Here is how Taves defines the problem of the Book of Mormon:

Based on this reconstruction, a naturalistic account would need to explain (1) the rapid flow of words that were “known” but seemed like they were not their own; (2) their ability to control the process, specifically to stop and start and shift modalities; and (3) their execution of a complex overall plan without evident planning. (250)

Compare this description of what, in 1953, Hugh Nibley observed about the puzzle regarding the best way to investigate the claims of purportedly historical texts. The traditional non-LDS approach involves a very different set of rules than what Taves offers:

One of the best-established disciplines in the world is the critical examination of written texts to detect what in them is spurious and what is genuine. ... [T]he rules given by Blass are all obvious enough on experience and reflection, but every one of them is a stumbling block to the superficial critic, and

36. See Carl Hugh Jones, “The ‘Anthon Transcript’ and Two Mesoamerican Cylinder Seals,” *Newsletter and the Proceedings of the Society for Early Historic Archeology*, no. 122 (Sept 1970), http://www.shields-research.org/General/SEHA/SEHA_Newsletter_122-2.PDF.

they have all been scrupulously avoided by those attacking the Book of Mormon.

To begin with, says Blass, “We have the document, and the name of its author; we must begin our examination by assuming the author indicated really wrote it.” You always begin by assuming the text is genuine. What critic of the Book of Mormon has ever done that?

...Thus while we can never prove absolutely that the Book is what it claims to be, we are justified at the outset in assuming that is it what it claims to be. If one assumes that it is true, its features at least become testable.³⁷

Taves’s definition of what a naturalistic account needs to explain is notably different from what Blass described as the definitive test for purportedly ancient documents. This potential test of the Book of Mormon involves details only an eyewitness could have seen, details difficult to fake, particularly at length in a long historical document, and emphasizing comparisons with information unknown to anyone in Joseph Smith’s time. We have in the Book of Mormon, beginning at a specific time and place, a journey across a desert, an ocean voyage, and then long accounts of life in the New World. We can hypothesize that any such details or claims got there through imagination or careful research by Joseph that none of his family or neighbors managed to detect, even when living with him daily or in rummaging through his house and belongings (after which the frustrated searchers never said, “No gold or plates, just shelves of books, maps, and reams of notes”). For Taves’s audience, it is enough to rely on Joseph’s conscious or unconscious memory, his storytelling abilities and mental states. It is important to remember that early critics of the Book of Mormon included Alexander Campbell, a second generation religious leader who was deeply involved in an attempt to restore primitive Christianity via Enlightenment methods, Abner Cole, a local newspaper editor, and John Gilbert, the typesetter, punctuator, and printer, all of whom had superior education and access to books than had Joseph Smith. That is, if anyone outside the Smith family was positioned to authoritatively comment on Joseph Smith’s environmental sources, it was they. (And it happens that we do have copies of every book listed in the Manchester lending library, though the Smiths were not members, did not

37. Hugh Nibley, “New Approaches to Book of Mormon Study” in CWHN 8, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Study, 1989), 55–56.

live in Manchester, and the bulk of the translation was done in far away Harmony, which had neither library nor bookstore.) But even Campbell, Cole, and Gilbert could not test Joseph Smith and the Book of Mormon against sources and even sciences like plate tectonics that no one at the time could have known.

So environmental theories are themselves things with the potential to be tested rather than accepted uncritically. In testing rival theories, the issue remains, “Which paradigm is better?” and “Which problems are more significant to have solved?”³⁸ The question of the potential presence of eyewitness details in the text represents an obvious puzzle for Book of Mormon readers to consider even if Taves and her target audience disregard it. Remember that Kuhn explained that some of the most important questions for paradigm testing are these:

[T]hey must, first and foremost, permit puzzle formulation and solution; where possible, they should be simple, self-consistent, and plausible, compatible, that is, with other theories currently deployed.³⁹

The most important and reliable scientific approach to testing the authenticity of purportedly ancient texts is based on the experience and efforts of Renaissance scholars. That is, the test is not self-referential in design, requiring us to judge either Mormonism or secularism by the standards of Mormonism. Nor does the test require us to end with either a naturalistic explanation or a faithful one. We have a method that could, in theory, support or undermine the claims of either audience. In 1953 Nibley offered Blass’s methods as a model approach to the Book of Mormon. Many believing Book of Mormon scholars since Nibley have adopted it and have found it to be impressively fruitful. Only one book in Taves’s bibliography discusses this sort of thing in significant detail: *By the Hand of Mormon* by Terryl Givens. And the only bit of evidence that Taves mentions from his survey is “chiasmus” (241), listing the word once without defining it.

Neither the *Big Book of AA* nor *A Course in Miracles* claims to be an ancient text. By comparing the Book of Mormon only with surface features of the translation and the most general features that the three books have in common (“large” and “complex”), she avoids the need to even mention the possibilities for testing the content. (She does not even mention as a point of comparison with Bill Wilson that the

38. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 110 and 147.

39. *Ibid.*, 185.

Book of Mormon contains the Twelve Steps of addiction recovery.⁴⁰ She offers a paradigm as one to compete in the open marketplace of ideas. But as Kuhn explains, one of the most important criteria for valuing a paradigm is “puzzle definition and solution” and those offering “different paradigms engage in different concrete laboratory manipulations.”

For an example of how scholars with overlapping backgrounds can engage in different approaches to the same material, consider an essay that Taves does not cite from *American Apocrypha*, a 2002 book she does cite for essays by Vogel, Dunn, and Stoker. In his essay in the volume, Robert Price refers to the reforms of Josiah and the Deuteronomists in “discovering” the Book of Law in the sixth century BCE as an example of pious fraud, a paradigm for viewing Joseph Smith as doing something similar with the Book of Mormon.⁴¹ Just a few years later, in 2005, Margaret Barker spoke on the Book of Mormon at a conference in Washington, DC, introducing her approach like this:

I am not a scholar of Mormon texts and traditions. I am a biblical scholar specializing in the Old Testament, and until some Mormon scholars made contact with me a few years ago, I would never have considered using Mormon texts and traditions as part of my work. Since that initial contact I have had many good and fruitful exchanges and have begun to look at these texts very closely. I am still, however, very much an amateur in this area. What I offer can only be the reactions of an Old Testament scholar: are the revelations to Joseph Smith consistent with the situation in Jerusalem in about 600 BCE? Do the revelations to Joseph Smith fit in that context, the reign of King Zedekiah, who is mentioned at the beginning of the First Book of Nephi, which begins in the “first year of the reign of Zedekiah” (1 Nephi 1:4)? Zedekiah was installed as king in Jerusalem in 597 BCE.⁴²

40. See Colleen Harrison, *He Did Deliver Me from Bondage* (Hyrum, UT: Hearthaven Publishing, 2012).

41. Robert Price, “Joseph Smith: Inspired Author of the Book of Mormon” in Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 321–66.

42. Margaret Barker “Joseph Smith and Pre-exilic Israelite Religion” in *BYU Studies Quarterly*, 44/4 (2005), 69. <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=3731&context=byusq>.

Even though Price and Barker are both non-LDS Bible scholars approaching the Book of Mormon, and even though both cite the reforms of Josiah and the appearance of the Book of Law, they engage in very different “concrete laboratory manipulations” and consequently perceive very different things.⁴³ For Price, the “discovery” Book of the Law serves as paradigmatic model of pious fraud; for Barker, it is part of a relevant historical context that constitutes a valid test. Remember that I quoted Nibley on Blass’s rules for authenticating historical documents:

To begin with, says Blass, “We have the document, and the same of its author; we must begin our examination by assuming that the author indicated really wrote it” You always begin by assuming the text is genuine. What critic of the Book of Mormon has ever done that?⁴⁴

What was remarkable about Barker’s approach is that it actually allows that assumption to inform her test. And that is the point Nibley made: “If one assumes that it is true, its features at least become testable.” Price began, as Professor Midgley observes of some LDS scholars, “to approach the text of the Book of Mormon already knowing, from sources exterior to the text, both the questions and the answers.”⁴⁵ Barker brought what she knew, from sources exterior to the text, a rather different set of questions for the Book of Mormon. Under the circumstance Barker defines, “its features became testable” to the degree the answers she gave were not ideologically predetermined. She does not begin by declaring the Book of Mormon is either fraudulent or correct but rather frames her approach in a manner in which both positive and negative answers to that question are at least possible, depending on how the testing goes. All of the themes of authority, transfiguration, and ascent that Price mentions in his discussion of 3 Nephi as evidence of a “cut and paste” approach by Joseph Smith also come forward quite naturally in comparing the Book of Mormon to Barker’s work on the Jerusalem 600 BCE context and the First Temple tradition. That is, the very issues that Price sees as evidence of Joseph Smith’s pious fraud turn out to belong together in the 3 Nephi temple setting in which they appear. It also happens that Price reviewed Barker’s *The Great Angel* as marking a “paradigm” shift

43. I treat this in detail in a forthcoming essay, “Notice and Value.”

44. Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon*, 55.

45. Louis Midgley, “Prophetic Messages or Dogmatic Theology? Commenting on the Book of Mormon: A Review Essay” in *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon*, 1 (1989): 107.

in Biblical studies and published her essay on “The Secret Tradition,”⁴⁶ which contained much relevant to the themes he considered in 3 Nephi. In his case, he has the relevant information at hand, but guided by his paradigm of pious fraud, he fails to imagine the possible connection.

I mentioned that Thomas O’Dea famously observed that the Book of Mormon is not “one of those books that one must read in order to have an opinion of it.” The same thing often applies to serious Book of Mormon scholarship. Sometimes, from some critics who read it comprehensively, we get telling admissions like that from John Charles Duffy, the author of an ambitious *Sunstone* essay on Book of Mormon scholarship. He reports of himself, “As someone who does not believe in the historicity of the Book of Mormon, I dismiss *a priori* much of the work FARMS scholars have done around the book.”⁴⁷

As Barbour observes,

[I]f a deduction is not confirmed experimentally, one cannot be sure which one, from among the many assumptions on which the deduction was based, was in error. A network of theories and observations is always tested together. Any particular hypothesis can be maintained by rejecting or adjusting other auxiliary hypotheses.

... In practice the scientist works in the framework of accepted assumptions and throws all the doubt on one hypothesis at a time; but it might be the accepted assumptions that should be questioned.⁴⁸

Here is what Professor Taves does with Joseph Smith, Bill Wilson, and Helen Schucman. For each of her three subjects, she first walks through the formal history written by the leaders of each group. Then she looks again at history, noting differences between the later formal histories and earlier contemporary accounts. This establishes the formal history as socially constructed to some degree to serve later purposes not originally envisioned. And it establishes Taves herself as one who knows what really happened and, therefore, somewhat above the historical record that binds believers.

46. Margaret Barker, “Secret Tradition” (paper, 1993), <http://www.margaretbarker.com/Papers/SecretTradition.pdf>

47. John-Charles Duffy, “Defending the Kingdom, Rethinking the Faith: How Apologetics is Reshaping Mormon Orthodoxy,” *Sunstone* 132 (May 2004): 43.

48. Barbour, *Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Science and Religion*, 99.

The discussion of each group opens with a consideration of how the story of the path's emergence is usually told by followers of the path, briefly introduces the key collaborators, and then indicates, based on the available sources, how we can reconstruct the process as it unfolded from the point of view of the interacting subjects. It's important to recognize that while the reconstructed process will break with the more or less "official" story of the path's emergence, it still tells the story from the point of view of the interacting subjects. The difference lies in the timing and the vantage point of the telling. Insiders tell the "official" stories in light of what emerged. Their retrospective accounts make the outcome look much more inevitable than it did as the process was unfolding. (6)

One thing she does not do is compare the process of emergence in her historical accounts with what happens in all histories, including the history of science. In a fascinating chapter called "The Invisibility of Revolutions," Kuhn observes:

As the source of authority, I have in mind principally text books of science together with both popularizations and the philosophical works modeled on them. ... They address themselves to an already articulated body of problems, data, and theory, most often to the particular set of paradigms to which the scientific community is committed at the time they are written. ... To fulfill their function they need not provide authentic information about the way in which those based were first recognized and then embraced by the profession. In the case of textbooks, at least, there are even good reasons why, in these matters, they should be systematically misleading...

For the moment, let us simply take it for granted that, to an extent unprecedented in other fields, both the layman's and the practitioner's knowledge of science is based on textbooks and a few other types of literature derived from them. Textbooks, however, being pedagogic vehicles for the perpetuation of normal science, have to be rewritten in whole or in part whenever the language, problem-structure, or standards of normal science change. In short, they have to be rewritten in the aftermath of each scientific revolution, and, once rewritten, they inevitably disguise not only the role

but the very existence of the revolutions that preceded them. Unless he has personally experienced a revolution in his own lifetime, the historical sense either of the working scientist or the lay reader of textbook literature extends only to the outcome of the most recent revolutions in the field.

...For reasons that are both obvious and highly functional, science textbooks (and too many of the older histories of science) refer only to that part of the work of past scientists that can easily be viewed as contributions to the statement and solution of the texts' paradigm problems. Partly by selection and partly by distortion, the scientists of earlier ages are implicitly represented as having worked upon the same set of fixed problems and in accordance with the same set of fixed canons that the most recent revolution in scientific theory and method has made seem scientific. No wonder that textbooks and the historical tradition they imply have to be rewritten after each scientific revolution. And no wonder that, as they are rewritten, science once again comes to seem as largely cumulative.⁴⁹

It seems to me that much of the angst in parts of the LDS community over our changing history can and should be seen not as a reasonable response to a genuine faith crisis but rather a panic response to what we ought to see as a normal human process. The standards of doing history changed, not just within the LDS community, but within the history profession as a whole, and naturally, the histories change accordingly. So we have things like the Joseph Smith Papers project, gathering and making available original, contemporary, first-hand accounts.

I've learned it is crucial to be aware of the implications of one's one paradigm in approaching debates with others: "When paradigms enter, as they must, into a debate about paradigm choice, their role is necessarily circular. Each group uses its own paradigm to argue in that paradigm's defense."⁵⁰

We define our paradigms via the standard examples we offer; the stories we take as representative of the general circumstances. Not only is Nibley's work paradigmatic for many LDS scholars, but it also represents, via his non-LDS authority Blass, a generally paradigmatic approach for the questions in authenticating historical documents. Taves offers her own secular approach as a general model to approach claims to revelation as signified by "large and complex" books. This is important. My approach to

49. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 136–38.

50. *Ibid.*, 94.

Taves here, in noting the difference between Taves's secular assumptions and Nibley's reference to Blass raises the questions of which paradigm is better and whether we establish "better" through methods of examination and judgement not themselves paradigm dependent, not based on self-referential standards. That is, I ought to be able to consciously explain "Why us?" in a way not just overtly or covertly saying "Not us." My methods ought to put my own paradigm at risk rather than protect it from such. My methods should in principle provide the means to make a case against my own starting beliefs rather than reflexively and uncritically dismissing any opposition as "fake news!"

Whose picture is truly representative? Which is better? "Like the choice between competing political institutions, that between competing paradigms proves to be a choice between incompatible modes of community life."⁵¹

What would make Taves's approach better than mine or mine better than hers? Is it just a matter of which audience we want to please or which community we want to join? Her bibliography cites only a few texts relevant to the question of defining and comprehensively solving the puzzle that the Book of Mormon presents.

- Fawn Brodie, *No Man Knows My History: The Life of Joseph Smith*, 2nd ed. (New York: Knopf, 1971), a famously secular approach that has a section making an environmental explanation of the Book of Mormon.
- Richard Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984) which provides a brief summary of the Book of Mormon, a good survey of early critical arguments, and does respond well to the mid-80s fashion for invoking Ethan Smith's *View of the Hebrews* as potential source. (*View*, he observes, is about the Lost 10 Tribes, and in the Book of Mormon, the Lost 10 Tribes are expressly lost, and not the subject.) She also cites Bushman's *Rough Stone Rolling*.
- Scott Dunn, "Automaticity and the Dictation of the Book of Mormon" in Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002). This is a slightly edited version of a 1985 *Sunstone* essay, basically changing the title and adding a wholly inaccurate and inadequate

51. *Ibid.*, 94.

response buried in a single footnote to Richard L. Anderson's important essay on "Imitation Gospels and Christ's Book of Mormon Ministry."⁵² Dunn's note 85 lists such things as Dan Vogel's *Indian Origins and the Book of Mormon*, George D. Smith's and Madison Sowell's 1981 essays on the Roberts study and *View of the Hebrews*, and a few other essays arguing against the Book of Mormon, but he doesn't bother to mention or address any important LDS scholarship since then. His footnote 86 refers to Madison Sowell's 1981 *Sunstone* paper as providing a "good overview of the debates" regarding "View of the Hebrews," but this inevitably and irresponsibly neglects the important work published in the two decades subsequent to Sowell's short essay and available before the publication of *American Apocrypha*. This includes John Welch's 1985 paper, "Answering B. H. Roberts Questions and 'An Unparallel,'" as well as Sorenson's *An Ancient American Setting for the Book of Mormon*. Apparently, neither Dunn nor his editors considered these studies relevant enough to mention. We can take Taves's book as an elaboration of Dunn's hypothesis.

- Terryl Givens, *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture that Launched a New World Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). In two chapters on "The Book of Mormon as Ancient History," Givens provides a serious historical survey of believing and skeptical arguments regarding the Book of Mormon as history from 1829 to 2002. Of the material Givens surveys, only chiasmus rates a mention in her book. Givens discusses critics such as Howe, Brodie, and even Dan Vogel, Mark Thomas, and John Brooke. He also mentions defenders of the Book of Mormon including important work by Nibley, Sorenson, Hamblin, Welch, Ostler, and Peterson.

52. Richard Lloyd Anderson, "Imitation Gospels and Christ's Book of Mormon Ministry," in *Apocryphal Writings and the Latter-day Saints*, ed. C. Wilfred Griggs (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1986), 53–107, <https://rsc.byu.edu/archived/apocryphal-writings-and-latter-day-saints/4-imitation-gospels-and-christ-s-book-mormon>.

- Grant Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon: A Reader's Guide* (New York: Oxford, 2010). This is a valuable and important close reading of the Book of Mormon focused on “character studies ... particularly the three major narrators”⁵³ while “bracketing ... questions of historicity”⁵⁴ in order to “demonstrate a mode of literary analysis by which all readers, regardless of their prior religious commitments or the lack thereof, can discuss the book in useful and accurate ways.”⁵⁵ While I appreciate Hardy’s work, I have learned that contextualization can often make surprising differences in what a person might suppose is the “plain meaning of the text,” and that we cannot know the difference an ancient context makes unless we try it out.⁵⁶
- Eber D. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2015), which contains the oft-quoted affidavits regarding the supposedly lazy and primarily money-digging and superstitious Smiths and the first iteration of the Spaulding theory. Because Taves sees Smith as the author, she does not discuss the Spaulding theory.
- Grant Palmer, *An Insider's View of Mormon Origins* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), which views Joseph Smith as fraud, deriving the Book of Mormon from

53. Grant Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon: A Reader's Guide* (New York: Oxford, 2010), 23.

54. *Ibid.*, xvi.

55. *Ibid.*, xvii.

56. For instance, consider the word “mark” in Jacob 4:14. BYU Professor Paul Y. Hoskisson wrote a detailed essay called “Looking Beyond the Mark” in Kent P. Jackson and Andrew C. Skinner, eds., *A Witness for the Restoration: Essays in Honor of Robert J. Matthews* (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 2007), 149–64. He argues for a reading based on the definition used in the 1828 Webster’s Dictionary: a target. In “The Deuteronomist De-christianizing of the Old Testament” in *The FARMS Review* 16/2 (2004), I argued that the “mark” is the anointing of the high priest with the sacred name, as used in Ezekiel 9:4. We can’t both be right, and the difference does, I think, make a huge difference. So, how to decide which context is best? Does it matter more that the Book of Mormon was translated in 1829 in English or that Ezekiel was an exact contemporary of Jacob and also a priest in exile? That is just one word. Soil and nurture for words, Jesus said, can make a hundred-fold difference in yield. And of the Parable of the Sower, he says in Mark 4:13, “Know ye not this parable? And then will ye know all parables?”

the environment, using sources like *View of the Hebrews*. Despite his claims to be an insider, not just LDS but an insider historian speaking for the community, actual LDS historians found his work to be shallow and notably one-sided, ignoring important primary sources and important scholarship throughout.

- David Persuitte, *Joseph Smith and the Origins of the Book of Mormon* 2nd Ed. (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2000), which elaborates on the notion of Joseph Smith as a fraudulent money digger and argues for deliberate borrowing from Ethan Smith's *View of the Hebrews*.
- D. Michael Quinn, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1998). Quinn postulates that Joseph Smith drew on all sorts of esoteric traditions despite no evidence that Joseph Smith could afford or had even seen any of the esoteric books involved.
- B. H. Roberts, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992). This is another discussion of parallels to *View of the Hebrews*, making a devil's advocate case of Book of Mormon dependence from the perspective of 1923. It is worth noting that while Roberts was an LDS authority, much has happened in LDS scholarship since 1923 that he could not consider, and indeed, much has happened since the formal publication of the studies in 1985.
- Robert A. Rees, "The Book of Mormon and Automatic Writing" in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 15/1 (2006), 5–17. Taves observes that Rees here responds to Scott Dunn's automaticity essay. She does not cite Richard L. Anderson's earlier and, I think, much more important and telling response.
- Susan Straker, "Secret Things, Hidden Things: The Seer Story in the Imaginative Economy of Joseph Smith" in Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002). Straker's essay is the only one in *American Apocrypha* that explores the Book of Mormon narrative in

a sustained way. She argues for parallels between the seer narratives in the text and in Joseph Smith's career as seer.

- Dan Vogel, *Joseph Smith: The Making of a Prophet* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2004). She cites Vogel for his notion of fake plates and hypnotized witnesses. Vogel's book is notable for assuming any parallels he can find or create between Joseph Smith's life and the text demonstrates that Joseph created the text from his own imagination. Vogel's work is also notable for preferring to give preference to his own speculations over the reports of eye-witnesses that he so painstakingly gathered and published.

Her bibliography of contemporary LDS scholarship on the Book of Mormon is not extensive, not up-to-date, and is clearly weighted to skeptical interpretations generally consistent with her secular views. This is not necessarily decisive for her suggestions, but it does raise questions and has implications for the issue of how well her hypothesis accounts for what she has not considered. Even if she had read and listed many other important studies of the Book of Mormon, that doesn't mean she would take them seriously in relation to her study. Having listed Bushman's *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism*, she would have seen this passage:

Perhaps the most serious failing of the critiques of the Book of Mormon was an inability to deal with the text in any detail. ... The outsiders' yearning to find some rational explanation for the Book of Mormon caused them to hurry their work. Their aim was always to explain away the Book of Mormon rather than understand it. Failing to ground their views in the actual contents of the books, the critiques did not do justice to the work's actual complexity, and their conclusions were unstable, even ephemeral.⁵⁷

Taves's approach may seem sensible and promising from a secular perspective, but a reader like myself, coming to the problem and proposed solution with a great deal of reading that does not appear in her bibliography, may see the implications of her limited choices on context and comparison that would be illuminated by a broader perspective. For example, it is important to see the full implications of the way Taves contextualizes

57. Richard Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginning of Mormonism* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 127–28.

Joseph Smith by placing him in company with Wilson, Schucman, and research on dissociative mental states. In surveying a range of different Joseph Smith histories, Richard Bushman observed that

the context in which [Joseph Smith] is placed profoundly affects how people see the Prophet, since the history selected for a subject colors everything about it. Is he a money digger like hundreds of other superstitious Yankees in his day, a religious fanatic like Muhammad was thought to be in Joseph's time, a prophet like Moses, a religious revolutionary like Jesus? To a large extent, Joseph Smith assumes the character of the history selected for him.⁵⁸

John McDade had observed the same decisive influence of contextualization in his important survey of Jesus research:

There is then a radical dependence between the reconstructed Jesus and the reconstructed context/model: how the context and social model are understood determines how Jesus is understood. "Determines" is not too strong a word, for one of the problems with this approach is that the grid of social and economic context is such a strong factor it can inhibit responsible handling of the actual textual evidence we have for Jesus.⁵⁹

Contextualization has a determining effect, causing Joseph Smith to assume the character of the history selected for him. Taves places Joseph Smith alongside Helen Schucman and Bill Wilson and notions of automaticity and the creativity of highly hypnotizable individuals. That is a soil, context, and nurture designed to grow a particular crop targeting the appetite of her secular audience. One of her sources, Terryl Givens in *By the Hand of Mormon*, included a survey of scholars who contextualize the Book of Mormon in the ancient world. But which context is best? And how do we measure best? Jesus says that the soil and nurture in which a word is placed can lead to different yields, ranging from nothing to a hundred-fold. He also says of the Parable of the Sower, "Know ye not this parable? And how then will ye know all parables?"

58. Richard Bushman, "Joseph Smith's Many Histories" in John W. Welch, ed., *The Worlds of Joseph Smith*, BYU Studies 44/4 (2005), 4. Also compare Alan Goff, "To Insinuate All Ideas and Inevitably Misperceive Historical Judgement: Epistemological Metaphor in Mormon Biography" in *International Journal of Mormon Studies*, January 1, 2014, <http://www.ijmsonline.org/archives/3286>.

59. John McDade, "Jesus In Recent Research," *The Month* (December 1998): 495–505.

(Mark 4:13). And as Samuel Clemens says, “The difference between the right word, and almost the right word, is that between a lightning bug and lightning.” The same is true of context.

Alexander Campbell contextualized Joseph Smith by titling his response “Delusions” and by leading off his essay by saying, “Every age of the world has produced imposters and delusions. Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses,”⁶⁰ and he continues with a discussion of a range of “false prophets” and imposters. For his part, Joseph Smith, in his 1838 account, compares himself to “Paul, when he made his defense before King Agrippa” (Joseph Smith History – 1:24). For my part, I spent several years compiling a list of 28 biblical keys for discerning true and false prophets.⁶¹ That seems to me at least a natural and reasonable approach to contextualizing the claims of Joseph Smith, a relevant context in which to examine the puzzle he represents. And it is clear this approach to solving the puzzle of Joseph Smith leads to some very different conclusions regarding how we might compare him to Bill Wilson and Helen Schucman and what we consequently might see as most significant about them.

As Kuhn observes,

Insofar as he is engaged in normal science, the research worker is a solver of puzzles, not a tester of paradigms. Though he may, during the search for a particular puzzle’s solution, try out a number of alternative approaches, rejecting those that fail to yield the desired result, he is not testing the *paradigm* when he does so. Instead he is like the chess player who, with a problem stated and the board physically or mentally before him, tries

60. Alexander Campbell, *Delusions*. (Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 1832), 5, <https://archive.org/details/delusionsanalysis01camp>.

61. Kevin Christensen, “Biblical Keys for Discerning True and False Prophets,” FairMormon, copyright 2017, https://www.fairmormon.org/answers/Biblical_Keys_for_Discerning_True_and_False_Prophets. A secular person, or one of a different religious persuasion (say Hindu or Buddhist or Muslim), might reflexively and justifiably label my approach “polemical” when applied to their secular claims, or different religious claims, whether I am willing to put myself under the same microscope or not. If a person does not believe the Bible, or believes the Bible but does not trust my selection and interpretation of the verses, why should they bind themselves to my approach? Simply saying “So what?” can be an effective response for some, though that obviously is not the same thing as a careful and considered response. But if I were not willing to submit Joseph Smith to those 28 Biblical tests, the more accurate and telling label for my refusal would be hypocritical, rather than polemical.

out various alternative moves in the search for a solution. These trial attempts, whether by the chess player or by the scientist, are trials only of themselves, not of the rules of the game.⁶²

The presence of the alternative approach defined by Blass for testing documents also turns out to be a means to try the rules of the game as Taves defines them. And what we know about the rules of paradigm debate from Kuhn means that we compare paradigms in a way that does not completely depend on self-referential arguments. That is, we can frame the comparison that provide reasons that justify “Why us,” rather than just tribal dismissals as “Not us.”

Ian Barbour comments, “As when literary critics evaluate a play, there are both data and criteria held in common, which makes possible a rational discussion even among those whose conclusions differ. There are no *proofs*, but *there are good reasons* for judgements which are not simply matters of personal taste or individual preference.”⁶³

So the existence of a substantial body of work exploring the historicity of the Book of Mormon text may not demonstrate proofs, but it does demonstrate “reasons for judgements which are not simply matters of personal taste.”

Some of the reasons for judgements can arise because, as Kuhn observes, “[P]articularly persuasive arguments can be developed if the new paradigm permits the prediction of phenomena that had been entirely unsuspected while the old one prevailed.”⁶⁴

There is another relevant comparative test to make by reading Richard L. Anderson’s essay “Imitation Gospels and Christ’s Book of Mormon Ministry.” Because his article compares the 3 Nephi account with a range of other modern gospels, many of which were also composed in a manner that invites comparison with “spirit writing” and “automaticity,” this is an important essay to consult in order evaluate Taves’s arguments. The texts and books that Anderson examines include:

- *The Aquarian Gospel* by Levi S. Dowling, published in 1908. A convert in my ward gave me this to read a few years ago. It is long and draws extensively on the New Testament, but it goes its own way and does not, in my

62. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 144–45.

63. Barbour, *Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Science and Religion*, 146.

64. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 154.

view, rival the Book of Mormon. Anderson cites many historical inaccuracies and contradictions of scripture.⁶⁵

- *The Archko Volume*. “The supposed editor of a large find of writings was William D. Mahan, a Missouri Presbyterian preacher who was disciplined in 1885 by his local presbytery for plagiarizing Lew Wallace’s *Ben Hur* and publishing ‘Eli’s Story of the Magi’ as a fraudulent ancient document.”⁶⁶
- *The Gospel of the Holy Twelve*. “The medium of receiving this long gospel was the Reverend G. J. R. Ouseley, who left the Church of England and associated with several para-Christian movements before his death in 1906. Some of his writings promoted vegetarianism, also a prominent theme in his revealed additions to the New Testament.”⁶⁷
- *Oahspe*. “A tiny fraction of this ‘Kosmon Bible’ claims to report the historical Jesus. Its author was John Newbrough, a dentist who made a hobby of spiritualism for years. Finally claiming purification to reach the higher spirits, he began his scribal work in 1881 without any record: ‘One morning the light struck both my hands on the back and they went for the typewriter, for some fifteen minutes, very vigorously. I was told not to read what was printed. . . . For fifty weeks this continued . . . and then it ceased, and I was told to read and publish Oahspe.’ The time of day was before dawn, and the coming of daylight terminated the inspiration each day. The result was published in 1882 and reads like a science-fiction view of history, with strange mortal and extraterrestrial beings that control and conflict. Jesus appears incidentally as an astounding contradiction to gospel and Jewish realities: ‘In the thirty-sixth year of Joshu’s age he was stoned to death in Jerusalem by the Jews that worshipped the heathen Gods.’”⁶⁸
- *The Sorry Tale*. “This justly forgotten novel impressed American reviewers of the World War I generation but can only be reviewed as sterile bombast today. Its notoriety came from author Pearl Curran’s story of receiving

65. Anderson, “Imitation Gospels and Christ’s Book of Mormon Ministry,” 57.

66. *Ibid.*, 57.

67. *Ibid.*, 60.

68. *Ibid.*, 63–64.

dictation of poetry and historical tales from the spirit of a ‘Puritan spinster’ called Patience Worth.”⁶⁹

- *The Urantia Book*. “Published in 1955, this massive volume devotes a third of its space to the story of Christ. But of all the imitation gospels surveyed here, this one offers the fewest clues on its origin.”⁷⁰ Subsequent to Anderson’s 1986 essay, Martin Gardner wrote *Urantia: The Great Cult Mystery* (Amherst: Prometheus Books, 1995) which describes how physician William Sadler, as early as 1911, conducted interviews with a neighbor who had begun falling into nightly trances. Sadler shared his interest in the trance subject with a group of friends and colleagues who were already meeting for philosophical discussions. The group began conducting interviews with the trance subject, and the results eventually became *The Urantia Book*. I reviewed this for the AML-List in 1995. Gardner makes some superficial comparisons to Joseph Smith and The Book of Mormon. *The Urantia Book* origins via a trance subject and committee involvement over several years strikes me as far more amenable to direct comparison with *A Course in Miracles* than the Book of Mormon.

Anderson’s essay overall seems strikingly relevant to Taves’s subject, and I find it surprising that she did not reference it, at least as a compliment to the essay by Robert Rees responding to Scott Dunn that she does cite. Perhaps she did not know about Anderson, or perhaps Dunn’s response to Anderson in a single footnote defused her interest. According to Dunn, Anderson “discusses spiritualist works about Jesus Christ and makes judgements about their authenticity. His chief criteria are (1) consistency with Mormon interpretations of the Bible and (2) his personal opinion of each work’s literary merit.”⁷¹

Dunn here is so inaccurate and misleading in dismissing Anderson that it seems to me a response to what Dunn imagined Anderson wrote, rather than what he actually produced. Anderson discusses a range of modern Gospels, including but not limited to spiritualist work. And Anderson’s chief criteria involve consistency with known

69. Ibid., 65.

70. Ibid., 68.

71. Scott Dunn, “Automaticity and the Book of Mormon” in Dan Vogel and Brent Metcalfe eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 41.

historical records, including but not limited to the New Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and early Christian writings. He observes that in comparison to modern Apocrypha the Book of Mormon is unique in (1) not contradicting the New Testament; (2) demonstrating affinity with ancient styles and practices, including the Peshier form exemplified in the Dead Sea Scrolls but not known or demonstrated by any other modern Gospel; and (3) demonstrating unique consistency with the criteria non-LDS scholars have created for identifying authentic logia, that is, words of Jesus not found in the New Testament. Anderson also discusses the witnesses to the Book of Mormon as without parallel in any of the other modern gospels. So contrary to Dunn's non-exhaustive footnote response, Anderson does not simply reply on "consistency with Mormon interpretations" nor "his personal opinions" but he cites a range of non-LDS authorities, including scholars who have examined other modern Gospels, such as Enslin, Stendhal, Goodspeed, and Per Beskow. In doing so, he highlights what is different and distinctive about the Book of Mormon, and all of his findings are directly relevant in evaluating the model that Taves offers. These include the following:

- "No apocryphal gospel furnishes any witness who saw its original record, who could be cross-examined concerning it. Like Christ's resurrection itself, the Book of Mormon presents a supernatural claim surrounded by impressive circumstantial evidence."⁷²
- "Depth and dimension permeate Third Nephi but are notably absent from the spurious later gospels. Most are thinly disguised special pleading — making Christ a precursor for Mohammed, promoter of a natural health program, an Eastern mystic, or a cosmic spiritualist. These books mix strange code words and jargon with the known teachings of the Lord. But they are also disconcerting even in the portions that do not conflict with the Gospels, for here they trivialize Jesus into a wordy moralizer. So fictitious gospels must hazard two dangers: contradictions or flattening of dynamic events and vital personality. The gospel forger stands at the crossroads of too much novelty or too little substance."⁷³

72. Anderson, "Imitation Gospels and Christ's Book of Mormon Ministry," 77.

73. *Ibid.*, 80.

- “No modern apocryphal gospel pictures Christ as an expounder of the prophets, but when he appears in this role in Third Nephi, he speaks in a known idiom of ancient Judaism, alternating prophetic verses with interpretive explanations. The Qumran ‘commentaries’ generally quote a part of a verse, one verse, or up to three verses, with interspersed explanations. Early Christian literature has some examples of a chain of quotations with comments, but does not display the above explication of one prophet that makes the Qumran *pesharim* highly unusual. It is improbable that Joseph Smith stumbled onto this teaching form, since the Qumran *peshet* style is distinctive enough to rate a special article in the 1971 *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.⁷⁴

Dunn’s essay showed a particular interest in Pearl Curran’s production of a life of Jesus called *The Sorry Tale*. And Dunn and Taves are both legitimately impressed by comparisons of surface features of her composition to Joseph Smith’s translation. But surface composition does not tell the whole story of the different substances. For example, in making a case that *The Sorry Tale* had not only a translation resembling the Book of Mormon, but an equally impressive content, Dunn writes:

Regarding *The Sorry Tale*, one author notes that “scholars and literary critics agreed that even a lifetime of reading all of the available knowledge of the Holy Land (reading that apparently never took place, but even if it had) still would not have given [Curran] the information to produce a book with such verisimilitude.”⁷⁵

With respect to Curran and verisimilitude, Anderson writes:

Mrs. Curran’s editor stated the plot as follows:

Christ himself is the outstanding and speaking character, though the central figure is a son of the Emperor Tiberius by Theia, a dancing slave, who names him Hatte. He is born outside the walls of Bethlehem on the same night in which Christ was born, and the two lives move on parallel paths to the tragedy on Calvary, where Hatte also is crucified, being the person known as the “unrepentant thief.”

74. Ibid., 88–89.

75. Dunn, “Automaticity and the Book of Mormon,” 28.

This contrived story grinds through 500 pages of simplistic narrative and tedious dialogue before featuring Jesus. The whole is subvictorian prose at its predictable worst, where tears are dropping jewels and bosoms regularly heave. Despite Mrs. Curran's claim of "panoramic" moving pictures in her mind, *The Sorry Tale* notably lacks social and physical details. If they are mentioned, the score for accuracy is low. For instance, Mrs. Curran claimed to envision "the ark as it was at that time restored," but this relic had long since disappeared from Jewish scripture and history. The Roman governor sat in an oriental court, with "vested virgins" dancing before him, and Jesus shocked the masses by dining with the Pharisees, though they are known in the Gospels and Josephus as popularly respected. The unhistorical "eye of the needle" gate is described, with the physically implausible act of the camel inching through it on his knees.

If this *Tale* cannot recreate settings, what is its picture of Christ? The free and rapid dictation shows a patchwork of events from the Gospels — their historical integrity is flaunted in random chronology and modified message. The canonical five loaves and two fishes diminishes to "two fishes and a loaf," and the miraculous is next subtracted. Although all Gospels detail how five thousand were physically fed, *The Sorry Tale* gives a sentimental version of how hunger vanished as the crowd was overwhelmed with truth. The close is an unrealistic platitude on Jesus' lips: "for the body crieth out only when the spirit is barren." Since the *Tale* reports no resurrection, the natural crescendo of Christ's teachings is the Last Supper and the Garden, but here the reader meets no suffering Savior. Emotive prose changes the grim night arrest to a pregnant dawn; the bloody sweat is reduced to a footnote while Christ's insuperable burden becomes a pleasant prayer about "supping sweet the cup." This storybook Jesus gently wanders back to his Apostles, "pausing to pluck a branch and kiss it, plucking up a stone, to smile and leave it fall."

The Sorry Tale spins overdone human tragedy but fades out the divine tragedy of Christ's atonement for sin. Its Jesus teaches an unstructured "kingdom of love" but drops out the realities of

sin and salvation, church and ordinances. Such oversimplified humanism does not match the Christ of the Gospels.⁷⁶

Rather than confront any of these specifics in Anderson's article, Dunn's updates to his 1982 essay for the 2002 *American Apocrypha* settled for an unsupported and inaccurate claim regarding what Anderson wrote. Yet Anderson's work offers a wealth of fresh and important observations in noting how distinct the Book of Mormon is in comparison to a wide range of modern gospels produced by means of automatic writing and dissociative states:

The beginning of this paper noted the continuation of Jesus' sayings in quotations by Paul and by the Christian fathers. Here scholars seek some basis for judging whether these free-floating sayings have historical credibility, since they are not in canonical Gospels. To be considered authentic, the quotation should come from an early source with probable access to authentic information about Christ. But given this condition, how can one separate folklore from responsible tradition? That forces a judgment after first determining these "genealogical" credentials. Then comes the question: is the saying "conceivable in the mouth of Jesus, in view of what the canonical Gospels make known to us of his thought and spirit"?

There are many terse and wholesome utterances, utterly unobjectionable and free from the bias of dubious theology or the tinsel of fantasy, which have appeared to many critics as not inappropriate to the Jesus of the canonical Gospels.

The first half of this paper gave sample quotations from modern apocrypha, showing that their language typically displays platitudes, wordiness, or unfocused mysticism. But Third Nephi joins the four Gospels in the spiritual light reflecting from vivid sayings of the Lord. These are not in obvious positions in the American Gospel, but are spread evenly throughout Christ's teachings as the spontaneous utterances of one who typically sums up his message in concise urgency:

76. Anderson, "Imitation Gospels and Christ's Book of Mormon Ministry," 65–67.

Old things are done away, and all things have become new (3 Nephi 12:47).

Therefore, whoso remembereth these sayings of mine and doeth them, him will I raise up at the last day (3 Nephi 15:1).

Behold, I am the law, and the light (3 Nephi 15:9).

Behold, I am the light which ye shall hold up — that which ye have seen me do (3 Nephi 18:24).

And if it so be that the church is built upon my gospel, then will the Father show forth his own works in it (3 Nephi 27:10).

Because a main goal of scholarship is discovery, studies continue to gather and weigh the noncanonical sayings of Jesus. Out of several hundred possibilities, from one to two dozen are usually selected on the double basis of location in a responsible historical source plus tone reminiscent of Jesus. Third Nephi contains many more vivid sayings than the examples given above. But if these are mingled with other uncanonical words from early sources, they measure up with those most favored in possessing the “terseness and aptness very characteristic of Jesus’s mode of speech.” The objective element is style, the close resemblance to Jesus’ patterns of expression.⁷⁷

Readers of Dunn’s essay are not informed of the existence of the kinds of observations and evidence that Anderson makes regarding the unique and distinctive nature of the Book of Mormon, even in relation to a range of books that rival its claim to be a modern gospel. That Taves did not consult or confront Anderson’s important work makes her book particularly vulnerable in comparison. Kuhn observes that “particularly persuasive arguments can be developed if the new paradigm permits the prediction of phenomena that had been entirely unsuspected while the old one prevailed.”⁷⁸

One of the reasons I enjoy the work of the best LDS scholars in comparison to the work of disaffected LDS and secular critics is that while I am rarely surprised or disturbed by what the critics offer,⁷⁹ I am

77. Anderson, “Imitation Gospels and Christ’s Book of Mormon Ministry,” 95–96.

78. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 154.

79. See Kevin Christensen, “New Wine and New Bottles: Scriptural Scholarship as Sacrament,” *Dialogue* 24/3 (Fall 1991): 121–129. My first publication in LDS

continually astonished by what I learn from scholars like Nibley, Anderson, Welch, Peterson, Tvedtnes, Ricks, Goff, Gardner, and many others. Yet, she did list *By the Hand of Mormon* in her bibliography, a remarkable book published by Oxford University Press for an academic readership.

Taves can take a kind of comfort in knowing that her secular audience, for the most part, will not know or value this body of scholarship. But as Ian Barbour says, a belief in God “makes a difference not only in one’s attitudes and behaviour but in the way one sees the world. One may notice and value features of individual and corporate life which one otherwise might have overlooked.”⁸⁰

Taves mentions the important issue of delusion:

According to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*, a delusion is “a false belief based on [an] incorrect inference about external reality that is firmly sustained despite what almost everyone else believes and despite what constitutes incontrovertible and obvious proof or evidence to the contrary” (DSM-5 2013, 819). (269)

This sounds straightforward, except that until we all possess omniscience, we all inevitably possess incorrect inferences about external reality and are therefore all operating under as yet unidentified delusions. The history of science demonstrates over and over again that change can often come through a new insight that goes against what almost everyone else believes. Taves also brings in the concept of “reality monitoring” (260), which raises the question of how best to do it. In considering whether Taves or I and other believing scholars offer a map that more accurately describes the territory of LDS faith, consider the following criteria of worth because they are not paradigm-dependent. Kuhn reports on what matters most in pragmatic practice:

- “[S]ince no paradigm ever solves all the problems it defines, and since no two paradigms leave all the same problems unsolved, paradigm debates always involve the question: Which problems are more significant to have solved?”⁸¹
- “Probably the single most prevalent claim advanced by the proponents of a new paradigm is that they can solve the problems that have led the old one to a crisis.”⁸²

letters grew out of a brief disturbance that generated encouraging insights.

80. Barbour, *Myths, Models, and Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Science and Religion*, 56.

81. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 110.

82. *Ibid.*, 153.

- “Claims of this sort are particularly likely to succeed if the new paradigm displays a quantitative precision strikingly better than its older competitor.”⁸³
- “[P]articularly persuasive arguments can be developed if the new paradigm permits the prediction of phenomena that had been entirely unsuspected while the old one prevailed.”⁸⁴
- “These are the arguments, rarely made entirely explicit, that appeal to the individual’s sense of the appropriate or the aesthetic — the new theory is said to be ‘neater’, ‘more suitable’, or ‘simpler’ than the old.”⁸⁵
- “[T]he issue is which paradigm should in the future guide research on problems, many of which neither competitor can yet claim to resolve completely. A decision between alternate ways of practicing science is called for, and in the circumstances that decision must be based less on past achievement than on future promise. ... A decision of that kind can only be made on faith.”⁸⁶
- “First, the new candidate must seem to resolve some generally recognized problem that can be met in no other way. Second, the new paradigm must promise to preserve a relatively large part of the concrete problem-solving ability that has accrued to science through its predecessors.”⁸⁷
- “There are also, however, values to be used in judging whole theories: they must, first and foremost, permit puzzle-formulation and solution; where possible they should be simple, self-consistent, and plausible, compatible, that is, with other theories currently deployed.”⁸⁸
- “In matters like these the resort to shared values rather than to shared rules governing individual choice may be the community’s way of distributing risk and assuring the long-term success of its enterprise.”⁸⁹

83. *Ibid.*, 153–54.

84. *Ibid.*, 154.

85. *Ibid.*, 155.

86. *Ibid.*, 157–58.

87. *Ibid.*, 169.

88. *Ibid.*, 185.

89. *Ibid.*, 186.

Notice that none of the key values Kuhn observes as valuable in pragmatic practice is based on whether or not it is pleasing to a particular audience. So playing to an audience always involves a kind of deference to opinion, to not saying and thinking beyond a given set of assumptions, to accepting the authority of group orthodoxy. But what should matter most is not who has a given set of opinions but why? Are those opinions well grounded? Do I accept audience expectation as a constraint or determiner on my thought and questions, or am I engaged in an open-ended quest for further light and knowledge, considering audience only as an afterthought or side-effect that comes after new insight or discovery?

When Apostle Neal Maxwell addressed the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies in 1991, he quoted Austin Farrar's famous remark about the work of C.S. Lewis:

Though argument does not create conviction, the lack of it destroys belief. What seems to be proved may not be embraced, but what no one shows the ability to defend is quickly abandoned. Rational argument does not create belief, but it maintains a climate in which belief is possible.⁹⁰

Then after the 2012 “change in direction,” new editor Spencer Fluhman explained his choice of audience:

A couple of years ago, Maxwell Institute leaders asked me to advise them on the future of the *Mormon Studies Review*. They were interested in engaging more fully with the rising academic field of the same name, but wondered if the journal should even continue given the already crowded periodical field. My response was brief — well, brief for me — and would not have impressed any capitalists in the room. *Don't worry about the LDS audience*, I said. Other journals have that covered. Speak instead to scholars, period....

The Review's advisory board cured any lingering conflicted feelings. Drop any hybridity goals, they urged, and tilt unreservedly toward the academy. So as it stands, it's the Institute's humble Mormon studies endeavor that seems least

90. Austin Farrer, “Grete Clerk,” quoted in Daniel Peterson, “Elder Neal A. Maxwell on Consecration, Scholarship, and Defense of the Kingdom,” *Interpreter* 7 (2013): vii–xix, <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/elder-neal-a-maxwell-on-consecration-scholarship-and-the-defense-of-the-kingdom/#more-4243>.

interested in a broad audience — which isn't to say educated Latter-day Saints should feel uninvited!...

All this helps explain why the *Mormon Studies Review's* tilt toward the broader scholarly community is not the sign of an insidious secularism spreading at BYU. For us, it's primarily a question of audience, voice, and scholarly niche.⁹¹

This change in audience has implications. Ours is not the only community that has experienced the results when the universities serve academic interests rather than faith community interests. It is not just a Mormon issue. Compare what happened in recent LDS social history with a survey of trends in biblical studies in the twentieth century:

There is a major crisis in biblical studies of which the churches seem unaware, and there is need for urgent action to ensure that at least in theological colleges something is taught that does not simply rely on university departments and replicate their syllabus and interests. Theological colleges and university departments now have very different agendas....

Biblical studies should serve the needs of the Churches; there are other goals, too, but if the needs of the churches are not even considered, something has to be amiss. Perhaps the time has come to break free from the Faustian pact between Church and Academy. *We are unlikely to solve the problems currently facing biblical studies using the methods which created them.* What we need is an approach, soundly based in scholarship, which enables us to stand where they stood, look where they looked, read what they wrote and glimpse what they saw.⁹²

Barker has also more recently addressed the question of audience for scholars, and the relationship between a scholar's allegiances, and the work they produce.

There is no such thing as objective biblical scholarship, that is, biblical scholarship produced by those with no faith commitment. I have often said that a professor of French who

91. Spencer Fluhman, "On Audience and Voice in Mormon Studies Publishing," *Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship* (blog), November 21, 2016, <https://mi.byu.edu/intro-msr-v4/>.

92. Margaret Barker, "Reflections on Biblical Studies in the Twentieth Century" (paper, 2000), <http://www.margaretbarker.com/Papers/ReflectionsOnBiblicalStudies.pdf>.

had never been to France did not speak the language and doubted that France even existed would not be taken seriously. *The same should apply with biblical studies, but it does not.*

The result is that the much biblical study produced in the UK, outside the faith-based institutions, is of no use to the consumers of biblical scholarship, that is, the faith-based communities. Any medical school that produced no graduates fit to practice medicine and no research relevant to the human body would be closed down. *The same should apply with biblical studies, but it does not.*

All the independent biblical scholars that I know work from a faith-based perspective, and it is with us that the future lies.⁹³

I take Barker as a more appealing paradigmatic example than Taves. But of course, as I said at the beginning, I am not part of her secular audience, so my opinions may not have any weight in that community.

So what about my audience? Who are they? In my case, it is not just an academic community but includes a community of believers as well as those who wrestle with belief. I'm a believer who seeks "further light and knowledge," who seeks answers for my own questions, and who seeks to share what I find useful. I don't just write to believers. I also write for those who don't know what to believe or whether to believe. I write for people who share my love for "seeking out of the best books words of wisdom" and for "proving contraries" and for checking footnotes and sources. I write knowing that what I do is not just an abstract exercise designed to please people who sign my checks or approve my promotions. Because I'm an unpaid amateur, doing what I do out of gratitude, love, and passion, none of that professional aspect applies. I know what I write may have both positive and negative consequences, affecting not only the lives of individuals who read what I offer but also the lives of their loved ones in the present, their children, and generations unborn. So doing what I do involves an inescapable responsibility, yet I cannot take myself too seriously because I know that for all my effort, anyone can dismiss all I have done with a mere "So what?" But most of all, I cannot forget that as a believer, my audience also includes God.

93. Margaret Barker, "Being an Independent Scholar," *Providence, Divine Action and the Church* (blog), November 17, 2012, <http://christpantokrator.blogspot.com/search/label/Barker%3A%20%27Being%20an%20Independent%20Scholar%27>.

Kevin Christensen *has been a technical writer since 1984, since 2004 working in a suburb of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He has a BA in English from San Jose State University. He has published articles in Dialogue, Sunstone, the FARMS Review of Books, the Journal of Book of Mormon Studies, Insights, the Meridian Magazine, the FARMS Occasional Papers (Paradigms Regained: A Survey of Margaret Barker's Scholarship and Its Significance for Mormon Studies), Glimpses of Lehi's Jerusalem, and in collaboration with Margaret Barker, an essay in Joseph Smith Jr.: Reappraisals after Two Centuries. He lives with his wife Shauna in Canonsburg, Pennsylvania.*

“POSSESS THE LAND IN PEACE”: ZENIFF’S IRONIC WORDPLAY ON *SHILOM*

Matthew L. Bowen

ABSTRACT: *The toponym Shilom likely derives from the Semitic/Hebrew root š-l-m, whence also the similar-sounding word šālôm, “peace,” derives. The first mention of the toponym Shilom in Zeniff’s record — an older account than the surrounding material and an autobiography — occurs in Mosiah 9:6 in parallel with Zeniff’s mention of his intention to “possess the land in peace” (Mosiah 9:5). The language and text structure of Mosiah 9:5–6 thus suggest a deliberate wordplay on Shilom in terms of šālôm. Zeniff uses the name Shilom as a point of irony throughout his brief royal record to emphasize a tenuous and often absent peace between his people and the Lamanites.*

Regarding the narratological wordplay on the name Absalom (“[my] father is peace”) in terms of *šālôm* (“peace”) and the verbal root *š-l-m* throughout 2 Samuel 13–20, Moshe Garsiel observes that “the entire story deals in a manner of the most pronounced irony with the absence of ‘peace’ between ‘father’ and son.”¹ It is, he notes, an example of the “ironic inconsistency of names to events” being deliberately highlighted by the biblical writer.²

This observation brings to mind word usage in the brief royal autobiography of Zeniff recorded in Mosiah 9–10. During his life and

1. Moshe Garsiel, *Biblical Names: A Literary Study of Midrashic Derivations and Puns*, trans. Phyllis Hackett (Ramat Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1991), 226. For the full discussion, see pp. 226–27.

2. *Ibid.* Capitalization altered.

reign, Zeniff fights multiple wars with the Lamanites and therefore appears to use the toponym *Shilom* in a similar, ironic³ way:

Mosiah 9:5

A. And it came to pass that **I went again** with four of my men into the city, **in unto the king**

B. **that I might know** the disposition of the king,

C. **that I might know if I might go in** with *my people*

D. and **possess the land in peace** [*šālôm*]

Mosiah 9:6

A' And **I went in unto the king**

B' and **he covenanted with me**

C' **that I might possess the land** of Lehi-Nephi,

D' and [possess] **the land of Shilom**

Zeniff's use of parallelistic language in Mosiah 9:5–6 strongly suggests his correlation of the *šlm*-derived⁴ name *Shilom* with “peace” — Hebrew *šālôm*. Since the Nephites were a Hebrew-speaking/writing people,⁵ this correlation makes good sense. We further note Zeniff's covenant use of the verb *know* (cf. Hebrew *yāda'*)⁶ in correlation with “he covenanted with me.” Zeniff seeks a *bērīt šālôm* — a “covenant of

3. Zeniff uses ironic wordplay involving the Lamanites having “that which was good among them,” like the Nephites (“good[ly] ones,” “fair ones”) his autobiographical introduction (Mosiah 9:1). See Matthew L. Bowen, “O Ye Fair Ones — Revisited,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 20 (2016): 326–27. Zeniff may also have used an additional wordplay on the name *Zarahemla* in terms of the “sparing” of some of the original party of colonists. See David E. Bokovoy and Pedro Olavarria, “Zarahemla: Revisiting the ‘Seed of Compassion,’” *Insights* 30/5 (2010): 2–3.

4. *Shilom* most likely derives from the Semitic/Hebrew root *š-l-m*, “to be whole, or complete.” See Paul Y. Hoskisson, “Shilom,” *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/SHILOM>.

5. See, e.g., Mormon 9:33. See also John Tvedtnes, “‘I Have a Question: Since the Book of Mormon is largely the record of a Hebrew people, is the writing characteristic of the Hebrew language?’” *Ensign* (October 1986): 65.

6. On the use of “know” as a covenant term in the Book of Mormon, see RoseAnn Benson and Stephen D. Ricks, “Treaties and Covenants: Ancient Near Eastern Legal Terminology in the Book of Mormon,” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 14/1 (2005): 48–61, 128–29.

peace,”⁷ or what we would today call a “peace treaty” — on terms of equality with the king of the Lamanites.

Unfortunately for Zeniff and his people, the Lamanites do not view the resultant “peace” treaty in the same way. The Lamanite king, for his part, views Zeniff as his vassal “servant,”⁸ and war swiftly ensues. Zeniff notes that the “peace” is first violated by the Lamanites in the land of Shilom:

Now they were a lazy and an idolatrous people; therefore they were **desirous to bring us into bondage**, that they might glut themselves with the labors of our hands; yea, that they might feast themselves upon the flocks of our fields. Therefore it came to pass that **king Laman began to stir up his people that they should contend with my people; therefore there began to be wars and contentions in the land**. For, in the thirteenth year of my reign in the land of Nephi, away **on the south of the land of Shilom**, when my people were watering and feeding their flocks, and tilling their lands, **a numerous host of Lamanites came upon them and began to slay them**, and to take off their flocks, and the corn of their fields. (Mosiah 9:12-14)

Following breaking of the “peace” and peace treaty at Shilom, Zeniff reports that he and his people “did go forth in [the Lord’s] might; yea, we did go forth against the Lamanites, and in one day and a night we did slay three thousand and forty-three; we did slay them even until we had driven them out of our land. And I, myself, with mine own hands, did help to bury their dead. And behold, to our great sorrow and lamentation, two hundred and seventy-nine of our brethren were slain” (Mosiah 9:17-19). Thus ended the first of many subsequent bloody wars between the Zeniffites and the Lamanites.⁹

7. In the Hebrew Bible (OT), this expression occurs in such passages as Numbers 25:12; Isaiah 54:10; Ezekiel 34:25; 37:26. We recall that Zeniff mentions that he had wanted the leader of the previous, failed Nephite expedition to re-inherit the land of Nephi to “make a treaty” (Hebrew *kārat bērit*, “cut a covenant”) with the Lamanites (Mosiah 9:2). Having assumed the leadership of this group of Nephites, Zeniff obtains his initial stated purpose.

8. See especially Mosiah 9:10.

9. Following the initial war chronicled in Mosiah 9, subsequent wars between the Zeniffites and Lamanites occur in Mosiah 10:6-20; 11:16-19; 20:7-26; 21:1-8; 11-12; cf. Mosiah 7:18.

In the very next verse Zeniff states that “peace” (*šālôm*) was restored: “And it came to pass that we again began to establish the kingdom and we again began to **possess the land in peace**. And I caused that there should be weapons of war made of every kind, that thereby I might have weapons for my people **against the time the Lamanites should come up again to war against my people**” (Mosiah 10:1). Yet even in chronicling his people’s “peace,” Zeniff already directs his audience to the inevitable and imminent breaking of that peace.

As it happens, the Zeniffites enjoy a more-than-two-decade respite from war: “thus we did have continual **peace** [*šālôm*] in the land for the space of twenty and two years” (Mosiah 10:5). Inevitably, however, the threat of war resumes when a new king ascends to the throne (see Mosiah 10:6-7). Zeniff, at this later point in time, seems to view his own kingship as sovereign or superior to that of the Lamanite king — i.e., he describes the Lamanites as coming out “in rebellion” against him and his people (Mosiah 10:6). The Lamanites violate the peace treaty (*bĕrît šālôm*) and the “peace” again at Shilom: “And it came to pass that they came up upon the north of the land of **Shilom, with their numerous hosts, men armed with bows, and with arrows, and with swords, and with cimeters, and with stones, and with slings**; and they had their heads shaved that they were naked; and they were girded with a leathern girdle about their loins” (Mosiah 10:8). Some of the final scenes of Zeniff’s life (“in [his] old age”) have him “stimulat[ing]” his people “to go to battle” against the Lamanites and “contending with them face to face” (Mosiah 10:10, 19).

Just as the name *Absalom* (“father is peace”) and *šālôm/š-l-m* dramatically and ironically emphasize the absence of “peace” between father and son in the David-Absalom cycle (2 Samuel 13–20), Zeniff’s juxtaposition of the name Shilom alternatively with “peace” (*šālôm*) and with “war” terminology serves the same function throughout his autobiography. For Zeniff, the name *Shilom* served as the bittersweet symbol of a mostly tenuous “peace” with the Lamanites in whom he had once seen “Nephite”-like “good” (Mosiah 9:1)¹⁰ and an ironic reminder of the ever-looming reality of war and bloodshed in the lives of his people.

[**Editor’s Note:** *The author would like to thank Allen Wyatt and Victor Worth.*]

10. Bowen, “‘O Ye Fair Ones’ — Revisited,” 326–27.

Matthew L. Bowen was raised in Orem, Utah, and graduated from Brigham Young University. He holds a PhD in Biblical Studies from the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC, and is currently an Assistant Professor in Religious Education at Brigham Young University-Hawaii. He and his wife (the former Suzanne Blattberg) are the parents of three children: Zachariah, Nathan, and Adele.

THROUGH A GLASS DARKLY: EXAMINING CHURCH FINANCES

Larry T. Wimmer

Abstract: *The Mormon Hierarchy: Wealth & Corporate Power* is Michael Quinn's impressive response to a century of books and articles that have often distorted the finances of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. This third volume in The Mormon Hierarchy series covers Church history from 1830 to 2010, and represents a staggering commitment. For 46 years Quinn has diligently gathered data on Church income, expenditures, taxation, and "living allowances" paid to Church leaders. The results are significant and engrossing, with but one possibly serious error. If you are interested in any aspect of the Church finances, the enormous effort required to bring us *Wealth & Corporate Power* may well be the final word. In Quinn's own words, it tells an "American success story without parallel."

Review of D. Michael Quinn, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Wealth & Corporate Power* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2017), 597 pp., with appendices and index. \$49.95.

Forty-six years of interest in a topic, while Michael Quinn continued in his active professional career and wrote multiple publications in other areas, is an unusual commitment by any standard. When it covers almost two-thirds of one's lifespan and 100 percent of one's professional career, it may qualify as a compulsion! But such has been the ongoing interest of Quinn in the finances of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and its leadership from 1830 to 2010. His interest began early, in 1971, as a young graduate student in a history seminar taught by Davis Bitton at the University of Utah. Subsequently, it became his PhD dissertation at Yale University in 1976. And over the next 40 years, he published a monumental three-volume work in *The Mormon Hierarchy*

series: *The Origins of Power* (1994), *Extensions of Power* (1997), and most recently, *Wealth & Corporate Power* (2017). While this subject may have occupied part of Michael's mind and time, it had to contend with a broad range of his interests. During the same period, Quinn published five other books (some quite controversial) and numerous articles on a wide range of topics in Mormon history. In 2016 he received the Leonard J. Arrington Award for "distinguished and outstanding service to Mormon History."

Quinn's most recent book, *The Mormon Hierarchy: Wealth & Corporate Power*, may well be his last on this subject. That has been said before, but apparently Quinn was initially reluctant to return to this topic as a significant commitment, hoping instead to find a publisher for the 270 pages found in Appendix 5 of this book. It took a persuasive publisher, Ron Priddis, to insist on a book with narrative and an extension of data from 1930 to 2010. We are the beneficiaries of a persistent editor and Quinn's willingness to pick up the plow!

As I read this latest volume, I was impressed with what I perceive as the maturation of a dedicated scholar. Volume 3, published 20 years after his previous volume, demonstrates a willingness on Quinn's part to be surprised by the data and to change his mind accordingly. In addition, Quinn's Volume 3 stands as a scholar's response to the numerous books and articles by those who have attempted to sensationalize the Church's wealth, power, and financial secrecy.¹ On page 2, Quinn briefly states his objectives for Volume 3: "This book examines the finances of the LDS leaders and their financial policies from 1830 to 2010, expanding those topics far beyond their discussion in my two previous volumes in the Mormon Hierarchy series."

Chapter 1 of *Wealth & Corporate Power* is identified as "Personal Wealth." He examines early LDS views regarding a paid ministry; unique Church administrative positions, including Trustee-in-Trust and Corporation Sole; and the compensation and wealth of LDS leaders from Joseph Smith through those serving in 2010. Also, Quinn has annual estimates of tithing receipts from 1898 to 2010 — with a four-decade gap from 1903-1942. To bring these estimates together, one must rather inconveniently combine data from Chapter 1 and Chapter 3. The reader probably would have benefited from more information closer to Table 1.7

1. Included in this list is the work of John Heinerman and Anson Shupe, *The Mormon Corporate Empire* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1986). I suspect that Quinn purposely fails to use their data or mention their work, other than a critical comment on their methodology found in footnote 166 of Chapter 2.

(1960–2010) rather than having to wait until Chapter 3 and Tables 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 for Quinn’s methods and earlier years.²

Before discussing several important findings of Quinn’s Chapter 1, it is necessary to look at a critical aspect of methodology he constantly uses throughout the book’s narrative, footnotes, and appendices. In the same introductory paragraph setting out his objectives for Volume 3, Quinn describes this methodology:

To make these matters [allowances, tithing, expenditures, and all nominal values] more understandable to twenty-first-century readers, this volume often states what the equivalent of US dollars in the nineteenth century would be in terms of purchasing power in 2010, the final year of this book’s emphasis. For example, even trained historians might currently think that an annual income of \$10,000 was modest for the year 1899, when it was actually equivalent to \$271,000 in 2010. Rather than my own estimates of comparative worth, the financial equivalents are derived from the Consumer Price Index on the internet. (2)

Therefore, all dollar amounts in 2010 are stated both in terms of the value for that earlier year and also their worth in purchasing power in 2010 prices. Two comments:

First, a kudo: Quinn uses internet adjustments provided by a respected economic historian, Samuel H. Williamson.³ There is no better source, and Quinn deserves credit for recognizing and using that source.

Second, Quinn uses Williamson’s Consumer PRICE Index (CPI) exclusively to adjust all nominal values. Surely far better than no adjustment at all. However, one needs to understand what the CPI measures. His example of an 1899 income of \$10,000 does *not* translate into an income of \$271,000 in 2010. Instead, the CPI adjustment attempts to estimate what an income of \$10,000 in 1899 could buy as a given bundle of consumer goods in 2010. For that reason, Williamson proposes *seven* different measures for comparing prices vs. wages vs. income over time. Thus, instead of comparing equivalent dollars needed to “purchase a bundle of consumer goods” between any two years, Quinn could have used different indices comparing wages or income over time. Comparing the General Authorities’ “living allowance” to

2. Quinn, *Wealth & Corporate Power*, 35, 119, 121, 123.

3. Samuel H. Williamson, “Seven Ways to Compute the Relative Value of a U.S. Dollar Amount — 1774 to Present,” *Measuring Worth*, last updated 2018, www.measuringworth.com/uscompare/. Hereafter cited as Williamson, “Measuring Worth.”

Williamson's Labor Value Index or Income Value Index might have given a more comparable measure of worth. On the other hand, it should be noted that by using the CPI, whether or not Quinn intended, he was consistently "understating" the differences between early income values compared to modern equivalents. And, since his purpose was to show how large the earlier living allowances were when compared to present values, underestimating was the proper procedure.

Quinn finds several surprises in the income "living allowances" from Chapter 1. First, compared to employment options outside of church service, Quinn appraises these allowances for those devoting full time to Church administration to be modest. He reports the following annual allowances for the president of the Church: \$5,000 from 1877 to 1907 (10, 13); \$7,800 from 1932 to 1946 (14); \$6,000 in 1947 (14); \$7,800 in 1951; \$10,260 in 1973 (34); \$89,325 in 1999; \$116,400 in 2013; and \$120,000 in 2014 (36).

Second, the living allowances for General Authorities have not kept pace with inflation over most decades nor during the entire 137-year period. Shortly after President Brigham Young's death, the living allowance for the president, as reported above, was lowered to \$5,000 per year and remained at that level until 1907. In real purchasing power dollars, the \$5,000 allowance during the period 1877-1907 would be worth more than the today's allowance of \$120,000. In between those endpoints, inflation was playing havoc with the real value of these allowances. The \$7,800 in 1951 would buy about \$65,000 of consumer goods in 2010 dollars, and the 1973 allowance of \$10,000 only \$50,377 (34). What these numbers show is the effect of having an administratively set salary that is not indexed to the rate of inflation. The allowance fell most rapidly in real value during the inflationary periods of 1907-1917, after WW I, again after WW II, and during the inflation of the 1970s.

Third, Quinn finds it "stunning" that General Authorities' allowances lag behind those of professional administrators working for the church — some earn as much as double the allowances of General Authorities (36). Quinn concludes:

There are no current measures for salaries of top administrators in the LDS bureaucracy at Salt Lake City, nor for CEOs of the church's for-profit businesses. Still, the available data show that "salaries" of all general authorities in the twenty-first century could be less than half of what some rank-and-file employees received within the international church over which those "prophets, seers, and revelators" presided. (37)

A comparison of the living allowance for the President and General Authorities of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints to the salaries of executive officers of other churches was reported in the *Chicago Tribune* for 1992.⁴ The closest year for comparison is the living allowance for the LDS Church President for 1999 at \$89,325. Thus, seven or eight years previous, compensation for the Bishop of the Episcopal Church was \$160,000; President of the Executive Committee of the Southern Baptist Convention, \$120,000; President of the United Church of Christ \$89,000; while the United Methodist Church “has no official designated as a national leader, but each of the 50 regional bishops earns \$70,000 and is provided housing.”⁵ Officials of the Evangelical Lutheran Church “would not reveal the exact salary” of their bishop, but stated that it was “between \$61,200 and \$105,500.” And leaders of the Presbyterian Church are “supposed to earn no more than four times what janitors and other workers at the bottom of the pay scale earn.”⁶

A similar comparison can be made with many of America’s charitable organizations.⁷ In 2014, when the LDS President was receiving \$120,000 as a living allowance, Charity Watch, Charity Navigator, and Forbes announced that of the 100 largest charities, “18 reported paying some employees more than \$1 million.”⁸ The highest salaried chief executive

4. “U.S. Church Leaders’ Pay Compared,” *Chicago Tribune*, May 8, 1992, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/1992-05-08/news/9202100773_1_rev-james-andrews-24-million-member-episcopal-church-bishop-edmond-browning. The article is unclear whether the data are for full compensation or only salaries. Frequently, it states “salary.” I have also found data on compensation for clergy of the Episcopal church but not national leadership. Senior male clergy in 2011 were paid an average of \$100,425, with some provinces paying an average of \$123,374. (Matthew J. Price and Anne Hurst, *The 2011 Church Compensation Report* (New York: Church Pension Group, July 2016) <https://www.cpg.org/linkservid/52804A0F-D7BE-3E5F-DFC951500B70F3C2/showMeta/0/?label=2015%20Church%20Compensation%20Report>.)

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. In an interview with the editors of the *Salt Lake Tribune*, Quinn commented that he wished he had made comparison between the president’s living allowance and salaries of charitable associations. (D. Michael Quinn, interview by Jennifer Napier-Pearce and David Noyce, “Mormon Land,” in *The Salt Lake Tribune*, October 25, 2017, <https://www.sltrib.com/religion/local/2017/10/25/mormon-land-historian-d-michael-quinn-talks-about-his-exploration-of-lds-church-wealth-what-he-found-may-surprise-you-it-did-him/>.)

8. William P. Barrett, “The Largest U.S. Charities for 2016,” *Forbes*, Dec 14, 2016, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/williampbarrett/2016/12/14/the-largest-u-s-charities-for-2016/#49e595484abb>.

represented the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, who was paid \$4,195,252. The annual salary of the CEO of the Metropolitan Museum of Art was \$2,555,131, and the National President of the Boy Scouts of America \$1,351,724 (2015).⁹ A similar list by a Christian blog site, *Temple Stream*, lists the CEO's salary for the nation's largest charity, United Way Worldwide, with annual donations of almost \$3.708 billion, at \$1,166,454 (2015).¹⁰

The conclusion? Many heads of America's churches are paid comparable or higher compensation than that received by LDS Church leaders, and executives of America's largest charitable organizations are paid 10 to 20 times the living allowance of the President of the LDS Church. It should be noted that the living allowance from the Church does not include all compensation, which might also include benefits, any allowances for housing or automobiles, and income from books or directorships. But the same is often true for reported income of other churches and salaries of America's largest charities.

Fourth, I share Quinn's surprise at the egalitarian nature of these living allowances, beginning immediately after the death of President Brigham Young. President Young died a millionaire (in actual 1870 dollars; a multimillionaire in modern value) (9, 174). Within two months, the Quorum of the Twelve began reducing the compensation of some, increasing others, equalizing the allowance for most of the Twelve (9), and holding the president's income constant at \$5,000 from 1877 to 1890 (\$132,500 in 2010 prices) (10). In 1882, newly appointed Apostle Heber J. Grant objected to receiving the same allowance as a senior member of the Quorum of the Twelve, such as Joseph F. Smith (11); but by 1932, as president of the Church, Grant had "nearly equalized the compensation for all general authorities below the First Presidency" (14). This 85-year trend toward equalization of General Authorities' allowances became complete just after 1963 during the tenure of President David O. McKay, who insisted all General Authorities receive the same allowance, from the Church's president to its lowest-ranking member

9. Lee Davidson, "Scout salaries high in Utah, but higher elsewhere," *The Salt Lake Tribune*, November 13, 2011, <http://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?id=52897650&itype=CMSID>. Davidson reported that the Scout executive of the Great Salt Lake Council was paid a salary of \$155,613 (not including benefits) and two other support directors over \$100,000, with a median salary for top regional Scout executives equal to \$225,908.

10. Rick Warden, "List of 17 CEO Salaries of Charities" *Templestream Blog*, December 3, 2016, <http://templestream.blogspot.com/2016/12/list-of-17-ceo-salaries-of-charities.html>.

of the Seventy. Motives of egalitarianism and family size are apparently more important to Church leaders than seniority and hierarchy (14-15).

Finally, from Quinn's work, it is apparent that the financial administration of the LDS Church changed dramatically after the death of Brigham Young, who, with his counselors, was among the wealthiest men in Utah. While Brigham Young had a nominal income of \$10,000 per year in 1862, in that same year John Taylor received a meager \$330 and Wilford Woodruff \$380 (25). Subsequently, Brigham Young's allowance rose to \$111,081. (That's in 1870 prices — a purchasing power of \$1,911,000 in 2010 prices!) Such disparities are presumably the topic for another book.

Chapter 2 represents an enormous amount of work over many years. Quinn identifies 1,800 businesses that have had General Authorities as owners, partners, directors, officers, or major stockholders before 1933. In addition to the narrative, this chapter includes Quinn's massive Appendix 5 of 270 pages. Except for the sheer number of companies and interconnecting directorships by General Authorities, there are fewer surprises in this chapter.

Quinn subscribes to the popular notion that "the business of the church is business" and quotes various leaders throughout LDS history as saying that no dichotomy exists between "spiritual" and "temporal" affairs. According to Quinn, this "theology" becomes the basis for Mormon leadership's early and constant involvement in business activities. Quinn acknowledges conflicts but seems not to adequately reconcile the anti-commercialism and concerns over national markets encroaching upon Utah, quoted in Chapter 1, with the Church's tendency to engage in multiple business activities (6).

There are other possible explanations. Perhaps Mormon business was less about money making and more about ensuring survival and self-determination. It is plausible that much of the early involvement in iron, coal, sugar, salt, cotton, banking, transportation, and local merchandising had less to do with profit maximization than an initial fear of failure in a hostile natural environment, followed quickly by a feeling of imminent threat from a distant, hostile government. This fear proved valid as the Church found itself with most of its assets, including tithing donations, confiscated by the federal government. These fears did not end with statehood and intensified as the national economy and population closed in around them. It was not until the second half of the 20th century that the Church began to feel secure. And, shortly after

that, leaders began removing themselves from directorships, boards, and hands-on business activities.

Quinn's "Cradle-to-Grave World of Early Twentieth-Century Utah" (62-66) does not use the word *monopoly*; however, the hypothetical family buying exclusively from LDS-owned businesses did not exist anywhere in the State of Utah. By implication, his hypothetical exaggerates the power of the Church over the consumer habits of a typical Utah family. The only Church-owned monopolies of which I am aware are the Beehive Clothing Mill and the publication of official LDS magazines. In both cases, these underpriced products fail to conform to monopoly behavior. The multiple businesses Quinn lists in his cradle-to-grave example are by no means a threat to the independence of Utah consumers.

Chapter 3 may be the most compelling chapter to a general audience. Quinn addresses Church commercial activities, many problematic issues involving early investments and finance, annual church financial reports from 1915 until the practice ended in 1959, estimates of Church income and expenditures from mid-to-late 20th century, the troublesome issue of taxation, the extent to which the international Church is dependent upon Church headquarters for financial assistance, service missionaries as unpaid employees, and finally, an attempt to clarify wildly different claims of the Church's total income and wealth.

The finances of the LDS Church have been a recurring controversy from Joseph Smith to the present, primarily from critics of the Church but at times among members.¹¹ There has been almost no decade in which criticisms have not surfaced, at times sufficient for the Church to feel it necessary to answer charges of excessive wealth or extravagant spending. Following earlier verbal reports dating back to 1832,¹² President Joseph F. Smith's decision to provide a written audit of the finances of the Church in 1915 may well have been motivated by such criticism. Quinn quotes President Smith:

Now I am taking a liberty that has not been indulged in very much; but there have been so many false charges made against me and against my brethren by ignorant and evilly disposed people, that I propose to make a true statement which will, I believe, at least have a tendency to convince you that we are trying to do our duty the best we know how. (117)

11. Perhaps the most recent example drawing some internal criticism was the support of the Church in 2012 for the City Creek Center in the heart of Salt Lake City.

12. Quinn, *Wealth & Corporate Power*, Appendices 8-13.

That sympathetic report includes spending for schools, hospitals, temples, the worthy “poor,” and war “sufferers” from WW I (493-94). After the 1915 report, annual auditing was reported in general conferences for the next 44 years. From a report of the mid-1920s, Quinn concludes, “Rank-and-file Mormons . . . would have been surprised to learn that the total outlay for all non-hierarchy expenses at headquarters equaled the money spent on twenty-six top leaders,” who “received a surprisingly low portion of the Church’s overall expenditures at that time: 3.5 percent in 1924-26, 3.3 percent in 1927, and 2.8 percent in 1928” (117).

Chapter 3 includes detailed accounts of the Church’s several efforts to dig its way out of excessive and costly debt and onto a sound financial foundation. The Church found itself heavily burdened at the start of the 20th century, resulting in part from the federal government’s confiscation of Church property but primarily from serious business and investment losses — far too many in local mining ventures (111). Perhaps surprising to those of us on the faculty at BYU, the most recent financial challenge was in 1963 when the Church was literally concerned about its ability to meet its payroll (121). On a more positive note, Chapter 3 identifies several financial “heroes” who have been primarily responsible for recovery and finally placing the Church on an impressively sound financial basis: Antony W. Ivins, Charles W. Nibley, J. Reuben Clark, William F. Edwards, and, most impressive, N. Eldon Tanner (112-13, 122-24).

A critical issue in this chapter examines the totality of Church finances by bringing together all that Quinn has been able to gather regarding Church expenditures and Church income, including both tithing donations and estimates of income from Church businesses and investments. The results are the most complete picture we have of total income and expenditures, including deficits or surpluses, the proportion of expenditure paid from tithing vs. other income, and assistance to the international Church.

I applaud Quinn’s efforts, but my concerns involve his method and assumptions for estimating tithing receipts 1960 to 2010. Quinn used published Church data from 1950 to 1960 (121) to derive a 12.9 percent annual growth in tithing. He then applies that number to estimate Church tithing receipts from 1960 to 2010. Changes in tithing collections are a function of several variables: the annual rate of change in nominal income; the rate of change in prices (inflation), membership growth; age profiles among youth, wage-earning adults, and the elderly; and changes in voluntary compliance among members.

His calculation of a 12.9 percent growth in tithing receipts during the 1950s resulted primarily from a 5-6 percent annual growth in nominal

income per capita (of which almost 2 percent was due to inflation), and about 4.2 percent growth in membership during the 1950s,¹³ therefore requiring only 2 percent either from increases in adult population or greater commitment to the payment of tithes.

Projecting the next 50 years based on that early decade of the 1950s involves major assumptions. During each subsequent decade, major changes took place, some of which favored Quinn's 12.9 percent assumption, while others would bring it into question. For example, in the decade of the 1960s, membership was growing by almost 7 percent. Therefore, it would have taken small changes in inflation or income for tithing to have grown by 12.9 percent. Similarly, during the 1970s and 1980s, substantial growth of tithing was attainable but for very different reasons. Inflation almost tripled to over 6.5 percent per year, thereby requiring only small increases in income and membership for tithing to grow by 12.9 percent per year.

However, during the 20 years from 1990-2010, inflation averaged only 2.5 percent, and growth in Church membership was falling from 6 to 4 and then to 2 percent per year. In fact, in 2016, the growth rate in membership dropped to 1.59 percent, the lowest percentage growth since 1937.¹⁴ Also, working against rapid growth in tithing receipts is the increasing proportion of members living in lower-income countries, the long trend of declining birth rates and the aging of populations.

The effect of "voluntary compliance" is the unknown in all these calculations. Quinn shows a doubling of tithing paid per capita from 1950 to 1960 (141), but this includes the income effect as well as possible increases in voluntary payments. Since we do not know the direction or amount of any change in compliance, it is best to assume that it has been constant.

Therefore, given what we know regarding the declining rates of membership, inflation, and income, it is possible that the growth rate in tithing donations fell from Quinn's 12.9 to 8 percent 30 years later (1990-1999) and perhaps as low as 6 percent during the next 11 years (2000-2010). If those lower rates of tithing receipts are accurate, they

13. "The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints membership history," Wikipedia, last modified December 6, 2017, 21:28, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Church_of_Jesus_Christ_of_Latter-day_Saints_membership_history#Table_for_recent_growth. The growth rate of Church membership during the 1960s appears to have been an anomaly, averaging approximately 4 percent during the 1950s, increasing to as high as 7.8 during some years of the 1960s, declining to under 5 percent in the 1970s and 1980s, less than 4 percent in the 1990s, and about 2.5 percent in first decade of the 21st century.

14. *Ibid.*

imply that tithing in 2010 may have been closer to \$12 billion rather than \$33 billion.¹⁵ Such a conclusion has considerable implications for several of Quinn's results in his Chapter 3 on Church finances.

Finally, Quinn has some very interesting findings on financing the international Church. Obviously, the international Church requires more assistance from US tithe payers than converts from North American or other developed countries (128-34). Given the vigorous building programs of chapels and temples, plus administrative costs, no country other than the US is entirely self-sufficient. Quinn reports that financial help varies from remarkably little in Australia, Canada, and the UK, to large amounts of assistance required in developing countries (several exceeding 80 percent of their total expenditures). This scenario applauds the generosity of members from North America but also implies that the difference between expenditures and tithing donations is likely widening, thereby requiring an increasing share of income from Church businesses and investments to maintain current worldwide expenditure levels.

A fear on my part — perhaps shared by Ron Priddis — is that while there might be considerable interest in many of the topics involving Church finances, a casual glance at Quinn's book may discourage many potential readers. Look again more carefully. While it is true that Quinn's book is 597 pages of data, tables, and charts (fodder for economists!), there are only three chapters — of 38, 43, and 36 pages. You may not be up for all 597 pages, but you may be willing to invest in 117 pages of narrative, giving only an occasional pause in his 21 appendices of 381 pages or his footnotes of 42 pages or an impressive 59 pages of index. Thus, for a personal investment of 117 pages, you can feast on 46 years of Quinn's meticulous work.

A concluding observation: During the interview of Quinn by the two editors of *The Salt Lake Tribune*, it seems they expected more critical comments from him on the financial practices of the LDS Church. Finally, one stated, "You have been excommunicated from the church, and yet this book is not super critical!"

15. Obviously, using the 12.9 percent from 1960 to 1989, I obtain almost the same tithing as Quinn for that later year: tithing of \$2.978 billion. Using 8 percent from 1990 to 1999 gives me \$6.429 billion rather than his \$8.872 billion. The large difference comes when you apply a 6 percent for the last decade (2000-2010) rather than 12.9. The statistical Rule of 72 predicts that a value increasing at 12.9 percent will double in 5.6 years; therefore, \$8.9 is almost quadrupling in 11 years, while increasing at 6 percent takes 12 years to double.

Michael responded, “I don’t think that it is critical at all. It could be viewed as faith promoting.”

He concluded, “We are looking at 180 years of Mormonism. . . . For me, it is an American success story without parallel. . . . There is no church; there is no business; there is no non-profit organization that has gone from confiscation of all assets by the federal government to now worth billions of dollars.”¹⁶

Larry T. Wimmer is Emeritus Professor of Economics and past recipient of the Warren and Wilson Dusenberry University Professorship at Brigham Young University (2001–2006). He received his BS degree from BYU and his MA and PhD from the University of Chicago. His primary interest is American economic history, with research and publications in US monetary history, income and wealth distribution in early Utah, and the standard of living for US families during the last half of the 19th and early 20th centuries. His research has been sponsored by the National Science Foundation and the National Institute on Aging. Among his publications is a book by the BYU Press entitled *The Kirtland Economy Revisited: a Market Critique of Sectarian Economics*, for which he, along with his coauthors Marvin Hill and Keith Rooker, received the Mormon History Association Award for the “Best Work in the Field of Mormon History” for 1977. He was a Research Associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research Institute (NBER) from 1979 until his retirement in 2008.

16. D. Michael Quinn, interview by Jennifer Napier-Pearce and David Noyce, “Mormon Land,” Salt Lake Tribune, October 25, 2017.

UNVEILING WOMEN'S VEILS OF AUTHORITY

Lynne Hilton Wilson

ABSTRACT: The Apostle Paul's theological explanation for female veil wearing (1 Corinthians 11:2–13) highlights the woman's head covering as an expression of female empowerment or "authority/exousia." It appears that the Corinthian saints struggled with this tradition, as Paul preceded the discussion with, "but I would have you know/thelō de" (1 Corinthians 11:3). Rather than merely restating the dress code for certain prayers, Paul laid out the doctrinal background underlying the imagery. He began with the order of creation from the Garden of Eden. God was the "kephale," meaning source or origin of Christ, who was the source of man, who was the source of woman. Paul taught that God's glory (referring to man) should pray unveiled, and by the same token, humanity's glory (referring to woman) should address God with her head covered (1 Corinthians 11:7). The early church interpreted the relationship between Adam and Eve typologically. The Edenic couple typified Christ and his Church — the Bridegroom and Bride. In this typological scenario, Eve (or the Church) worked through the mediator Adam (or Christ). In either a symbolic or literal interpretation, Paul described this empowering veil as a sign of unique female authority to pray and prophesy (1 Corinthians 11:5). By covering her head, female saints received "power on her head" and could interact with angels (1 Corinthians 11:10). Paul concluded by emphasizing that men and women are completely interdependent — woman was created from man, while man is born of woman (1 Corinthians 11:11–12). In this regard we see an equal status between men and women in their relationship with the Lord. Their relationship focuses on their union with each other and God.

Western cultures often associate veiled women with subjugation and misogyny.¹ However, we find scriptural sources that communicate positive empowerment about veils as well (1 Corinthians 11:10; Exodus 34:33–35; Genesis 24:65). One of those examples, 1 Corinthians 11:2–13, empowers a woman to pray and prophesy with her head covered. While women’s veils in ancient societies were worn as a symbol of modesty, subservience, fashion, or marital status, we find early Christian women donning veils for prayers to be connected to prophecy, as a symbol of their authority and humility before God.

Cultural Background for Veiling Women

By way of background, for “a Roman woman, ‘to get married’ and ‘to veil oneself’ were exactly the same word. . . . The veil was the flag of female virtue, status, and security.”² Avant-garde Roman women of the first century were “more keen on showing off [their] elaborate hair-style than on constantly wearing an old-fashioned veil.”³ Ancient coins of aristocracy feature royal women wearing head coverings for a social or fashion statement.⁴



Faustina II, Wife of Marcus Aurelius, 147–175/76

1. Fred Skolnik and Michael Berenbaum, eds., *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., (Detroit, New York, San Francisco: Thomson Gale, 2007), s.v. Judith Lynn Sebesta and Larissa Bonfante, “Women,” in *The World of Roman Costume* (Madison, WI: University Press, 2001), 8, 155, 186.

2. Sarah Ruden, *Paul Among the People: The Apostle Reinterpreted and Reimagined in His Own Time* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2010), 85. “The veil held great symbolism: it reminded everyone that all freeborn women, women with families to protect them, were supposed to enter adulthood already married and that they were supposed to stay chaste married or else that they were chaste widowed until the end of their lives.” Ruden elaborated, “the ancients believed that it was female hair’s nature to inflame men, almost like breasts or genitals: men experienced women’s hair as powerfully inescapably erotic” (88).

3. *Ibid.*, 86.

4. Zach Beasley, “Faustina II, Wife of Marcus Aurelius,” Photograph, *Beast Coins*, Permission received September 4, 2014, <http://www.beastcoins.com/Topical/RomanWomen/RomanWomen.htm>. *Ibid.*, “Faustina I, Wife of Antoninus Pius”.



Faustina I, Wife of Antoninus Pius, 138–140

The veil also had religious significance for those who worshiped the Egyptian goddess of Night. The cult instructed women to anoint and cover their heads with a light piece of linen fabric while praying.⁵ In other circles, a Pharisaic Jewish woman veiled herself from head to foot whenever she left her home as a symbol of modesty and female subservience.⁶ In Middle Assyrian law, a wife claimed the right to wear a veil in public to differentiate her standing from a concubine or slave.⁷ Her *veil* was a sign of prominence and authorized her actions and inheritance as a legal wife.⁸ In contrast, the Christian practice of women

5. Jan Assmann, *From Akhenaten to Moses: Ancient Egypt and Religious Change* (Oxford University Press and American University in Cairo Press, 2014), 110. Bonnie Thurston, *Women in the New Testament* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing, 1998), 26. Worship of the Egyptian goddess of Night (Isis) was illegal in the early Roman Empire; the rites were practiced in Cenchræe, just a few miles from where Paul lived and preached in Corinth. Unlike many indigenous Roman religions, women in this Egyptian sect were allowed to serve as religious leaders. In this setting, women were equal or superior to their male consorts and considered worthy of being anointed and communing with deity.

6. Mishnah, *bGittin* 90b: “[A] man ‘who sees his wife going out into the street with her head uncovered,’ has cause for divorce. Even though the Mishnah was not codified until 160–200 CE, it records older rabbinic traditions and sayings, including many from the Second Temple period. The most influential rabbis quoted were Hillel and Shammai from the late first century BCE. Also see *Encyclopedia Judaica*, (2007), s.v. “Women.” C.D. Yonge, trans, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Reprint 2004), 817.

7. Hennie J. Marsman, *Women in Ugarit and Israel: Their Social and Religious Position in the Context of the Ancient Near East* (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 123. Deborah Lyons and Raymond Westbrook, *Women and Property in Ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean Societies* (Boston: Center for Hellenistic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University, 2005), 1.

8. Ruden, *Paul Among the People*, 88. Ruden sees Paul’s request for Christian women to wear a veil as “Paul was being protective rather than chauvinistic.” The lack of a veil may have been distracting to men “and stigmatizing to women.”

veiling for prayers, as described in 1 Corinthians 11, differed from the cultural usage of the day.⁹

Paul among the Corinthians

Paul wrote to a culturally mixed audience of Christian converts in an attempt to redirect their understanding about women praying and prophesying while veiled.¹⁰ On his second apostolic mission he established a branch of Christianity in Corinth and stayed for eighteen months (Acts 18:1–11).¹¹ Yet, after his departure, the infant church struggled to understand the apostle’s teachings (1 Corinthians 1:11; 5:9; 7:1; and 16:10–11). The letter insinuates that the saints struggled with inexperienced membership and conflicting backgrounds. This is not surprising in light of the fact that Corinth had a reputation for wealth, worldliness, and immorality. The city’s unique geography allowed it to control the neck of land between mainland Greece and the Peloponnesus, making it a double port city.¹² As such, it seemed to have a double portion of promiscuity.¹³ Paul’s letter attempts to realign several false moral and religious traditions.¹⁴

1 Corinthians 11:2–13

In 1 Corinthians, Paul boldly corrects the saints on many issues — one of which is the need for a woman to cover her head during certain prayers (1 Corinthians 11:2–13). He teaches the Corinthian women that they could participate in the sacred experience of speaking by divine inspiration,

9. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Keys to 1 Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 167, 170, 172.

10. In addition to the text that points to conflicting understandings of Paul’s expectations, the names of Corinthian saints referenced in the epistle are half Greek and half Latin, suggesting different familial backgrounds.

11. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries: 1 Corinthians* (New York: Random House-Doubleday, 2008), 30–35. As evidence of the New Testament claims of a Jewish community in Corinth, archeologists found a broken lintel stone that announced the “Synagogue of the Hebrews” and other artifacts mentioned in the New Testament.

12. Between 625 and 585 BC, the Greeks cut a five-foot-wide track through the rock peninsula connecting the ports on the Aegean and Adriatic Seas to create a more direct sailing route around southern Greece. It saved travel time as merchants could pull or wheel their ships across the four-mile isthmus.

13. Fitzmyer, *Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries: 1 Corinthians*, 35.

14. Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 92; argues that Paul addresses a “clash of social values: ... uncovered hair to many connoted seduction and immodesty.”

with their veils signifying their authority to do so (1 Corinthians 11:5,10, NRSV). Yet many biblical scholars find these verses a jumbled mess or a discussion of hairstyles and dress.¹⁵ With this as a disclaimer (see note), I do not. I draw on restored scripture and teachings to help decipher the early saints' practice of covering a woman's head during particular prayers.¹⁶ I find these verses point to an exalted role of women.

Now I praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you. (1 Corinthians 11:2)

Paul opens the subject by commending the Corinthian saints for keeping the "ordinances" (KJV) or "traditions" (NRSV), he taught them. The word "ordinances" carries significant meaning for Latter-day Saints, but the Greek word "*paradosis*" has a broader definition that includes "handing over, delivery, hence *teaching* committed to a pupil ... transmission, handing down, hence that which is received."¹⁷ Here it is a noun and modern English translations use "directions" (DBT), "traditions" (RSV, ESV, NASV), or "teachings" (NIV). In the Greek Old Testament (LXX), in use at the time of the late Second Temple, *paradosis* also describes the teachings that were handed down orally.¹⁸

15. William Orr and James Arthur Walther, *Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries: 1 Corinthians* (New York: Random House-Doubleday, 1976), vii; "it is perilous to try to modernize Paul." Sarah Ruden speaks of this whole passage in parentheses with "grounds for considering these verses not genuine ... rough ... clunky repetition." A few pages later she bemoans, "the passage doesn't flow, it sputters with emotion, gets incoherent, changes tactics, and ends almost with a snarl." *Paul Among the People*, 85, 88. Other interpretations who also differ from mine are found in: Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, trans. James W. Leitch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 189, 179–91; Gregory J. Lockwood, *1 Corinthians* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing, 2000), 363.

16. As a disclaimer, my thoughts on 1 Corinthians 11:2–13 do not purport to be a culminating study on the scholarship available on this difficult passage. My observations come through my LDS lens. I understand that many real differences exist between the Corinthian branch and today's church. But even while honoring the historicity of first-century Christianity, we can find Paul's message illuminating to Christian women who veil to pray.

17. G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 1014. Emphasis in original. *Strong's New Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* defines *paradosis* as "from; transmission, a precept; spec. the Jewish traditionary law" (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990), 54 of the Greek Dictionary section.

18. The term *paradoseis* is found thirteen times in the New Testament, eight of which are in Matthew 15 and Mark 7, where Christ discusses the "traditions

For our discussion on 1 Corinthians 11, it is especially helpful to see how Paul uses the term “*paradosis*” in this epistle — both as a noun and verb.¹⁹ Just a few verses following Paul’s council to women veiling in prayer, he uses *paradosis* again, “I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you” (1 Corinthians 11:23).²⁰ The *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* explains, “The essential point for Paul is that it has been handed down (1 Corinthians 15:3) and that it derives from the Lord (11:23).”²¹ Whatever type of teachings Paul refers to with “*paradosis*,” he passed down the practice of women praying with a veil.

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. (1 Corinthians 11:3)

The first phrase of verse 3, “*but I would have you know*,” or “*I want you to understand*,” suggests that the saints had, at least partially, misunderstood Paul’s previous instructions to “keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you” (1 Corinthians 11:2–3). Paul uses the next phrase four times in this letter, “*but I would /thelō de*” (1 Corinthians 7:32; 10:20; 14:5). Interestingly, each time he uses it to correct a misconception. In chapter 11, he explains why women should cover their heads while praying and why men did not (1 Corinthians 11:4–11). His tone sounds as if the saints of Corinth had a problem with following this specific teaching.

Paul wants to correct this misunderstanding, but rather than merely restate the dress code, he explains the important doctrinal background that underlines the veil imagery. He explains the series of relationships established

of the elders” with the Jewish scribes (Matthew 15:2, 3, 6; Mark 7:3, 5, 8, 9, 13; also see Galatians 1:14; Colossians 2:8; 2 Thessalonians 2:15, 3:6; and 1 Peter 1:18). Some of these *traditions* refer to ritual behavior found *not* in the written law, but in the 10,000 oral laws. Pharisees and others claimed that these oral laws began with Moses and were passed down for 1,500 years. Others may be new Christian teachings as described in 1 Corinthians 11:2.

19. 2 Thessalonians 2:15; 3:6; 1 Corinthians 11:2, 23; 5:3; Colossians 2:8; Galatians 1:14.

20. Looking beyond Paul into other early Christian sources, we find *paradosis* generally referring to unwritten sacred “tradition given by Christ, preached by apostles, guarded by fathers.” These teachings handed down through words or example and included the sacrament of Jesus’s Last Supper and “the later activities of the Twelve.” Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1014–15.

21. G. Kittel, ed., Geoffrey W. Bromiley, translator, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 1965), 6.172–73; Buchsel, “*παράδοσις*.” In 1 Corinthians 11:23, Paul uses *paradosis* to imply the Lord’s Supper.

from the order of creation: God-Christ-man-woman. Paul reviews that God is the *head* of Christ, who is the *head* of man, who is the *head* of woman. The word “head/*kephale*” has multiple meanings in both Greek and English and most often refers to: 1) the physical head or body and 2) figuratively, the origin or source.²² According to the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, the word “head/*kephale*” used by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 deals with the relationship of man and woman “at the very foundations of their creaturehood.”²³ Whether or not we understand, or agree with Paul, it appears that he sees God the Father as the source, starting point, or origin of Christ (John 20:17),²⁴ who was the “origin” of man (John 1:3), and man, via his side-rib, the “origin” of his partner, woman (Genesis 2:22).²⁵ By the end of his argument, this linear connection loops around into a circle with woman becoming a co-creator with God (1 Corinthians 11:12).

22. Murphy-O'Connor, *Keys to 1 Corinthians*, 169–72. For a different perspective, see Wayne Grudem, “Does Kephale (‘Head’) Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’ in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples,” *Trinity Journal* ns 6.1 (Spring 1985): 38–59, https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/tj/kephale_grudem.pdf. Grudem argues against the definition of “source,” but his study demonstrates that 53% of the 2,336 examples of ancient Greek Literature he examined use “head” physically, and the next most common use, 23% of the texts, use it figuratively to mean the “starting point” (51).

23. Gerhard Kittel, ed, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 1965), 3:679. I disagree with this interpretation that “woman is the reflection of man to the degree that in her created being she points to man, and only with and through him to God.” This speaks more of the perspective of the translators (writing for Nazi Germany) than Paul’s text as he explains in 1 Corinthians 11:8–11.

24. God the Father created Jesus’s spirit body, His mortal body, and His resurrected body (see Luke 1:34–35; Acts 13:34). Latter-day Saints (LDS) believe Jesus is the literal “Son” of God and the premortal Jehovah, God of the Old Testament (Mosiah 3:5–8). The Father then is the source of the Son. Because they define God and Christ through the Trinity, my description runs contrary to that of most Christian biblical scholars, who prefer the definition of superior authority or rank. The Council of Nicaea was called in 325 CE to determine the relationship between God the Father and Jesus the Christ. The issue was not resolved for centuries. For the LDS view of the Father and Son, see Joseph Smith-History, 1:17; 3 Nephi 9:15; D&C 130:22.

25. For many Trinitarian scholars, this chain is difficult because the Old Testament does not explicitly discuss Jesus Christ as source or creator of man, rather Elohim or Jehovah. For Latter-day Saints though, the pre-eminence of Christ’s deification in earlier dispensations makes sense of this difficult passage. Some Christian scholars question how Paul understood the Godhead, with the Father as the source of the Son, but it is not as confusing for those who deny the Trinity. Latter-day Saints also define the creation through Moses 3:23; Abraham 5:17; 3 Nephi 9:15; and D&C 29:34.

This chain of interlocking relationships links humanity with their creators and becomes the foundation of Paul's instruction here.²⁶ Three times in ten verses he uses different words to describe the genders intertwining origins — the woman, Eve, originates from the man, Adam, and a man-child comes from woman (1 Corinthians 11:3, 8, 12, NASB). Both genders are connected to their creators. Looking at Paul's defense as a whole, he discusses a symbiotic connection in which men and women have mutual responsibility for one another.

This bears highlighting, as Paul does not make a case for male superiority.²⁷ In the same section, he speaks of woman as privileged with authority and indispensable to men and vice versa (1 Corinthians 11:10–12). Outside of these verses, we find “head/*kephale*,” used forty-nine times in the New Testament to describe either a physical head or the Savior.²⁸ While some interpret this verse to say men are to rule over women, I do not find evidence for that in the Pauline epistles at large, nor specifically in the context of 1 Corinthians 11. Whenever Paul refers to a “ruler” he uses other words — for example, “rulers/*archon*” (Romans 13:3), “rule/preside/*proistemi*” (1 Timothy 3:5; 5:17), “rule/govern/*brabeuo*” (Colossians 3:15), and “rule/leader/*hegeomai*” (Hebrews 13:7, 17, 24) — not *kephale*.²⁹ Part of the transforming teachings that the

26. An alternative definition of “head/*kephale*” is “authority,” as a result, some scholars, including Robert Allard, Mark Finney, and Ed Christian, see Paul teaching the proper ecclesiastical relationships — beginning with God who presides over all, to Christ who presides over men, and men who preside over women. Robert E. Allard, “Freedom on your head’ (1 Corinthians 11:2–16): A Paradigm for the Structure of Paul’s Ethics,” in *Word & World* 30, no. 4 (Fall 2010): 399–407. Mark Finney, “Honour, Head-coverings and Headship: 1 Corinthians 11.2–16 in its Social Context,” in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33, no.1 (2010). Also, Ed Christian, “Prophets under God’s Authority: Head coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:1–16,” in *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 1, nos. 1–2 (1999): 291–95.

27. After carefully counting each piece of advice to women and men in the New Testament (and in the Pauline corpus specifically), I found more positive statements than negative ones. For a discussion each negative reference (including 1 Corinthians 14:34–35; and 1 Timothy 2:9–15) by Paul to women see Lynne Hilton Wilson, *Christ’s Emancipation of Women in the New Testament from their Cultural Background and Baggage* (Palo Alto, CA: Good Sound Publishing, 2015).

28. References in the New Testament where “head/*kephale*,” speaks of the Savior are found in: Acts 4:11; Ephesians 1:22; 4:15; Colossians 2:10; 1 Peter 2:7.

29. Timothy and Barbara Friberg, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2000), 77; “active rule over, be leader of.” *Strong’s New Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* defines it, “first (in rank or power): chief (ruler), magistrate, prince, ruler (16, #758).

Lord restored denounced unrighteous dominion and superiority of any kind (Matthew 19:16; Mark 10:17, etc.).³⁰ Paul's verses on veiling women encourage a positive interrelationship between man, women and God; they do not promote gender supremacy.

Paul does not intend this lineup to sound demeaning, as he explains in verses 10 and 12. His analogy applies specifically to the order of creation. In the ancient world, ideas that linked someone with deity were honorable and empowering. The New Testament does not suggest that women needed a detour or middleman to communicate with God. Both men and women pray directly to God the Father (Luke 11:1–2; Acts 1:14; 16:13; Romans 8:26; etc.), both men and women had access to the gifts of the Spirit (1 Corinthians 12:1–11), and both build the kingdom of God (1 Corinthians 12:12–31). Paul describes men and women as team players, not as competing individuals lined up in order of importance (1 Corinthians 12:7). There are a few odd verses that contradict this.³¹ Yet the majority of the New Testament — including the Pauline epistles — encourage women to pray, serve, teach and witness.³²

Paul's orderly line-up does not disrupt the other scriptural admonition for men and women to work side by side as companions, "help meet[s]," "counterpart[s]" (Genesis 2:18, KJV, YLT), or "yokefellow[s]" (Philippians 4:3). By working in the same direction with God, men and women assist in building God's kingdom on earth. Whether this team effort is described as an alignment from the order of creation or as working side-by-side, the result is the same. Christ, Peter, and Paul taught that husbands and wives need to work toward the same goal to become joint heirs (John 17:21–23; 1 Peter 3:7; Romans 8:17). In 1 Corinthians 11,

30. The Gospels record many references to Jesus calling for leaders to serve. For example: "whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all" (Mark 10:44).

31. For example, 1 Corinthians 14:34–35 sticks out like a sore thumb, interrupting Paul's teachings on the positive relationship of men and women. Not knowing Paul's circumstances inhibits our full understanding. Greek manuscripts from Ephesus, some of the most trusted and oldest New Testament manuscripts, do not include 1 Corinthians 14:34–35. Additionally, textual critics find a break in the text between verse 33 and 36. Paul's thought, is contradicted by these two verses which suggests a later editor added them as his interpretation. It seems odd that Paul contradicts himself within the same portion of the same epistle. These troublesome verses fit with thinking from the end of the first century. I find it easier to see them as added by a copyist rather than Paul.

32. Matthew 5:3–11; 9:19–22; 14:21, 15:23; 38; 28:5–10; Mark 7:25–29; 14:4–6; Luke 7:39; 10:4, 39–42; 13:12; John 4:7–27; 8:10; 17:21; Acts 1:14; 9:36; 16:1, 36; 17:4, 12, 34; Romans 1:8; Philippians 4:3; and Ephesians 5:25, 31; etc.

Paul advocates mutually supportive relationships (11:11), but first he describes the order of creation as a linear link to God to explain why women cover their heads during special prayers.

Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered,
dishonoureth his head. (1 Corinthians 11:4)

In the context of verse 4, Paul states that men who cover their head dishonor their “head” or God.³³ He uses the dual meaning for head: “Every man praying or prophesying, having his *head* [physically] covered, dishonoureth his *head* [figuratively].” In keeping with the creation narrative, Paul’s injunction follows the reasoning that man was created in the image and glory of God, so when man communes with God, he should not cover himself but acknowledge that affiliation (Genesis 1:27). By covering his head, a man would cover the image of God, thereby figuratively denying the power and dignity the Creator bestowed on him at creation. *In other words*, if man covers his head, he dishonors his *origin*. To do otherwise was to devalue his Christian beliefs. However problematic male head covering may have been, it appears the bigger issue was that women were not covering their heads, as this becomes the subject for the next five verses.

But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head
uncovered dishonoureth her head: for that is even all one as if
she were shaven. (1 Corinthians 11:5)

The first phrase in verse five clarifies an enormous breakthrough in worship for Christian women. Paul explicitly declares that women prayed and prophesied in early Christian public worship. Paul’s example of women praying and prophesying may refer to private, personal experiences, but the larger context suggests they were part of a special congregational experience with both men and women. It corresponds with Joel 2:28, where the Spirit pours out the gift of prophecy on both men and women as “your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.”

This Christian practice marked a dramatic departure from Paul’s previous Pharisaic traditions,³⁴ where female Jews’ religious experiences

33. For more information on men wearing veils in the first century AD, both the social and liturgical, see, Mark Finney, “Honour, Head-coverings and Headship,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 33, no. 1 (2010).

34. *Mishnah*, *Ketuboth* 6.6; *Gittin* 9.10. Jewish women were not allowed to speak in their worship or synagogue, nor in any public gathering — in fact, a husband could divorce his wife for speaking to another man (see chapter 6, under “Divorce”).

were sharply curtailed — from pilgrimages to synagogue worship.³⁵ More applicable to Corinth, in Greco-Roman religious traditions, women usually worshiped with other women. When both genders joined in Greco-Roman fertility cults, women acted as prostitutes.³⁶

Paul's choice of wording for "prophesy/propheteuo/to speak forth under inspiration" may refer to women giving sermons or a testimony as well (Revelation 19:10). In either case, it represents enormous liberation as the whole idea of women participating in the public worship services was limited at the time.³⁷ Jewish men dominated the public world and confined women's worship primarily to their homes.³⁸ Outside of her home, the Pharisees preferred women unseen and unheard.³⁹ Paul's

35. *Mishnah, Kiddushin*, 4:13. The Mishnah forbade women from teaching in the synagogue. After the New Testament, sometime around the second century AD, rabbis added lattice barriers to their synagogues to further separate the women from the men. Archeologists have found these lattice barriers in a Mesopotamian synagogue from AD 245. Then to segregate even more, between the third and seventh centuries, separate entrances and galleries were built to keep the women on separate floors from the men. See *Encyclopedia Judaica* (2007), s.v. "Synagogue." Not only did some Rabbis discourage women from speaking and worshiping in public, one view discouraged women from learning the Mosaic Law even at home. *Mishnah, Sotah*, 3.4. "If a man gives his daughter a knowledge of the Law it is as though he taught her lechery."

36. Thurston, *Women in the New Testament*, 26. Greco-Roman women had several opportunities to worship in their religious organizations. Religious cults developed around occupations, social classes, and stages of women's life. For example, young girls worshiped the goddess *Fortuna Virginitis*; newly married youth worshiped *Fortuna Primigenia* to encourage childbirth. The cult of Venus, *Changer of Hearts*, promoted marital fidelity in women. *Fortunata Muliebris* was for women who married only once. Prostitutes worshiped *Fortuna Virilis* in men's baths. Sects trained young boys and girls to become "divine organs of inspiration and prophecy." Ben Witherington III, *Women and the Genesis of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 15. *Pythoness*, the prophetess or oracle of Apollo, was a widow from Delphi who tended the temple fires faithfully. Women acted in orgiastic rites such as the Greek Dionysian and Bacchanalia mysteries. The greatest Roman religious honor for women was the six Vestal Virgin priestesses (*ibid.*, 25).

37. *Encyclopedia Judaica* (2007), s.v. "Women."

38. Dan W. Clanton, *The Good, the Bold, and the Beautiful* (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 24; "From kosher laws to the recitation of the *Shema*, from private prayer to Sabbath practices, not only would women have been present, they would have been active participants due to their dominance in the private, domestic sphere."

39. Judaeus Philo, *Special Laws III* (London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1967), 169, 171; "Marketplaces and council-halls, law-courts and gatherings, and meetings where a large number of people are assembled, and open-air life with full scope

statement is an enormous step forward for women in communal worship.⁴⁰

In verses 5 and 6, Paul states that women should cover their heads during special prayers or prophesying — unlike men. However, his argument seems exactly the opposite for women. When a woman covers “her head/*kephale*” (physically), she showed honor and respect to “her origin/*kephale*” (husband, Christ, and God). To rephrase Paul’s words, a man honors his relationship to God by uncovering his head, while a woman honors her ultimate head, God, by veiling her head.⁴¹ Paul explains this dichotomy in verse 7, but first in verse 6, he expresses his opinion that a woman’s head without a covering is as disgraceful as shaving her head.⁴²

For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. (1 Corinthians 11:7)

for discussion and action – all these are suitable to men both in war and peace. The women are best suited to the indoor life which never strays from the house. ... A woman then, should not be a busybody, meddling with matters outside her household concerns, but should seek a life of seclusion.”

40. Carol Myers and Toni Craven and Ross Shepard Kraemer, eds., *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001). The New Testament includes over a hundred examples of Christian women in public worship as witnesses, co-workers, servants of the church, leaders of house churches (Acts 12:12; 16: 15, 40; Romans 16:3–5; 1 Corinthians 1:11; Colossians 4:15), including one “prominent among the apostles” (Romans 16:7, 1sv).

41. I use the word *veiling* because some English translations use the word “unveiled” (American Standard Version, English Revised Version, New Heart English Bible, World English Bible, etc.), while others use “uncovered.” The Greek is a vague reference to something “down from the head.”

42. Flavius Josephus, *The Jewish War*, in *The New Complete Works of Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1999), 751. Josephus mentions a woman named Bernice who shaved her head in conjunction with taking a Nazarite vow. Even though her vow was noble and voluntary, she was still publicly humiliated and shamed for the loss of her hair. This phrase from 1 Corinthians 11:6, had a dramatic effect in the late fourth century, when the early Church father Chrysostom wrote, “If thou cast away the covering appointed by the law of God, cast away likewise that appointed by nature.” St. Chrysostom, “Homily XXVI,” in *Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*, ed. Philip Schaff (Oxford: Parker, 1891), 152.

In verse 7, Paul references both creation stories from Genesis chapters 1 and 2.⁴³ Modern revelation teaches of a spiritual creation before the physical creation, which may help clarify the dichotomy between the two Genesis accounts (D&C 29:32; Moses 3:5). Genesis 1:26–27 describes both male and female created “in the image of God,” and both are given dominion over the earth. Genesis 2:20–22 describes Adam naming all the animals, unable to find one equal or complementary companion for himself, until God takes part of his rib cage to create a “partner” (New English Bible), or “his one before” (Genesis 2:20, Transparent English Bible).⁴⁴

Paul references both of these creation stories, yet he does not follow our Genesis wording.⁴⁵ Instead, Paul changes the first creation account from plural to singular with only man representing the “glory of God.”

Genesis 1:27	1 Corinthians 11:7
God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.	<i>he is the image and glory of God</i>

It appears that Paul wants to accentuate woman as the “glory of man,” as something different from the “glory of God” (1 Corinthians 11:7) — which causes this reader to ask *why*? Some limit the discussion to gender-distinctive clothing, but I see Paul exploring the theology behind human interactions with God.

Within the context of this chapter, letter, and New Testament at large, we can safely assume Paul does *not* mean that God created woman solely to glorify men, nor that man could use woman for his glory in a manipulative or disrespectful manner. Although Josephus and many contemporaries of Paul disagreed, Paul repeatedly states that woman is not inferior to man

43. *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel Ludlow (New York: Macmillan, 1992), s.v. “Ancient Sources.”

44. A more literal translation is found in the Transparent English Bible (TEB) where they use side, not rib; “And YHVH ELOHIM made a deep sleep fall upon the *soil*-man, and he slept; and he took one from his sides, and he closed flesh under it. And YHVH ELOHIM built the side that he took from the *soil*-man into a woman, and he made her come toward the *soil*-man. And the *soil*-man said, “This one this time — bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh! To this one will be called “woman,” because from a man this one was taken” (Genesis 2:21–23).

45. E.A. Speiser, *The Anchor Bible Genesis* (New York: Doubleday, 1964), 7. Although Paul deviates from the English versions of Genesis 1:27, we do not know if his memory or copy of the text may have been different, thus he uses a singular man, rather than using the *plural to* denote humanity as in Genesis 1:27. Biblical commentaries often mention the plural nature of *Adam* in Genesis 1:26–27.

(1 Corinthians 11:7, 11).⁴⁶ Understanding what Paul means by “the woman is the glory of man” (1 Corinthians 11:7), is vital to understanding why Paul thinks a woman should cover her head during special prayers.

Narrowing in on the “glory of God,” Moses understood that God’s work and glory is “to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man” (Moses 1:39). Without the union of man and woman in procreation, God’s work and glory cannot be eternally achieved. The union is a glorious thing and it produces more glory. Nevertheless, in the hierarchy of God, the glory of humanity should not overshadow the glory of God. As children are born to a woman, she represents the “glory of man[kind]” and veils her head out of respect to her ultimate head, God.

Paul describes woman as a symbol of human potential as she facilitates human reproduction and glory. Paul teaches that during this time when men and women commune with God through prayer and prophecy, the man takes on a vicarious role to represent the “image and glory of God,” while a woman represents the image and glory of supplicating humanity (1 Corinthians 11:7). Man does not cover because he acts in the image of God. Woman, on the other hand represents humanity, so she reverently and symbolically covers humanity’s glory when she stands in the presence of God.⁴⁷ This interpretation is consistent with the scriptures that describe woman or bride as a symbol of God’s people or the church.⁴⁸

For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.
Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman
for the man. (1 Corinthians 11:8–9)

46. Josephus, *Against Apion*, in *The New Complete Works of Josephus*, 973. “A woman is inferior to her husband in all things.”

47. Catherine Thomas, CES Symposium, unpublished manuscript, 1992. “What makes all of this so hard in practice? It may seem unfair that the man is subject to a perfect head, and the woman to an imperfect head. But how much humility the man must cultivate to hear the Lord’s voice! And how much humility the woman must exercise to encourage and rely on her imperfect husband to make that connection. The man’s presidency over the woman is designed to be as much of a tutorial for him as it is for the woman to submit to his presidency. A very fine tuning is required of each. The challenge of perfecting ourselves is great indeed, but the challenge of perfecting ourselves in a relationship is greater.” Catherine Thomas pointed out the delicate innuendoes and powerful learning opportunities this connection creates.

48. Isaiah 50:1; 66:8; Hosea 1; 3:1; Jeremiah 3:8; 33:11; John 3:29; Revelation 21:9; etc.

According to Genesis 2:18–23, woman's arrival in Eden fulfilled the need for man's "counterpart" (YLT) or "authority corresponding to him" (ISV) or "a helper suitable for him" (NSB) or "help meet" (KJV). Significantly, God did not provide Adam immediately with a wife but waited for him to name "all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field" (Genesis 2:20). It is as if God waited to introduce this important creation until Adam recognized his own inability as a single man, "but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." Once Adam recognized his need, he received a co-partner or equal, not a subordinate or servant.

In this sense, woman is "the glory of man" because she allows humanity to achieve their potential and glory. God created females to carry and grow embryos. This does not mean women are valued only if they can produce offspring. Nor does it mean that most women bear children. However, it is why Adam named his wife "Life" or "Living," translated as "Eve/*Chavvah*." With this unique potential to bring forth life, woman reflects the work of Christ himself. Just as Christ labored to create sons and daughters of God, so God designed a woman's body to create mortal sons and daughters. But woman cannot do this alone. The physical creation of each human requires the work of woman and man working together as God planned.

Through the spousal relationship, a woman and a man became a mutually supporting entity. This may be misunderstood with many influential translations of Genesis 3:16, when Eve is told, "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (KJV). But there are other valid translations that speak of a joint responsibility "and he will rule *with you*"

(TEB) or “he will govern *with you*”.⁴⁹ Adam was no dictator.⁵⁰ The partnership is more important than either of the single entities. Only as a unified entity can either person experience lasting glory. God created Adam and Eve so a glorious union could potentially be formed.

Allegorical View. Paul’s words about the order of creation have also been interpreted allegorically. We see Paul using an allegorical view in this same epistle, when he refers to Jesus as the “last Adam” (1 Corinthians 15:45).⁵¹ Early Christian writers built on this theme: “Eve is a type of the church as Adam is a type of Christ. As Eve was made out of a part of Adam, so the church is part of the Lord Jesus. The church is called His bride as Eve was Adam’s bride.”⁵² Typologically, Adam and

49. Personal correspondence to author with the translation team at *Power on High Ministries*. The KJV of Genesis 3:16 uses “rule over,” although this biblical translation speaks more of the translator’s belief than of the text. According to the Hebrew scholar Legrand Davies, the KJV translation of “rule over” in Genesis 3:16 is based on the last two letters of the sentence translated as “over her.” In Hebrew, the “beth” is a prefix or inseparable preposition. Hebrew dictionaries include its meaning as: *in, at, to, on, among, with, towards, according to, by, because of, on top of, besides*, and about twenty other such meanings. All are valid, depending on the interpretation of the passage. Adam ruling “with” Eve is in keeping with LDS doctrine outlined in D&C 132:19. However, many translators disagree with this interpretation, so I rely on living prophets for clarification. Elder L. Tom Perry explained, “Since the beginning, God has instructed mankind that marriage should unite husband and wife together in unity. Therefore, there is not a president or a vice president in a family. The couple works together eternally for the good of the family. They are united together in word, in deed, and in action as they lead, guide, and direct their family unit. They are on equal footing. They plan and organize the affairs of the family jointly and unanimously as they move forward.” L. Tom Perry, “Fatherhood, an Eternal Calling,” *Ensign* (May 2004): 71.

50. Bruce C. and Marie K. Hafen, “Crossing Thresholds and Becoming Equal Partners,” *Ensign* (August 2007): 27.

51. The Old and New Testaments are filled with examples of relationships between men and women to allegorically teach about our relationship to God. While some allegorical views from the middle ages went to extremes that offend modern scholarship, others have enough evidence to suggest the author suggested multiple levels of meanings, like Jesus’s parables (i.e., see John W. Welch, “The Good Samaritan: Forgotten Symbols,” *Ensign* (February 2007): 41).

52. Ambrose, quoted in Alonzo Gaskill, *The Savior and the Serpent: Unlocking the Doctrine of the Fall* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2002), 115. It appears that Adam conveys the command to Eve, who walks by faith. Gaskill sees this as significant: “Again, according to scriptural accounts, Eve had less information than Adam — she could not see as clearly, as it were — and thus Adam was to be her guide, to whom she was to cling. Similarly, you and I have less information about the things of salvation than do Christ and His prophets — we labor under a veil,

Jesus are wounded in the side to bring forth the life of Eve and the Church respectively. As Adam's wounded side produced mankind, so Christ's wounds provide the way for mankind to return to God the Father. Christ as the second Adam and as the Savior champions fallen humanity. Eve represents all those born of women, who become the Church and join Adam/Christ in a covenantal relationship. Furthermore, "Adam and Eve were commanded to be one, and, in like manner, Christ and His Church are to be one."⁵³ In this allegorical scenario, the Church (or Eve) works through the mediator Christ (or Adam) to become unified as the scriptural Bridegroom and Bride (Revelation 18:23; Isaiah 61:10; Joel 2:16. etc.).

Restored Perspective. Stepping outside the Pauline text for a moment, we can find insights from the restoration that shed light on this perspective.⁵⁴ Elder Bruce Hafen explains, "The concept of interdependent, equal partners is well-grounded in the doctrine of the restored gospel."⁵⁵ From the restored perspective, sealing of eternal partners may happen on either side of the veil. Men and women continue to progress and can be sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise to fulfill their eternal potential (D&C 132:18–19). However, without this sealing of companions, their work of procreation and eternal glory cannot be achieved (D&C 132:17). It is the inter-reliance of the couple, unified to do God's work, that allows them to develop into a glorified state. This is when they join in "the patriarchal priesthood," meaning, "the priesthood shared by husbands and wives who are sealed."⁵⁶ The restoration also provides hope for those not sealed in ideal relationships. Whether due to death, living single, or an unhappy marriage, all can hope for celestial relationships in the world to come.⁵⁷ I think Paul refers to this glorious potential union in these verses (11:8–9).

For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head
because of the angels. (1 Corinthians 11:10)

as it were — and hence they must be our guides, to whom we must cling. To take matters into our own hands is to bring heartache and trials into our lives (as Eve did metaphorically into hers)" (119).

53. Gaskill, *The Savior and the Serpent: Unlocking the Doctrine of the Fall*, 114.

54. M. Russell Ballard, "This Is My Work and Glory," *Ensign* (May 2013).

55. Hafen and Hafen, "Crossing Thresholds and Becoming Equal Partners," 27.

56. Ludlow, *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, s.v. "Priesthood, Patriarchal."

57. Ezra Taft Benson, "To the Single Adult Sisters of the Church," *Ensign* (November 1988). Gordon B. Hinkley, "To the Women of the Church," *Ensign* (November 2003).

In verse 10, Paul emphasizes that the veil identifies a woman's power and authority to act in that "ordinance" (11:2). Women become agents of authority or "power/*exousia*" during that time of prayer and prophecy. The KJV translates the word *exousia* in this case as "power," and the RSV as "veil." The NIV comes closest to the original Greek with "authority." 1 Corinthians repeatedly addresses the topic of authority — specifically the need to respect authority and who has the authority.⁵⁸ Here Paul returns to the subject again and focuses on women's authority to act in church worship. Clarifying even further, the Young's Literal Translation (YLT) reads, "because of this the woman ought to have a token of authority upon the head, because of the messengers."⁵⁹

Paul returns to the creation theme referring to angels in the last phrase of verse 10. Angels protect the creative order of Eden.⁶⁰ Not only do angels guard the "the way of the tree of life" (Moses 4:31), but here angels also have a connection to woman with "authority" or "a veil on her head" (1 Corinthians 11:10, NIV, RSV). Paul teaches that women need this sign of authority "because of the angels."⁶¹ Covered with "authority/*exousia*," it is possible that during worshipful prayer, the veil signaled the messenger angels to provide the woman with the word of God to prophesy or testify. 'Or perhaps, when the woman wore her

58. For Paul's discussion on authority in this letter see: 1 Corinthians 7:37; 9:4-18; 11:10; 15:24.

59. The translations of the KJV, NIV, NRSV, EVS, ASV, etc. all that state the veil refers to a woman's authority or power. The Anchor Bible reads, "the genuine force of *exousia* is best brought out by the simple translation, 'a woman ought to have authority over her head.'" Fitzmyer, *Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries: 1 Corinthians*, 417.

60. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 189; many biblical scholars interpret the angels in this verse to refer to the fallen angels that became "the origin of demons" through sex with mortal women [sexually libidinous]. Orr and Walther interpret the angels as "guardians of the order of nature and are so concerned with proper respect for God in worship (261). Lockwood quotes early church fathers (Ambrose, Ephraim, Primasius) who thought the angels referred to bishops or presbyters, while Lockwood argues that the New Testament usage of "angels" designates "supernatural beings" (374).

61. David W. Bercot, ed., *A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs*, (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1998), s.v. "Veil." The early Christian father, *Tertullian* (c. 198), understood the angels referenced by Paul, to be devils, "This refers to the event, when on account of 'the daughters of men,' angels revolted from God." Similar ideas spread throughout Christianity.

emblem of authority, it signaled to the angels that the mouthpiece was now ready to receive divine instruction.⁶²

Angels fill many assignments as “*aggelos*/messengers” of God. Here Paul’s angels have some connection to praying veiled women and power or authority. Imparting the same gospel, though removed by a dispensation from Paul, Brigham Young notes that one of the roles of angels is to guard the entrance to heaven. Sentinel angels receive “signs and tokens” from both women and men to return to the presence of God.⁶³ President John Taylor references these teachings of Paul as he addresses women on similar truths about guardian angels and gender:

Thou hast obeyed the truth, and thy guardian angel ministers unto thee and watches over thee. Thou hast chosen him you loved in the spirit world to be thy companion. Now, crowns, thrones, exaltations, and dominions are in reserve for thee in the eternal worlds Thou wilt be permitted to pass by the Gods and angels who guard the gates, and onward, upward to thy exaltation in a celestial world among the Gods, to be a priestess queen upon thy Heavenly Father’s throne, and a glory to thy husband and offspring, to bear the souls of men, to people other worlds (as thou didst bear their tabernacles in mortality) while eternity goes and eternity comes; and if you will receive it, lady, this is eternal life. And herein is the saying of the Apostle Paul fulfilled, that the man is not without the woman, neither is the woman without the man, in the Lord; that man is the head of the woman, and the glory of the man is the woman. Hence, thine origin, the object of thy ultimate destiny. If faithful, lady, the cup is within thy reach; drink then the heavenly draught and live.⁶⁴

In keeping with the ideas of John Taylor and Brigham Young, Joseph Smith’s translation of this verse suggests similar thoughts.

62. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 189.

63. Brigham Young, *Journal of Discourses* (London: Latter-day Saints’ Book Depot, 1855), 2:31. Brigham Young said this at the dedication of the cornerstone of the Salt Lake Temple on April 6, 1853.

64. John Taylor, “The Mormon,” (August 29, 1857), quoted in Daniel H. Ludlow, ed., *Latter-day Prophets Speak: Selections from the Sermons and Writings of Church Presidents* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1993), 10.

Joseph Smith makes only one change to 1 Corinthians 11 in his inspired version.⁶⁵ He changed the word “power” in verse 10, to “covering.” In Joseph Smith’s mind, a woman was “to have *a covering* on her head because of the angels.”⁶⁶ In this context, when female saints covered their heads with veils to pray and prophesy, they functioned with divinely acknowledged power. It becomes a sign of obedience and an exercise of faith which opens the door to the ministry of angels (Moroni 7:29–33, 37).

Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God. (1 Corinthians 11:11–12)

Paul ends his explanation by stressing the complete interdependence of men and women — woman was created from man, while man is born of woman. Paul’s description encompasses the Edenic creation and birth process. In this unique role, each mother opens the veil to mortality, just as Jesus opened the veil of immortality. A woman’s womb symbolizes a veil of life as spirit children pass from heaven to earth through her. In this task, woman acts as a veil.

Verses 11 and 12 focus on the underlying theology of the reciprocal union that occurs between a husband and wife. With two references to God’s interaction with the couple, “*in the Lord ... all things of God,*” Paul intimates a covenantal relationship with God (also see D&C 132:15). Through this trio of unity, we understand the mutuality of eternal marriage.⁶⁷ Paul’s promotion of marital interdependence is consistent with

65. Joseph Smith’s translation of 1 Corinthians took place in the early 1830s, over a decade before the temple endowment was revealed to the saints in 1842.

66. Thomas A. Wayment, ed., *The Complete Joseph Smith Translation of the New Testament: A Side-by-Side Comparison with the King James Version* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2005), 272; emphasis added.

67. Hugh Nibley, *Old Testament and Related Studies* (Provo, UT: FARMS and Deseret Book, 1986), 93; describes the covenantal partnership between God, a husband and wife as a system of checks and balances: “There is no patriarchy or matriarchy in the Garden; the two supervise each other. Adam is given no arbitrary power; Eve is to heed him only insofar as he obeys their Father — and who decides that? She must keep check on him as much as he does on her. It is, if you will, a system of checks and balances in which each party is as distinct and independent in its sphere as are the departments of government under the Constitution — and just as dependent on each other.”

statements made earlier in the same epistle (1 Corinthians 7:2–3, 12–14).⁶⁸ The interrelationship of genders speaks to the worth of women as equals to men. I see Paul's request for a woman to wear a veil during prayer as having nothing to do with gender inequality and everything to do with her relationships and authority to participate in Christian worship.

Judge in yourselves: is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered? (1 Corinthians 11:13)

In this new Christian order, Paul teaches the primitive saints that it is comely or proper for women to pray and prophesy or testify. Her veil witnesses to her authority to act in that proper manner. The word “comely/*prepo*” also means “fitting, to stand out, to be conspicuous, eminent, becoming, seemly, or fit.” Paul concludes this subject by reminding the Corinthian saints, who had been disposed to contentions in the past (see 1 Corinthians 11:16), that they were not a law unto themselves on this matter. He calls for a unity of the faith among all the churches of God — even in the practice of women wearing veils when praying and prophesying. He asks the saints to take responsibility for themselves and judge if a veil worn during certain prayers could signify the order of creation with divine relationships between God and mortals.

Conclusion

In conclusion, within Paul's list of corrections to the Corinthian saints (“*I want you to understand,*” 1 Corinthian 11:3), he addresses the issue of women wearing veils during group prayers and prophesying in early Christianity (11:2). His counsel acknowledges Christian women's participation in public worship. His instructions capture the order of creation — a fortifying link between women, men, Christ, and God — that endowed humanity with God's power. The woman's head covering represents her authority or “power on her head” in the presence of angels (11:10). Essentially, Paul asks whether it is “not better to pray and prophesy with humility before God and with a sign of her authority?” For Paul, the sanction derived from the creation allows God's glory (referring to man) to pray unveiled; and by the same token, humanity's glory (referring to woman) should humbly commune with God veiled. As he explains

68. Perhaps Paul repeated his messages on unity and equality within marriage, to combat the culture where the average middle and upper-class Roman divorced four to five times each. David Instone-Brewer, *Divorce and Remarriage in the Bible: The Social and Literary Context* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 73.

these principles, he recognizes and encourages unity between men and women in their covenant relationship with God.

Lynne Hilton Wilson graduated from Brigham Young University with a degree in nursing, received an MA in religious studies from Cardinal Stritch University, and received a PhD in theology and American history from Marquette University. She has been an instructor for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter day Saints in France, Belgium, Wisconsin, and California. She was an adjunct professor at BYU in 2009 and 2011 and has presented papers at conferences nationwide — including the Society of Biblical Literature, Mormon History Association, and FAIR. She and her husband Dow have seven children.

“SWEARING BY THEIR EVERLASTING MAKER”: SOME NOTES ON *PAANCHI* AND *GIDDIANHI*

Matthew L. Bowen

ABSTRACT: *This brief article explores Paanchi and Giddianhi as names evidencing the Egyptian onomastic element –anchi/anhi/‘nh(i) and the potential literary significance of these two names in the context of Mormon’s narrative detailing the formation of the oath-bound secret combinations sworn with oath-formulae upon one’s “life” (cf. Egyptian ‘nh, “life”; “live”; “swear an oath [by one’s life]”). It also explores the implications for Mormon’s telling of Nephite history during his own time.*

From the beginning of the abridged Book of Helaman, much of Mormon’s remaining narrative history details the formation, development, and proliferation of oath-bound secret combinations among the Nephites and their eventual fatal impact on Nephite society. The common Egyptian lexeme ‘nh — which as a verb means “to live” and as a noun denotes “life”¹ — also denotes “to swear”² as a verb and “oath”³ as a noun and constitutes a common onomastic element. Even in its primary meaning, “to live,” the use of ‘nh is attested abundantly in oaths during Lehi’s time (cf. the Late Egyptian oath-formula ‘nh n=i NN, “As NN lives for me”).⁴ Thus, the twofold mention of the name Paanchi (Helaman 1:3, 7) in the immediate context of the first recorded swearing of an oath-bound

1. Raymond O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian* (Oxford Griffith Institute/Ashmolean Museum, 1999), 43–44. Hereafter cited as CDME. Adolf Erman and Hermann Grapow, *Wörterbuch der Aegyptischen Sprache* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1971), 192–202. Hereafter cited as Wb.

2. CDME, 44; Wb., 202–3.

3. Friedrich Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar: An Introduction*. 2nd English ed., trans. David Warburton (Oxford: Griffith Institute, 2005), 326. Wb., 202–3.

4. Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 326.

secret combination (“swearing by their everlasting Maker,” Helaman 1:11) among the Nephites emphasizes this moment as a key event in the ill-fated Nephite history. Understanding the semantic range of meaning for Egyptian *nh* to include “oath” and “swear” also helps us appreciate the irony highlighted by Mormon’s inclusion of Giddianhi’s epistolary “oath” as a failed attempt by the latter to intimidate Lachoneus and his people into surrender (see especially 3 Nephi 3:8).

Thus, both Paanchi and Giddianhi appear to share the Egyptian onomastic element *-anchi/anhi/nh(i)*, and Mormon mentions both names in connection with the rise of the secret combinations that eventually overtook the Lamanite and Nephite societies, contributing to the destruction of the latter. Mormon, amid the decay and collapse of Nephite society, had striking personal reasons for their inclusion.

Unhallowable Oaths

When Alma gave his son Helaman charge of all the sacred Nephite records, which by this time also included Jaredite records, he gave Helaman a specific charge regarding the latter:

And now, my son, I command you that ye **retain all their oaths and their covenants, and their agreements in their secret abominations**; yea, and all their signs and their wonders ye shall retain from this people, that they know them not, lest peradventure they should fall into darkness also and be destroyed. For behold, there is a curse upon all this land, that destruction shall come upon all those workers of darkness, according to the power of God, when they are fully ripe. Therefore I desire that this people might not be destroyed. **Therefore ye shall keep these secret plans of their oaths and their covenants from this people. And only their wickedness and their murders and their abominations shall ye make known unto them.** And ye shall teach them to abhor such wickedness and abominations and murders. And ye shall also teach them that those people were destroyed on account of their wickedness and abominations and their murders. (Alma 37:27–29; all Book of Mormon citations follow Skousen’s Yale edition;⁵ emphasis in all scriptural citations is mine)

5. Royal Skousen, ed., *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

The plates of Ether appear to have contained detailed descriptions of the plans, oaths, and covenants of a secret society or faction that precipitated the destruction of the Jaredite nation and kingdom. Mormon, knowing the final arc of Nephite history and thus the unhappy ending of his own people's story, includes this statement in part to alibi Alma the Younger and his successors up front from any potential accusation that the Gadianton (hereafter Gaddianton) oaths and rituals came from Mormon's predecessors' records.⁶ He explicitly makes this point after telling the story of how these oaths came forth: "Now behold, those secret oaths and covenants did not come forth unto Gaddianton from the records which were delivered unto Helaman; but behold, they were put into the heart of Gaddianton by that same being who did entice our first parents to partake of the forbidden fruit" (Helaman 6:26). The Gaddianton oaths, so far as he knew, came directly from Satan.

Mormon and Moroni offer only general descriptions of the oaths, rituals, plans, and covenants of Gaddianton and his robbers, who "did prove the overthrow, yea, almost the entire destruction of the people of Nephi" (Helaman 2:13). One of Mormon's main authorial and editorial aims,⁷ consciously taken up and completed by his son Moroni after Mormon's death, was to show that oath-bound secret combinations destroyed not just one but two nations: an Israelite nation (the Nephites) and a gentile nation (the Jaredites).

Following the death of his father, Mormon, Moroni sketches the events and persons who gave rise to the secret oath-bound combinations among the Jaredites that helped bring about the eventual destruction

6. Brant A. Gardner (*Second Witness: Analytical and Textual Commentary on the Book of Mormon, Volume 5, Helaman – 3 Nephi* [Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2007], 112) writes: "Mormon defends the recordkeepers from any possible charge of negligence that may have led to the band's proliferation. The oaths were not part of the record that Alma₂ delivered to Helaman₁. Therefore, the Gadiantons arose directly due to Satan's influence."

7. Mormon's editorial statement in Mosiah 28:17–19 confirms that he intended to give at least an abridged account of the plates of Ether: "Now after Mosiah had finished translating these records, behold, it gave an account of the people which was destroyed from the time that they were destroyed back to the building of the great tower, at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people and they were scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth, yea, and even from then until the creation of Adam. Now this account did cause the people of Mosiah to mourn exceedingly, yea, they were filled with sorrow. Nevertheless it gave them much knowledge, in the which they did rejoice. **And this account shall be written hereafter; for behold, it is expedient that all people should know the things which are written in this account.**"

of that society. Notably, the Jaredites who formed these oath-bound combinations swore their oaths “by the God of heaven.” In other words, they swore by the *life* of the God of heaven in invoking him as a ratifying witness of their wicked acts, as though so swearing these oaths ensured their desired (unrighteous) outcome or somehow sanctified them:

And it came to pass that Akish gathered in unto the house of Jared all his kinsfolks and saith unto them: **Will ye swear unto me** that ye will be faithful unto me in the thing which I shall desire of you? And it came to pass that **they all sware unto him by the God of heaven and also by the heavens and also by the earth and by their heads** that whoso should vary from the assistance which Akish desired should lose his head; and whoso should divulge whatsoever thing Akish made known unto them, **the same should lose his life**. And it came to pass that thus they did agree with Akish. And Akish did administer unto them the oaths which were given by them of old, who also sought power, which had been **handed down even from Cain**, who was a murderer from the beginning. And they were kept up by the power of the devil, **to administer these oaths** unto the people, to keep them in darkness, **to help such as sought power to gain power** and to murder and to plunder and to lie and to commit all manner of wickedness and whoredoms. (Ether 8:13–16)

In order to emphasize the unholy origin and unhallowable nature of the oath-bound secret combination that has just been forged, Moroni appropriates an older wordplay on Cain [Hebrew *qayin*] in terms of a verb rendered “gain” (Semitic/Hebrew *qny/qnh*; see also Helaman 6:17, 26–27; Moses 5:16, 31, 50).⁸ Moroni’s additional emphasis on the oath having been “sworn” by “the God of heaven” helps latter-day readers perceive the genetic link between the Jaredite secret combinations and later Nephite secret combinations that were formed with covenants and oaths similarly sworn by “their everlasting Maker” (Helaman 1:11, see below).

Later, after the attempt on Omer’s life fails when Omer and the faithful members of his household flee, Akish and his kinsfolk turn against Jared, son of Omer, their co-conspirator. Again, Moroni emphasizes the ancient origin of the unholy oaths: “And it came to pass that Akish sought the life of his father-in-law, and he applied unto **those**

8. Matthew L. Bowen, “Getting Cain and Gain,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 15 (2015):115–41.

whom he had sworn by the oath of the ancients. And they obtained the head of his father-in-law as he sat upon his throne giving audience to his people” (Ether 9:5). He uses the characterization in describing the revival of secret combinations among the Jaredites generations later: “And in the days of Com there began to be robbers in the land and they adopted the old plans and administered **oaths after the manner of the ancients** and sought again to destroy the kingdom” (Ether 10:33). The collocations “the oath of the ancients” and “oaths after the manner of the ancients” have direct reference to the oaths that had their origin with the oath between Satan and Cain.

The JST version of Genesis (part of which has been canonized as the Book of Moses) reveals that Satan adjured Cain — or caused Cain to swear — “by the living God”: “And Satan said unto Cain: *Swear* unto me by thy throat, and **if thou tell it thou shalt die**; and **swear thy brethren by their heads**, and *by the living God*, that they tell it not; for if they tell it, they shall surely die; and this that thy father may not know it; and this day I will deliver thy brother Abel into thine hands” (Moses 5:29). That the original Cainitic oath, the subsequent Jaredite oaths, and the much-later Nephite oaths were all sworn “by the living God” or “by the God of heaven” or “by their everlasting Maker” constitutes a fundamental key to understanding Mormon’s description of Paanchi and the “oath”-swearing activities of those who supported him as well as Mormon’s inclusion of Giddianhi’s “oaths” of intimidation.

Paanchi and the Beginning of Unhallowed Oaths amongst the Nephites

The Book of Mormon attests the name *Paanchi* twice (Helaman 1:3, 7). As John Gee has noted,⁹ *Paanchi*, as a form of the common Egyptian name *p3 nḥ*, most plausibly denotes “the living one” (transliterated in Greek as *Ponchēs*).¹⁰ The name “the living one” could have reference to a specific deity (cf. the title, “the living God,” Moses 5:29),¹¹ but also to a person/child who lives (cf. Joseph’s Egyptian cognomen,

9. *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, s.v. “Paanchi”, modified on November 10, 2017, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/PAANCHI>.

10. Erich Lüddeckens, et al., *Demotisches Namenbuch*, quoted in *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, s.v. “Paanchi”, modified on November 10, 2017, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/PAANCHI>.

11. For Old Testament examples of the title “living God,” see also Deuteronomy 5:26; Joshua 3:10; 1 Samuel 17:26, 36; 2 Kings 19:4, 16 (Isaiah 37:4, 17); Jeremiah 10:10; 23:36; Hosea 1:10; Daniel 6:20, 26; Psalm 42:2; 84:2.

Zaphnath-paaneah = “The god has said, ‘He shall live’” [*paanēah* = *p3* ‘*nh*], Genesis 41:45).¹² Mortality rates — not least infant mortality rates — were extremely high in the ancient world.

In addition to the above, I would here point out that the Egyptian lexeme ‘*nh* (vb. “live,” n. “life”) had additional derived meanings. Perhaps the most important secondary meaning of ‘*nh* as a verb was to “swear” and as a noun it also meant “oath.” For example, the Demotic conditional legal formula *iw=f ir p3* ‘*nh* meant “If he swears...”¹³ Hence, as a sentence name, Paanchi could, at least from a phonological perspective, connote or evoke not just “the living one,” but also “he [i.e., the deity] is my (life-)oath” (*p3* “He” + ‘*nh*=i “my [life-]oath”) or “he [the deity] is my swearing,”¹⁴ etc. In legal and cultic contexts, the deity’s “life” constituted an important part of “oaths.” Persons swearing oaths in the ancient world typically swore them by deities or somehow invoked deities. Both ancient Israelites and ancient Egyptians swore oaths by the “life” of the deity: *hay* X or *hêy* X (“by the life of X” or “as X lives”),¹⁵ as well as by one’s own life. Jeremiah 44:26 provides an example of the Lord himself swearing an oath regarding human oaths sworn this way: “Therefore hear ye the word of the Lord, all Judah that dwell in the land of Egypt; Behold, **I have sworn** [*nišba* ‘*tî*] by my great name, saith the Lord, [*if* (+ implied gesture, e.g., passing the index finger across the throat)¹⁶] my name shall [anymore] be named in the mouth of

12. Robert F. Smith, quoted in *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, s.v. “Paanchi”. Smith mentions a possible connection between Zaphnath-paaneah and Paanchi. See also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2001), 1049–50. Hermann Ranke (*Die ägyptischen Personennamen* [Glückstadt, Augustin, 1935], 1:409–12) cites of examples of the *qd-DN-iw=f* ‘*nh*, “DN said, he will live,” naming formula.

13. Janet H. Johnson, ed., *Chicago Demotic Dictionary*, Volume 3: [‘ayin] (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2001), 82–83, https://oi.uchicago.edu/sites/oi.uchicago.edu/files/uploads/shared/docs/CDD_c.pdf.

14. If *-anchi* / ‘*nh*(i) and *-anhi* / ‘*nh*(i) represent the same onomastic elements (or variations thereon), perhaps our understanding of the names Kumen and Kumenonhi is also helped. “Kumen lives” or Kumen is my oath.” Much work remains to be done on these names.

15. Bruce M. Waltke and Michael P. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 678–80 (§40.2.2). See also Blane Conklin, *Oath Formulas in Biblical Hebrew*, (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 5; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011).

16. Cf. the oath formulae *kōh ya’āseh yhw h lî wēkōh yōsîp* (“the Lord do so to me, and more also”) in Ruth 1:17, and *hay-yhw* (“as the Lord liveth”) in Ruth 3:13, which call attention to what Jan de Waard and William A. Smalley say about Amos

any man of Judah in all the land of Egypt, saying, **The Lord God liveth** [*ḥay ʾādōnāy yhw̄h*, literally, “(by) **the Lord Yhw̄h’s life**”¹⁷]. In instances when the Lord says, “As I live,” (*ḥay ʾānî* or *ḥay ʾānōkî*)¹⁸ he is saying in essence, “I swear by my throat” (cf. Amos 6:8, “The Lord God hath sworn by himself”¹⁹ = “The Lord Yahweh has sworn **by his throat** [*bēnapšō*]). As Stephen Ricks notes, the former “witness invocation” constitutes “the most common formula” used in ancient Israelite oath-taking.²⁰

Two “passing between the halves” scenes in the Hebrew Bible, Genesis 15:17–18 and Jeremiah 34:18, illustrate the basic idea behind this type of oath. In the first, Abram and the Lord make a covenant — literally, “cut a covenant” *kārat bērit* — in which the Lord himself guarantees to perform specific promises to Abram and his posterity:

And it came to pass, that, when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that **passed between those pieces**. In the same day the Lord **made**

6:8 (*nišbaʿ ʾādōnāy yhw̄h bēnapšō* = “The Lord God hath sworn by himself” — literally, “the Lord Yahweh has sworn by his throat”): the formula therein reflects the ancient rite of touching one’s throat during oath-taking (citing examples from Mari). See Jan de Waard and William A. Smalley, *Translators Handbook on the Book of Amos* (American Bible Society, March 1977 advanced MS), 45. Moreover, *The Jerusalem Bible* notes the same slit-the-throat or similar blood-oath *signum* (or sign) as evident in such places as 1 Kings 19:2 (see now note **f** at Gen 15:17 in the *New Jerusalem Bible* (New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell, 1985). See also 1 Samuel 3:17; 14:44; 20:13; 2 Samuel 3:9; 1 Kings 2:23; 20:10; 2 Kings 6:31.

17. Waltke and O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 679.

18. See, e.g., Numbers 14:21, 28; Ezekiel 5:11; 14:16, 18, 20; 16:48; 17:16, 19; 18:3; 20:3, 31, 33; 33:11, 27; 34:8; 35:6, 11; Isaiah 49:18 (1 Nephi 21:18); Jeremiah 22:24; 46:18; Zephaniah 2:9. Cf. Nephi’s use of the idiom (“as I live”) in his oath to Zoram in 1 Nephi 4:32. Consider also the force of Nephi’s oath as he swears on the Lord’s life, his own life, the lives of his brothers when he promises: “As the Lord liveth and as we live, we will not go down unto our father in the wilderness until we have accomplished the thing which the Lord hath commanded us [i.e., getting the brass plates from Laban]” (1 Nephi 3:15).

19. Another ritual gesture that accompanies the taking of an oath is the raising of the (right) hand: For example, “**I lift up my hand** to heaven, and say, **I live for ever...**” (Deuteronomy 32:40); see also Ezekiel 20:5–6, 15, 23, 28, 42; 47:14; Daniel 12:7. Paul Joüon and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2nd ed., with corr. (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2011), §112f. *nišbaʿtî*, “I swear” (Genesis 22:16) = *hārimōtî yādî*, “I raise my hand [while swearing]” (Genesis 14:22).

20. Stephen D. Ricks, “Oaths and Oath-taking in the Old Testament,” in *The Temple in Time and Eternity*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1999), 45.

a covenant [*kārat* ... *bērît*, cut a covenant] with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates. (Genesis 15:17–18)

Since the Lord always keeps his covenant promises and performs his oaths, his oath to Abram constitutes the perfect guarantee. Unlike the Lord, however, human beings do not always perform their oaths or keep covenant stipulations. The book of Jeremiah describes the fate of some Judahites who failed to uphold their covenant obligations:

And I will give **the men that have transgressed my covenant** [*bērîtî*], **which have not performed the words of the covenant** [*habbērît*] **which they had made** [*kortû*, they had cut] before me [*lěpānāy*, i.e., in my presence], when **they cut** [*kortû*] the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof, the princes of Judah, and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, and the priests, and all the people of the land, **which passed between the parts of the calf**; I will even give them into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life: and **their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth** [i.e., like a decaying carcass]. (Jeremiah 34:18–20)

In both scenes, the parties imply an imprecatory oath by their “cutting” (*kārat*) a “covenant”²¹ (*bērît*) and “pass[ing] [*‘ābar*, *wayya‘abrû*, *‘ōbērîm*] between the parts” of the slaughtered animal(s) that “may what has been done to this animal be done to me if I do not keep the terms of the covenant!”²² This ritual action appears to be the source of the collocation

21. For an extended treatment of this idiom, see Jared T. Parker, “Cutting Covenants,” in *The Gospel of Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, The 38th Annual BYU Sidney B. Sperry Symposium*, edited by D. Kelly Ogden, Jared W. Ludlow, and Kerry Muhlestein (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, 2009), 109–28.

22. E.g., Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman (*Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 1980], 280), for example, assert regarding the idiom *kārat bērît* “make. Literally ‘cut.’ To ‘cut’ a covenant is the commonest expression in the Hebrew Bible to describe this transaction.” Like Hosea 2:18 [MT 2:20], “Genesis 15 and Jeremiah 34 suggest that cutting might have been part of a sacrificial or oath-taking ritual that went with covenant-making.” In other words, “cutting” is describing ritual action. In addition, as Robert F. Smith (personal communication) notes, “In fact, this sort of ritual continues today among the Arabs, and (during the Iraq war) local American military commanders found themselves frequently partaking of a sheep sacrifice to solemnize agreements made in certain localities in Iraq.”

“enter into a covenant” (Hebrew *‘ābar bibērīt* or *bā’ babbērīt*; see, e.g., Deuteronomy 29:12 [MT 11]).²³ Apart from the cutting of righteous covenants, the mode of Gaddianton covenant-“cutting” and “entry” seems to have been similar — i.e., in mockery of righteous covenants (Helaman 1:11; 2:3; 6:21–22). For its part, the Egyptian language in its various stages employed very similar oath-formulas using the verb *‘nh*, “live” and the derived meaning of *‘nh*, “swear,”²⁴ among other oath-related terms.²⁵

In that light, we now consider Mormon’s twofold mention of the name Paanchi. Mormon associates Paanchi (“the living one” or “He [the deity] is my [life-]oath”) to the first Nephite “swearing” of the unholy and unhallowable secret-combination “oath of the ancients”:

But behold, **Paanchi** and that part of the people that were desirous that he should be their governor was exceeding wroth. Therefore he was about to flatter away those people to rise up in rebellion against their brethren. And it came to pass as he was about to do this, behold, he was taken and was tried according to the voice of the people and **condemned unto death**, for he had raised up in rebellion and sought to destroy the liberty of the people. Now when those people which were desirous that he should be their governor saw that he was **condemned unto death**, therefore they were angry; and behold, they sent forth one Kishcumen, even to the judgment-seat of Parhoron [or, Pahoron, rather than Pahoran],²⁶ **and murdered Parhoron** as he sat upon the judgment-seat. And he was pursued by the servants of Parhoron. But behold, so speedy was the flight of Kishcumen [Kishkumen] that no man could overtake him. And he went unto those that sent him; and they all entered into a covenant — yea, **swearing** [cf. Egyptian *‘nh*; Hebrew *šb’*] **by their everlasting Maker** [cf. Moses 5:29] — that

23. In addition, see 2 Chronicles 15:12; Jeremiah 34:10; Ezekiel 16:8 in the biblical corpus. In the Book of Mormon, see Mosiah 5:5, 8; 6:1–2; 18:10, 13; 21:31–32; Alma 7:15; 43:11; 44:15, 20; 46:20, 31, 35; 53:15–18; 62:16–17; Helaman 1:11; 2:3; 6:21–22; 3 Nephi 5:4–5; 6:3, 28–29; 7:11.

24. Wb. 202–3.

25. E.g., *‘rq* (“don” a garment, “swear” [i.e., an oath], CDME, 45); *iri ‘nh* or *dđ ‘nh* (“take an oath,” Junge, *Late Egyptian Grammar*, 326), *sdf3-tryt* (noun) “oath of allegiance,” CDME, 259).

26. See Royal Skousen, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon, Part 4: Alma 21–55* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2007), 2635–37.

they would tell no man that Kishcumen [Kishkumen] had murdered Parhoron. (Helaman 1:7–11)

As noted above, Moroni described this oath as “the oath of the ancients” (Ether 9:5) or the “oaths after the manner of the ancients” (Ether 10:33). Moses 5, which preserves a fuller etiological account of the establishment of secret combinations that may be akin to what the Nephites possessed on the brass plates,²⁷ describes how Satan caused Cain to “swear” an oath “by the **living** God” (Moses 5:29).²⁸ Beyond the “swearing” of this unhallowable oath “by,” i.e., by the life of “their everlasting Maker [cf. the title *qōnê* (*qny/qnh*) from Genesis 14:19, 22],”²⁹ the narratological irony of the name Paanchi as “the living one” in the context of Paanchi’s being “condemned unto death” and his supporters’ “murder” of Pahoran should also not escape notice.

Giddianhi and His Epistolary Oaths

The name *Giddianhi* immediately evokes the name *Gaddianton* (Gadianton in recent LDS editions). This is no coincidence. In Helaman 2:11–12, Gaddianton is spelled with the double-*d* in the Original Book of Mormon Manuscript and is allowed by the OMS spacing at Helaman 2:4. As noted by John W. Welch and Kelly Ward in 1985, the Hebrew word for “band; bandits,” is spelled with the double-*d*, *gēdūd*.³⁰ In fact, Hosea 6:9 attests the Hebrew phrase *’iš gēdūdīm* “band of robbers” (cf. NRSV Hosea 7:1 “bandits”; NRSV Job 19:12 “troops”;

27. Noel B. Reynolds, “The Brass Plates Version of Genesis,” in *By Study and Also by Faith: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday, 27 March 1990*, ed. John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks. 2 vols. (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990), 2:136–73. Bowen, “Getting Cain and Gain,” 115–41.

28. In another ironic instance of adjuration (or exacting an oath), Matthew records that the high priest Caiaphas attempted to force Jesus to swear an oath “by the living God”: “And the high priest answered and said unto him, **I adjure** [*exorkizō*] thee **by the living God**, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God” (Matthew 26:63). The verb *exorkizō* means “to force an oath.”

29. Genesis 14:22 records Abraham’s swearing an oath to God as “the Maker of heaven and earth” = biblical Elkanah (1 Samuel 1:1), and Book of Abraham Elkenah (1:6–20), as hypocoristic for “El-Creator-of-Heaven-and-Earth.” See further Patrick Miller, “El, The Creator of the Earth,” *BASOR*, 239 (Summer 1980): 43–46; Kevin Barney, “On Elkenah as Canaanite El,” *JBMS*, 19/1 (2010): 22–35.

30. John W. Welch and Kelly Ward, “Thieves and Robbers,” July 1985 *FARMS Update* (reprinted in John W. Welch, ed., *Reexploring the Book of Mormon:*

KJV Genesis 30:11 “troop”³¹). This matches the plural Neo-Babylonian term *gudūdānu*, and the Phoenician collocation *b'l ḡddm* “gang of robbers” (cf. Psalm 56:7 *yāḡōddû* “they form a gang,” as emended).³² Thus, it is by no means impossible that the name Gaddianton constitutes a metonymic or a symbolic epithet. Conceivably, the same might also be true of Giddianhi (note the double *-dd-*) later on, who also became chief of this powerful body of organized evil (3 Nephi 3).

Regarding the name Gaddianton, John A. Tvedtnes observes: “In form, Gadianton appears to be a Jaredite name based on the same pattern as Morianton (Ether 1:22–23) and contains the *-ian* pattern found [infixd] in Jaredite names such as Coriantor (Ether 1:6–7), Coriantum (Ether 1:13–14, 27–28), Coriantumr (Ether 8:4; 12:1), Moriancumer (Ether 2:13), and Ripliancum (Ether 15:8).”³³ Even though this powerful criminal organization (“secret combination”) was first headed by Kishcumen, Mormon (as noted above) denied the continuity of this secret society with the Jaredite “mafia” (Helaman 6:26–30, Ether 8:9–25). Nevertheless, the similarities between the Jaredite and Nephite incarnations of Cainitic, oath-bound “secret combinations” are undeniable, proving to be existential threats in both instances (Helaman 2:11–19, 11:32, 3 Nephi 6:28–7:3, Ether 8:19–25).

Hugh Nibley proposed that Giddianhi could represent a theophoric name meaning “Thoth is my life.”³⁴ Paul Hoskisson

A Decade of New Research [Provo, UT: FARMS; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1992], 248–49).

31. LDS *Holy Bible* (1979), 45 n, “paronomasia on the Heb. words *gedud* ‘troop’ and *gad* ‘good fortune.’”

32. Hayim ben Yosef Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion for Biblical Hebrew: Etymological, Semantic and Idiomatic Equivalence with Supplement on Biblical Aramaic* (Jersey City, NJ: KTAV Publishing House, 2009), 64, citing Genesis 49:19, Psalm 94:21 *yāḡōddû* (“band together against”) from *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary, Volume 5, “G.”* Ed. Leo Oppenheim (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1956), 120a; Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*. 3 vols. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981), 1:295b; Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*. 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 1968), 26A I:13:13–15.

33. John A. Tvedtnes, “Reinventing the Book of Mormon,” *FARMS Review*, 16/2 (2004):100. See also John A. Tvedtnes, “A Phonemic Analysis of Nephite and Jaredite Proper Names,” *SEHA Newsletter* 141 (December 1977): 1–8.

34. Hugh W. Nibley, *Lehi in the Desert; The World of the Jaredites; There Were Jaredites* (CWHN 5; Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1988), 26; Nibley, *An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, ed. John W. Welch; 3rd ed.; CWHN 6 (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1988), 287–88.

finds this etymology unlikely.³⁵ I concur that “Thoth” constitutes an unlikely theophoric element in any Lehite name. However, perhaps we can still salvage something of Nibley’s etymology. As noted above with the name Paanchi, the element *-anchi/’nh(i)* represents a perfectly viable Egyptian and Nephite onomastic element. The element *-anhi/’nh(i)* plausibly represents a biform or alternative transliteration of the element *-anchi/’nh(i)*. If so, and if *giddi-* can be analyzed as a form of Semitic *GD(D)/Hebrew *gād*,³⁶ the name Giddianhi would mean something like “my fortune(-deity) lives” or “my fortune(-deity) is my (life-)oath,” an appropriate name for someone who became a freebooter, a cutthroat, and a robber. In any case, from a literary perspective and Mormon’s editorial perspective, this proposed meaning of the name — especially the *-anhi/’nh(i)*-element — accords with the content of a letter by Giddianhi that Mormon presumably selected for inclusion in his record because it represented Gaddianton methods. In this letter, Giddianhi employs “oath”-taking as a means of intimidating Lachoneus and the Nephites into the surrender of their property and persons:

And behold, ***I swear*** [cf. Egyptian *’nh*; Hebrew *šb’*] **unto you:** if ye will do this **with an oath**, [cf. Egyptian *’nh*; Hebrew *šbu’ā*] ye shall not be destroyed. But if ye will not do this, ***I swear*** unto you with an ***oath*** that on the morrow month I will command that my armies shall come down against you, and they shall not stay their hand and shall spare not, **but shall slay you and shall let fall the sword upon you, even until ye shall become extinct**. And behold, I am ***Giddianhi*** and am the governor of this the secret society of Gaddianton, which society and the works thereof I know to be **good** [cf. Egyptian *nfr* = “good”; Nephi/Nephites as “good”/“fair one(s)”]. And they are of ancient date and they have been handed down unto us. (3 Nephi 3:8–9)

Although Giddianhi’s epistolary “oath” appears to lack the invocation of a specific deity by name or by title in the text, perhaps the mere mention of his name — understood as “my fortune-deity lives”

35. *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, s.v. “Gidgiddoni”, modified on November 21, 2015, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/GIDGIDDONI>.

36. Cf. *Book of Mormon Onomasticon*, s.v. “Gid”, modified on March 3, 2017, <https://onoma.lib.byu.edu/index.php/GID>. A more thoroughgoing study of this and other *GD(D) names in the Book of Mormon is forthcoming.

or “my fortune(-deity) is my (life-)oath” or the like — supplied it. On one level, Giddianhi’s “oath” implies life for Lachoneus and the Nephites if they comply with his demands and explicitly promises their death for non-compliance. On still another level, however, the mere mention of his name in the context of oath-taking and the phonemic elements of “life” and “oath” latent within the name itself, recalls the scene in Helaman 1 in which Kishcumen [Kishkumen] and Gaddianton’s band first “swore” their oaths “by their everlasting maker” (Helaman 1:11) as well as the earlier secret combination that the Jaredites “sw[o]re ... by the God of heaven” (Ether 8:14) and the original Cainitic oath “sw[orn] ... by the living God” (cf. Paanchi as “the living one”).

Giddianhi’s subsequent wordplay on Nephites and “good”³⁷ (i.e., that the Gaddianton society’s works were quintessentially “Nephite”) represents an attempt to return to the “politeness” of the earlier part of his letter,³⁸ but he has at this point fully unmasked himself. Whether Mormon intended it or not, Giddianhi’s additional declaration that the Gaddianton “society’s” works were “of ancient date” appears to further establish a genetic link between the Nephite secret combination and its Jaredite (and earlier) predecessors.³⁹ In other words, Giddianhi’s statement hints that though Alma the Younger and his successors did not publish the oaths from the Jaredite records in their possession, nevertheless the Jaredite secret combinations infected Nephite society by way of other “ancient” means.

Finally, it should also be noted that Lachoneus and Gidgiddoni — Giddianhi’s narrative counterparts in 3 Nephi 3–4 — also invoke an oath formula in preparing the righteous Nephites and Lamanites to go up against Giddianhi and the Gaddiantons. Lachoneus declared, “**As the Lord liveth**, except ye repent of all your iniquities and cry unto the Lord ye will in nowise be delivered out of the hands of those **Gaddianton robbers**” (3 Nephi 3:15). Against the people’s desire to preemptively destroy the Gaddianton robbers, Gidgiddoni further asserted: “The Lord forbid! For if we should go up against them, the Lord would deliver us into their hands. Therefore we will prepare ourselves in the center

37. Matthew L. Bowen, “O Ye Fair Ones’ — Revisited,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 20 (2016): 330–31.

38. Book of Mormon Central, “Why Was Giddianhi So Polite?” *KnowWhy* #90, September 19, 2016. <https://knowwhy.bookofmormoncentral.org/content/why-was-giddianhi-so-polite>.

39. Gardner (*Second Witness*, 255) states: “The Nephites have an authority that rests on one kind of antiquity, but the Gaddiantons trace their ruling authority to an even older source, the Jaredites.”

of our lands; and we will gather all our armies together. And we will not go against them, but we will wait till they shall come against us. Therefore, **as the Lord liveth**, if we do this, he will deliver them into our hands” (3 Nephi 3:21). These righteous oaths serve as a kind of narrative and rhetorical ballast (or balance) to Giddianhi’s unrighteous oaths, previously quoted. Moreover, Mormon wishes his audience to recall all of the foregoing when he undertakes to describe his own times and the roles that oaths and the Gaddianton robbers played in the winding up scenes of Nephite society and his mortal life when the Nephites went up against the Lamanites with unhallowable, unrighteous oaths. Mormon, like Gidgiddoni his predecessor, gathered his people into “one body” (Mormon 2:7; see 3 Nephi 3:25; 4:3–4), but the results of his use of this strategy were very different.

Conclusion: Mormon’s “Oath”

We can better understand Mormon’s onomastic interest in *Paanchi* and the “oaths” sworn by Kishcumen [Kishkumen] and his band that gave rise to the Gaddianton robbers and the epistolary “oaths” of Gaddianton when we consider the Gaddianton-like “oaths” that precipitated the end of Nephite society. Mormon witnesses the evil of these oaths firsthand:

And now because of this great thing which my people the Nephites had done, they began to boast in their own strength and began to **swear before the heavens** that they would avenge themselves of the blood of their brethren who had been slain by their enemies. And **they did swear** by the heavens and also by the throne of God that they would go up to battle against their enemies and would **cut them off from the face of the land**. (Mormon 3:9–10)

The Nephites became, in their depravity, even worse than the Lamanites and the vicious Gaddianton robbers who had long sought to destroy them (see Moroni 9). At this point, Mormon declares that he “did utterly refuse from this time forth to be a commander and a leader of this people because of their wickedness and abomination” (Mormon 3:11). The Lord had enough too:

And when they had sworn by all that had been forbidden them by our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ that they would go up unto their enemies to battle and avenge themselves of the blood of their brethren, behold, the voice of the Lord came unto me, saying: Vengeance is mine, and I will repay. And

because this people repented not after that I had delivered them, behold, **they shall be cut off from the face of the earth.** And it came to pass that **I utterly refused** to go up against mine enemies. And I did even as the Lord had commanded me[.] (Mormon 3:14–16)

The Lord determines to bring upon the Nephites — or allow to come upon the Nephites — everything that they had “sworn” to do to their enemies: to “cut them off from the face of the earth.” Some years later we learn a significant detail regarding Mormon’s “utter refusal” to “be a commander and a leader” of the Nephites and to “go up against [his] enemies” (Mormon 3:11, 16). This “utter refusal” had taken the form of an “oath” that Mormon himself had sworn: “And it came to pass that I did go forth among the Nephites and did **repent of the oath** which I had made, that I would no more assist them. And they gave me command again of their armies, for they looked upon me as though I could deliver them from their afflictions” (Mormon 5:1).

It appears, then, that between the time when the Nephites swore their unhallowed oaths to exterminate the Lamanites (and Mormon’s own swearing an “oath” not to lead the Nephites or to go up against his enemies) and Mormon’s repenting of his “oath,” Mormon read and wrote much. Mormon read the Jaredite records and included Nephite descriptions of their contents (records Moroni later abridges). He read and selected for inclusion the records that detailed Paanchi’s rebellion and the oaths that gave rise to the Gaddianton robbers. He read and wrote the epistolary oaths of men like Giddianhi (and of course read and wrote much more!). He had also read the account of Cainitic oaths from the brass plates (see especially Helaman 6). Mormon had witnessed for himself the importance of Jesus’s charge to the Nephites and Lamanites at the temple in Bountiful: “swear not at all” (see 3 Nephi 12:33–37; cf. Matthew 5:33–37).⁴⁰ Perhaps this is what led him to repent of his own oath. The oath (cf. *nḥ*) first sworn in support of Paanchi (“the living one”) by his supporters, invoking the *life* of “their everlasting maker”

40. In finishing his father’s record, Moroni invokes the solemn oath formula (“as the Lord lives”) a final time in Mormon 8:23: “Search the prophecies of Isaiah. Behold, I cannot write them. Yea, behold, I say unto you that those saints which have gone before me which have possessed this land shall cry — yea, even from the dust will they cry unto the Lord; and **as the Lord liveth**, he will remember the **covenant** [Heb. *bērit*] which **he hath made** [*kārat*, *cut*] with them.” This should probably be understood as a reiteration of an earlier divine oath or promise rather than as the self-interested invocation of a personal oath.

culminated in the eventual *death* of the Nephites as a society. The “oaths” that the Nephites swore against their enemies differed little from the epistolary oaths of Giddianhi, and their fate differed little from his (compare 3 Nephi 4:14 with Mormon 4:5). The Nephites became like those Judahites who had violated the Lord’s covenant in Jeremiah 34:18–20: “their dead bodies [became] meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth” (cf. Mormon 6:15).

Note: The author would like to thank Allen Wyatt, Robert F. Smith, and Victor Worth.

Matthew L. Bowen was raised in Orem, Utah, and graduated from Brigham Young University. He holds a PhD in Biblical Studies from the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC and is currently an Assistant Professor in Religious Education at Brigham Young University-Hawaii. He and his wife (the former Suzanne Blattberg) are the parents of three children: Zachariah, Nathan, and Adele.

TWO NOTES ON THE LANGUAGE USED IN THE LAST SUPPER ACCOUNTS

Robert S. Boylan

Abstract: *The institution of the Lord's Supper is recounted explicitly in four New Testament texts (Matthew 26:26–29; Mark 14:22–25; Luke 22:19–20; 1 Corinthians 11:23–26). Common to all these texts is the phrase “this is my body,” and in the Lukan and Pauline texts, the command to “do this in remembrance of me.” In this paper, I will examine both the grammatical and theological implications of “this is my body” and the concept of “remembrance” in the theology of the Last Supper — with how Latter-day Saints can appropriate such in their weekly observance of this sacred ordinance.*

This brief article addresses two exegetical issues about the language used in the institutional narratives of the Last Supper in the New Testament: “This is my body” and “Remembrance.”

This is My Body

The phrase “this is my body” is the translation of the Greek phrases *τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα μου* (*touto estin to sōma mou*) in Matthew 26:26, Mark 14:22, and Luke 22:19 — literally, “this is the body of me” — and *τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα* (*touto mou estin to sōma*) in 1 Corinthians 11:24 — literally, “this of me is the body.”

A rather technical argument has been made to support more “substantial” views of the nature of the Eucharist by Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, and Lutheran authors based on this language against the more “symbolic” understanding of the Supper. The argument is that as the demonstrative “this,” *τοῦτο* (*touto*) is a demonstrative neuter singular; it cannot refer to the term “bread” *ἄρτος* (*artos*), which is masculine, but rather the noun “body” *σῶμα* (*sōma*), which is neuter. As a result of this and the fact that it is coupled with the verb *εἶμι* (*eimi*) “to

be,” Christ, according to some commentators, is teaching that the bread literally *becomes* the body of Jesus, with an alternative translation: “this [new entity] is the body of me,” something at first blush problematic for Latter-day Saint theology, which does not hold to a transformation of the “substance” of the bread and water during the celebration of the Supper.

It is correct that the referent for the demonstrative “this” is “body.” However, it would be problematic to read much into such grammar. In Greek grammar, there is an “interpretive εἰμι,” wherein the verb εἰμι, often in conjunction with τοῦτο (*touto*) or τι (*ti*), has the definition of “meaning” or “[this] means.”

Two notable instances of such can be seen in Matthew 27:46 and Luke 18:36:

And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is [τοῦτ’ ἔστιν (*tout’ estin*)] to say, My God, my God, why has thou forsaken me? (Matthew 27:46)

And hearing the multitude pass by, he asked what it meant [εἶη τοῦτο (*eiē touto*)]. (Luke 18:36)

A symbolic meaning of “this is my body” can still be retained, notwithstanding claims to the contrary. Furthermore, taking “is” in a literalistic manner would result in some problems if one were to be consistent in approach to the verb εἰμι. For instance, in Luke 22:20, both “cup” [ποτηριον (*potērion*)] and the demonstrative are singular neuters. However, in theologies that hold to a “substantial” (“bodily”) view of the nature of the Real Presence, it is not the cup but the contents thereof (i.e., the wine) that is transformed into the blood of Christ. Of course, just as “this is my body” is a literary device (the interpretative εἰμι) and should not be taken in a literalistic fashion, neither should “this cup” be interpreted as being the [blood of] the new covenant; in reality, it too, is a literary device (synecdoche), all of which are harmonious with Latter-day Saint theology of the Lord’s Supper.

Of course, a close identification of the consecrated bread and wine/water with the body and blood of Christ is not problematic for LDS theology and scripture; consider the following from the Book of Mormon (which records the very words of Christ Himself):

And this shall ye always observe to do, even as I have done, even as I have broken **bread** and blessed it and given it unto you. And this shall ye do in remembrance of **my body**, which I have shown unto you. And it shall be a testimony unto the Father that ye do

always remember me. And if ye do always remember me ye shall have my Spirit to be with you ... And now behold, this is the commandment which I give unto you that ye shall not suffer any one knowingly to partake of **my flesh and blood** unworthily, when ye shall minister it; For whoso eateth and drinketh **my flesh and blood** unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to his soul; therefore it ye know that a man is unworthy to eat and drink of **my flesh and blood** ye shall forbid him. Nevertheless, ye shall not cast him out from among you, but ye shall minister unto him and shall pray for him unto the Father, in my name; and if it so be that he repenteth and is baptized in my name, then shall ye receive him, and shall minister unto him of **my flesh and blood**. (3 Nephi 18:6–7, 28–30, emphasis added)

Remembrance

The noun ἀνάμνησις (*anamnēsis*), translated as “remembrance,” is used in two of the institutional narratives of the Lord’s Supper:

And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) of me. (Luke 22:19)

And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) of me. (1 Corinthians 11:24–25)

The term appears five times in the LXX. Four of these five instances are used within the context of a sacrifice, the exception being Wisdom of Solomon 16:6. The NRSV translates the verse as follows:

[T]hey were troubled for a little while as a warning, and received a symbol of deliverance to remind (ἀνάμνησις) them of your law’s command.

The other instances of this term in the LXX are Leviticus 24:7, Numbers 10:10, and Psalms 38:1 (LXX, 37:1) and 70:1 (LXX, 69:1). The NRSV captures the original language texts rather well:

You shall put frankincense with each row, to be a token offering for the bread, as an offering (ἀνάμνησις) by fire to the Lord. (Leviticus 24:7)

Also on your days of rejoicing, at your appointed festivals, and at the beginnings of your months, you shall blow the trumpets over your burnt offerings and over your sacrifices of well-being; they shall serve as a reminder (ἀνάμνησις) on your behalf before the Lord your God: I am the Lord your God. (Numbers 10:10)

A Psalm of David, for the memorial offering (ἀνάμνησις)... (Psalms 38:1)

To the leader. Of David, for the memorial offering (ἀνάμνησις)... (Psalms 70:1).

The term is only used one other passage in the Greek New Testament. Speaking of the iterative Old Covenant sacrifices, the author of Hebrews wrote:

But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) again made of sins every year. (Hebrews 10:3)

Unlike the Old Covenant sacrifices, Jesus's sacrifice is a one-time event:

By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. (Hebrews 10:10–14)

Therefore, in light of all these considerations, Jesus's command to "do that in *remembrance* of me," therefore, is a command not simply to "remember" Jesus in a physiological sense *merely* but to remember what Jesus has done for us — that is, His atoning sacrifice, a sacrifice that, unlike those of the Old Covenant, is not iterative but "once for all," using a Greek term that denotes "finality" or "once, and never again" [εφάπαξ (*ephapax*)].

Max Thurian, a Reformed Protestant theologian who, at the end of his life, would convert to Catholicism, noted the following about the meaning of ἀνάμνησις:

Douglas Jones seems disturbed by those writers who accord the word "memorial" a primarily sacrificial meaning. In this I am in agreement with him. The twofold meaning of the word

must be emphasized, in that it can mean both a recalling to men and a recalling to God, in praise and supplication. When it is applied to the Eucharist, the term means first of all the presence of the divine activity on behalf of His people, as a recalling to the believer, and the presence before God of what He has done in the course of the history of salvation, as a recalling in praise and supplication. The term memorial also has a secondary meaning which refers to the sacrificial understanding of the Eucharist. It does not have this as its primary meaning, but when it is used of the Eucharist it shows how and in what sense it can be conceived as a sacrifice, i.e. only in the sense that it is an act of proclamation, a memorial before men and before God, a presence and an actualization of the unique sacrifice of Christ.¹

The earliest Christians seemed to have understood this nuance. As one scholar wrote of the Eucharist during the time of Justin Martyr (AD 100–165):

In Justin's account, the prayer said at the Eucharist is extemporaneous, and this is likely to have been the general rule. From other second- and third-century witnesses, we can possibly glimpse something of the broad pattern such improvised prayers may have taken. In accordance with Jewish traditions of giving thanks at meals, eucharistic prayers seem often to have consisted of at least two aspects: remembrance (Greek, *anamnesis*) and invocation (Greek, *epiclesis*). **Remembrance meant recollecting the saving acts of God in the history of Jesus and perhaps reciting the words of Jesus at the Last Supper as an institutional narrative for the meal.** Invocation meant appealing for the Holy Spirit to come upon the worshipers and to accept their thanksgiving.²

1. Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial, Part 2: The New Testament*, trans. J. G. Davies (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), 84 n. 1. The study Thurian is advocating is that of Douglas Jones, "Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and interpretation of 1 Corinthians XI.25," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 6 (1955), 183-91. For a book-length study of ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25, see Fritz Chenderlin, "Do This as My Memorial:" *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Anamnesis in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25*. *Analecta Biblica* 99 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982).

2. Ivor Davidson, *The Birth of the Church: From Jesus to Constantine, AD 30-312* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2004), 281, emphasis added.

This parallels the underlying theology of the prayers used by Latter-day Saints to consecrate the bread and water:

... that they may eat in remembrance of the body of [Jesus] ...
(Moroni 4:3)

... to bless and sanctify this wine [or water] to the souls of all those who drink of it, that they may do it in remembrance of the blood of [Jesus] which was shed for them ... (Moroni 5:2)

Conclusion

While the terms “this is my body” and “remembrance” at first blush may seem rather simple and straightforward, our study has shown certain nuances that, when read in light of the Greek language, have added meanings — meanings that add to the symbolism and importance of the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper both in antiquity and in modern practice. Furthermore, in light of these interpretive issues, it is the hope of the author that readers will have a better appreciation of the underlying theology of the Last Supper accounts in the New Testament, a greater appreciation of one’s own partaking of the ordinance each Sunday, a strong focus on the “sacrificial remembrance” of the once-for-all atoning sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ, an appreciation of studying the original language texts of the Bible, and a fuller appreciation of the inexhaustible depths of Scripture.

Robert S. Boylan is a graduate of the Pontifical University of Ireland, Maynooth, and the National University of Ireland, Maynooth, with degrees in theology and anthropology, with extensive research in biblical exegesis, history of interpretation, and historical theology. His main areas of focus are the Old World origins of the Book of Mormon and Latter-day Saint theology in light of the historical-critical method of exegesis. He blogs on these and related topics at ScripturalMormonism.blogspot.com. He has also written three books on theological issues: *Not by Scripture Alone: A Latter-day Saint Refutation of Sola Scriptura* (CreateSpace, 2017); *Behold the Mother of My Lord: Towards a Mormon Mariology* (CreateSpace, 2017) and *After the Order of the Son of God: The Biblical and Historical Evidence for Latter-day Saint Theology of the Priesthood* (CreateSpace, 2018). He currently lives in Tralee, in the southwest of Ireland, and is pursuing qualifications in accountancy.

IS THE BOOK OF MORMON A PSEUDO-ARCHAIC TEXT?

Stanford Carmack

Abstract: In recent years the Book of Mormon has been compared to pseudo-biblical texts like Gilbert J. Hunt's The Late War (1816). Some have found strong linguistic correspondence and declared that there is an authorial relationship. However, comparative linguistic studies performed to date have focused on data with low probative value vis-à-vis the question of authorship. What has been lacking is non-trivial descriptive linguistic analysis that focuses on less contextual and more complex types of data, such as syntax and morphosyntax (grammatical features such as verb agreement and inflection), as well as data less obviously biblical and/or less susceptible to conscious manipulation. Those are the kinds of linguistic studies that have greater probative value in relation to authorship, and that can determine whether Joseph Smith might have been able to produce Book of Mormon grammar. In order to determine whether it is a good match with the form and structure of pseudo-biblical writings, I investigate nearly 10 kinds of syntax and morphosyntax that occur in the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible, comparing their usage with each other and with that of four pseudo-biblical texts. Findings are summarized toward the end of the article, along with some observations on biblical hypercorrection and alternative LDS views on Book of Mormon language.

This study addresses the degree to which Book of Mormon language differs from that of pseudo-biblical writings of the late 1700s and early 1800s, investigating whether there are small or large differences in form and structure. Pseudo-biblical writings can be considered a control group in relation to the linguistic form and structure that Joseph Smith might have produced had he been attempting to mimic biblical style in 1829. He was repeatedly exposed to King James idiom growing up. Thus, either adherence

to biblical language or deviations from biblical language that are close to pseudo-biblical patterns could support the position that Joseph was the author or English-language translator of the Book of Mormon text. On the other hand, there is nothing to indicate that Joseph was well-versed in many Early Modern English texts when he dictated the Book of Mormon. Hence, large deviations from both biblical and pseudo-biblical patterns that approach attested archaic usage could support the position that Joseph was not its author or English-language translator.

By means of deeper linguistic analysis we can discover whether the influence of pseudo-biblical style on the earliest text of the Book of Mormon is noticeable, or (as another possibility) whether there is substantial correspondence in style between pseudo-biblical texts and the Book of Mormon. Are there fundamental, structural similarities in syntax and morphosyntax? Alternatively, do low-level differences rule out classifying the Book of Mormon as just another pseudo-biblical literary production? Does the earliest text match Early Modern English usage sufficiently so that it should not be regarded as a pseudo-archaic text?

There is of course a very large amount of syntactic data to consider, and much of the syntax would have been produced subconsciously, based as it is on implicit knowledge.¹ Consequently, systematic analysis is possible and meaningful. Careful, thorough investigation of Book of Mormon grammar can therefore go a long way toward telling us whether Joseph could have been the author or English-language translator.

Specifically, this study focuses on those grammatical features whose usage patterns are either less noticeable (to non-linguists) or not as easily imitated. This is a crucial point. Linguistic items that are readily noticed and easily imitated are, at least as far as authorship determination is concerned, trivial and uninteresting. Such items have made up the bulk of the linguistic comparisons that the Book of Mormon has been subjected to up to this point. In contrast, some of the features analyzed

1. See, for example, Nick C. Ellis, "Implicit and Explicit SLA and Their Interface" in *Implicit and Explicit Language Learning: Conditions, Processes, and Knowledge in SLA and Bilingualism*, eds. Cristina Sanz and Ronald P. Leow (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2011), 35, 36: "Children ... automatically acquire complex knowledge of the structure of their language;" "language skill is very different from knowledge about language;" and Bill VanPatten, "Stubborn Syntax: How It Resists Explicit Teaching and Learning," in *Implicit and Explicit Language Learning*, 9–21. See also "The brain's implicit knowledge of grammar is important for understanding spoken language," National Aphasia Association, accessed December 20, 2017, <https://www.aphasia.org/stories/the-brains-implicit-knowledge-of-grammar-is-important-for-understanding-spoken-language/>.

for this study are reliably characterized only after rather detailed linguistic analysis.

The Pseudo-Biblical Texts Examined

The four pseudo-biblical texts examined for this study have been chosen based on frequent comparison to the Book of Mormon and/or being prominent, worthy specimens of the genus.² The four texts include John Leacock's *The First Book of the American Chronicles of the Times* (1774–1775), Richard Snowden's *The American Revolution* (1793), Michael Linning's *The First Book of Napoleon* (1809), and Gilbert Hunt's *The Late War* (1816).³ These four pseudo-biblical texts are freely available in the WordCruncher library.⁴

The background of these authors is as follows: John Leacock (1729–1802) was a goldsmith and silversmith from Philadelphia, Richard Snowden (1753–1825) was a Quaker from southwest New Jersey, Michael Linning

2. Ethan Smith's *View of the Hebrews* (Poultney, VT: Smith & Shute, 1823) has not been included as part of this study. Although its connection with the question of Book of Mormon authorship is fairly well-known, and its language is biblically influenced, it is not a pseudo-biblical text in the style of the other four texts examined here, so it is properly excluded from this analysis. Its forms are no more archaic than the forms found in the above four pseudo-biblical writings, and in most cases its patterns of use are less archaic.

3. The bibliographic information for the editions consulted is as follows:

- John Leacock, *The First Book of the American Chronicles of the Times, 1774–1775*, ed. Carla Mulford (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1987), 130 pages, 6 chapters, approximately 14,500 words.
- Richard Snowden, *The American Revolution* (Baltimore: W. Pechin, [1802]), 360 pages, 60 chapters, approximately 49,300 words: <https://archive.org/details/americanrevoluti00snow>.
- Michael Linning, *The First Book of Napoleon, the Tyrant of the Earth* (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees & Orme, 1809), 146 pages, 23 chapters, approximately 19,000 words, <https://archive.org/details/firstbooknapole00gruagoog>.
- Gilbert J. Hunt, *The Late War, between the United States and Great Britain, from June, 1812, to February, 1815*, 3rd edition (New York: Daniel D. Smith, 1819), 224 pages, 55 chapters, approximately 42,500 words: <https://archive.org/details/latewarbetweenun00inhunt>.

Despite the titles, Leacock and Linning did not produce any sequels.

4. Those interested can download the application, load the texts, and search them. Look under the category History in the WordCruncher Bookstore. WordCruncher (website), Brigham Young University, last updated 2017, <http://www.wordcruncher.com>.

(1774–1838) was a Scottish solicitor originally from Lanarkshire near Glasgow, and Gilbert J. Hunt was a manufacturer from New York City.⁵

According to Eran Shalev, Leacock’s work was “the most popular writing in biblical style of the Revolutionary era;” Snowden’s two-volume effort was “the first full-blown, thorough, earnest, and mature attempt to biblicalize the United States and its historical record;” and Hunt’s history of the War of 1812 was “the most impressive text among the numerous published during the opening decades of the nineteenth century.”⁶ A contemporary review of Linning’s pseudo-biblical effort found that

the book gives, in language with which they [the Bible-reading public] are best acquainted, a just view of the principle which led to the French revolution, to the elevation of Buonaparte to the throne of the Bourbons, and to all the miseries under which the continent of Europe has so long groaned; contrasting those miseries with the happiness which Britons, here denominated Albions, enjoy under the mild government of our excellent and amiable sovereign.⁷

Other Primary Sources

The critical edition of the Book of Mormon was essential to this study: Royal Skousen, editor, *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2009). Directly related to this is Skousen, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon*, 2nd edition (Provo, UT: FARMS and BYU Studies, 2017) and Skousen, *Grammatical Variation* (Provo, UT: FARMS and BYU Studies, 2016). LDS View provided access to the current LDS text of the scriptures,

5. For further information on Leacock see “John Leacock Commonplace Book,” American Philosophical Society, last updated 2017, <https://search.amphilsoc.org/collections/view?docId=ead/Mss.B.L463-ead.xml>; for Snowden see “To George Washington from Richard Snowden, 13 November 1793,” Founders Online, *National Archives*, last updated 2018, <http://founders.archives.gov/documents/Washington/05-14-02-0249>; for Linning see “Michael Linning,” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*, last edited on 17 July 2016, at 15:21, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_Linning; and for Hunt see “Gilbert J. Hunt to Thomas Jefferson, 30 January 1816,” Founders Online, *National Archives*, last updated 2018, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/03-09-02-0270>.

6. See Eran Shalev, “‘Written in the Style of Antiquity’: Pseudo-Biblicism and the Early American Republic, 1770–1830,” *Church History: Studies in Christianity and Culture* 79, no. 4 (December 2010): 809, 813, 817.

7. Author unknown, “Art. II,” *British Critic* 35 (January, February, March, April, May, June): 110.

<https://ldsview.wordcruncher.com> (Salt Lake City: Intellectual Reserve, 2001–).

The principal English textual source used in this study was the Early English Books Online database (<http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>). The publicly searchable portion of EEBO (Phase 1 texts) is currently found at <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebogroup>. I have mainly derived Early Modern English examples from a precisely searchable 700-million-word WordCruncher corpus I made from approximately 25,000 EEBO Phase 1 texts. Other important textual sources include Eighteenth Century Collections Online (<https://www.gale.com/primary-sources/eighteenth-century-collections-online> and <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/ecco>), Literature Online (<https://literature.proquest.com>), and Google Books (<https://books.google.com>).

Observations on Pseudo-Biblical Influence

Both LDS and non-LDS perspectives on Book of Mormon language have tended toward the pseudo-archaic or pseudo-biblical. Two commonly held beliefs are the following: (1) archaic Book of Mormon usage is not systematically different from King James language; (2) the earliest text is often defective in its implementation of archaic vocabulary and grammar. Many scholars believe Book of Mormon grammar is a flawed imitation of biblical usage. That conclusion, however, has been founded on insufficient grammatical and lexical study.

A number of LDS scholars believe that because Joseph Smith's mind was saturated with biblical language, he could have produced the text of the Book of Mormon from a mixture of biblical language and his own dialect.⁸ Other commentators, whose affiliation is not always known,

8. Philip L. Barlow, *Mormons and the Bible: The Place of the Latter-day Saints in American Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 27, 220. On page 220 we read the following: "The Prophet's mind was demonstrably saturated in biblical language, images, and themes." Brant Gardner, *The Gift and Power: Translating the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2011), 302, quotes and agrees with Lavina Fielding Anderson: "the Smith family's oral culture was so thoroughly imbued with biblical language . . . that its use was fluent, easy, and familiar." (Lavina Fielding Anderson, "Mother Tongue: KJV Language in Smith Family Discourse," [Paper, Mormon History Association, 22 May 2009]. Copy in Gardner's possession.) Gardner goes on to say that "King James version style appears in the Book of Mormon because Joseph could not escape it. I doubt that it was a conscious decision to imitate that style." See also Richard Lyman Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Knopf, 2005), 274: "While saturated with Bible language, the *Book of Mormon* was an entirely new history . . ."

have drawn similar conclusions. Here is one observation made in 2013 by a blogger — who goes by the initials RT — on the influence that one pseudo-biblical writing might have had on the formulation of the Book of Mormon text:

In sum, linguistic and narrative elements of the [Book of Mormon] are probably descended, at least in part, from Gilbert Hunt’s pseudo-biblical account of the War of 1812. The relationship between these two literary works is relatively strong, suggesting that the book had quite a memorable impact on Joseph Smith. But Smith did not borrow directly from [*The Late War*] (at least for the majority of the narrative content) during the process of composing the [Book of Mormon].⁹

For purposes of determining possible influence on authorship, RT has focused on linguistic and narrative evidence. However, the linguistic evidence he has considered is not syntactic in character, and there is no discussion of possibly obsolete lexis. Instead, this commentator has concentrated on archaic phrasal and lexical evidence that is rather obviously biblical or that is contextual to a larger degree than syntactic structures are, which can be employed in a wide array of diverse contexts. Phrases and lexical items routinely identifiable as biblical are of course more susceptible to imitation. Moreover, they are also less likely to have been produced subconsciously than syntax, so they are of secondary importance in determining authorship influence, compared to more complex linguistic studies. Also, the narrative evidence RT has considered is, by its nature, weaker than substantive linguistic evidence from the domains of semantics, morphology, and syntax.

Here is another summarizing comment about the Book of Mormon which one can currently find online: “Joseph most likely grew up reading a school book called *The Late War* by Gilbert J. Hunt and it heavily influenced his writing of *The Book of Mormon*.”¹⁰ Again, a comparison of phrases and lexical usage shared between the Book of Mormon and *The Late War* led to this comment. Specifically, the two researchers

9. RT, “The Book of Mormon and the Late War: Direct Literary Dependence?,” *Faith Promoting Rumor* (blog), *Patheos*, October 30, 2013, <http://www.patheos.com/blogs/faithpromotingrumor/2013/10/the-book-of-mormon-and-the-late-war-direct-literary-dependence/>. See my comment posted on 16 November 2016, to be found after RT’s write-up.

10. “A Comparison of The Book of Mormon and The Late War Between the United States and Great Britain,” WordTree Foundation, last edited March 9, 2014, <http://wordtreefoundation.github.io/thelatewar/>.

responsible for this comment carried out n-gram comparisons between the Book of Mormon and more than 100,000 pre-1830 texts. A significant flaw in the comparisons they made was failing to incorporate many Early Modern English texts — regularized for spelling and morphology — in their large corpus.¹¹ Nor is it clear that they used the critical text, the text closest to Joseph Smith’s 1829 dictation.¹² In addition, as Benjamin McGuire pointed out in 2013 (using different language), n-gram analyses provide only a brute-force approach to the question of authorship, since they ignore constituent structure.¹³

To these points I would add that issues of lemmatization have been ignored as well. Lemmatization involves regularizing words with inflectional differences as equivalent variants of the same lexeme. And even many lemmatization efforts cannot remedy the inherent deficiencies of most n-gram analyses. For example, Nicholas Lesse’s translation language “do not cause hym, that he shuld performe . . .” (1550, EEBO A22686) is a syntactic match with “causing them that they should . . .” (3 Nephi 2:3). These are both ditransitive causative constructions with repeated pronominals. But such a correspondence isn’t caught by standard n-gram comparisons, nor by narrowly drawn lemmatized comparisons, so that competent linguistic analysis is ultimately needed to determine relevant syntactic matching.

The website that contains the above comment comparing *The Late War* to the Book of Mormon has a large quantity of material to digest, and the linguistic analysis is confined to phrasal and lexical elements, which have their interest but are contextual in many cases. If there were

11. Chris Johnson, “Hidden in Plain Sight,” *Ask Reality* (blog), *Wordpress*, October 21, 2013, <http://web.archive.org/web/20131203090645/http://askreality.com:80/hidden-in-plain-sight/>. This webpage did not clearly indicate which texts the two Johnson brothers used in their comparisons. In late 2013, EEBO Phase 1 texts were not publicly available, so we may safely assume that they didn’t use those in their analyses. This is supported by their mention of OCR difficulties with the long s, since EEBO is mostly a manually transcribed database. They probably used the Google Books database, which doesn’t have many pre-1701 texts, relatively speaking. That would mean that they mainly examined texts of the late 1700s and early 1800s, and secondarily of the early 1700s, and comparatively few Early Modern English texts.

12. Royal Skousen, ed., *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009). The archived webpage didn’t indicate which edition of the Book of Mormon the n-gram researchers used in their analysis.

13. See “Flaw 5: Textual Context” in Benjamin L. McGuire, “The Late War Against the Book of Mormon,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 7 (2013): 348–49, <http://www.mormoninterpreter.com/the-late-war-against-the-book-of-mormon/>.

no syntax, morphosyntax, or obsolete lexis to study, then we would have to content ourselves with studying mostly contextual linguistic evidence, such as we find on this website. But there are other things that can be studied that are either more complex and less contextual or can be studied in a way that brings out relevant complexity. Hence, the choice of data and methodologies are quite important.

As McGuire mentions in his 2013 article, quoting Harold Love, the explosion of available textual data has made “intelligent selectivity” extremely important.¹⁴ Syntactic studies rank very high in terms of intelligent selectivity. (To this may be added studies of potentially obsolete lexis not undertaken here but soon to be available in Royal Skousen, *The Nature of the Original Language*. A substantially different version of this paper will be available in that two-part book as section 12.) Syntactic studies constitute a richer source of linguistic information and a more reliable data set on which to base conclusions about Book of Mormon authorship. One specific example is the study of relative-pronoun selection after human antecedents in earlier English, addressed below.

The aforementioned website liberally employs the ellipsis symbol (...), at times in lengthy or discontinuous passages. The way this symbol is used goes against customary practice in quite a few cases and can mislead the unaware. The casual reader is led to believe there is much more compact correspondence between the Book of Mormon and *The Late War* (and other texts) than there actually is. This analysis has been referred to by the CES letter, whose latest iteration links to the site rather than incorporating it in the body of the letter.¹⁵ A recent imitation of the CES letter provides the reader with a reprint of some of the color-coded comparisons that are heavy in ellipsis.¹⁶

Another short blog entry to consider is one titled “American Pseudobibles (and the Book of Mormon).” The author, John Turner, quotes Eran Shalev as suggesting that “the unique combination of the biblical form and style that the Book of Mormon shares with the pseudobiblical texts, as well as their distinctly American content, provide a case for seeing Smith’s book as meaningfully affiliated to that

14. McGuire, “The Late War,” 325.

15. See page 23 of Jeremy T. Runnells, “CES Letter: My Search for Answers to My Mormon Doubts,” CES Letter Foundation, updated October 2017, <https://cesletter.org/CES-Letter.pdf>.

16. See pages 93 and 94 of Anonymous, “Letter for My Wife,” *Letter for my Wife* (blog), WordPress, 2017, http://www.letterformywife.com/wp-content/letter/Letter_For_My_Wife.pdf.

American mode of writing.”¹⁷ This view of things — that pseudo-biblical style and Book of Mormon style are not substantively distinguishable — is only based on superficial linguistic considerations. We must dig deeper before we can be confident that such a view is accurate.

Eran Shalev wrote the following at the end of his article on pseudo-biblicism:¹⁸

The tradition of writing in biblical style paved the way for the Book of Mormon by conditioning Americans to reading American texts, and texts about America, in biblical language. Yet the Book of Mormon, an American narrative **told in the English of the King James Bible**, has thrived long after Americans abandoned the practice of recounting their affairs in biblical language. It has thus been able to survive and flourish for almost two centuries, not because, but in spite of the literary ecology of the mid-nineteenth century and after. The Book of Mormon became a testament to a widespread cultural practice of writing in **biblical English** that could not accommodate to the monumental transformations America endured in the first half of nineteenth century. [emphasis added]

The character of the Book of Mormon’s English is a matter that demands special study, not unstudied assumptions. Before Skousen, no one had acknowledged and accepted this reality.

Just before final submission of this piece, I was alerted to a recent Purdue University dissertation by Gregory A. Bowen.¹⁹ Bowen’s thesis examines usage in 10 texts and two small corpora, with the focus on the King James Bible and the Book of Mormon. Because the net is cast wide and touches on several linguistic areas, this study is a preliminary one in relation to the Book of Mormon. Hunt’s *The Late War* is one of the 19th-century texts examined.

17. Eran Shalev, *American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War*, quoted in John Turner, “American Pseudobibles (and the Book of Mormon),” *Anxious Bench* (blog), *Patheos*, March 6, 2014, www.patheos.com/blogs/anxiousbench/2014/03/american-pseudobibles-and-the-book-of-mormon.

18. Shalev, “Pseudo-Biblicism,” 826.

19. Gregory A. Bowen, “Sounding Sacred: The Adoption of Biblical Archaisms in the Book of Mormon and Other 19th Century Texts,” (2016) *Open Access Dissertations*, https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=2123&context=open_access_dissertations.

Bowen either begins with or comes to an expected academic conclusion.²⁰ He doesn't explore the possibility that a significant amount of Book of Mormon usage could be genuinely archaic, despite the existence of extra-biblical archaic markers occurring throughout the text. Although he mentions a few, he never pursues lines of inquiry that might have revealed true archaism. In short, there is good material in this thesis, but it doesn't approach lexical and grammatical issues that might be dispositive of the authorship question.

Bowen concludes that some heavy usage of archaisms found in the Book of Mormon were biblical hypercorrections by Joseph Smith. In the case at hand, a hypercorrection is a presumed overuse by Joseph of a prestigious biblical form.²¹ The issue of biblical hypercorrection will be addressed at various points in this study.

One item of archaic vocabulary that Bowen tracked was the adjective *wroth*. This word is a strong marker of archaism because the EEBO database clearly shows that usage rates dropped off significantly during the first half of the early modern era. He classifies the Book of Mormon's high-frequency *wroth* usage as a biblical hypercorrection, since its textual rate exceeds that of the King James Bible: 90 words per million (wpm) versus 64 wpm.²² In this case, however, the close synonym *angry* could have been considered as well.

If we include *angry* in calculations and determine a relative rate of archaism, we find that the King James Bible is 53 percent *wroth* (49 of 93) and that the Book of Mormon is only 26 percent *wroth* (24 of 93). As a result, even though the absolute rate of *wroth* in the Book of Mormon is greater than it is in the King James Bible, the Book of Mormon's archaic *wroth*–*angry* rate is half that of the King James Bible. This extra bit of analysis — which recognizes the importance of also considering the close synonym *angry* — reveals that the Book of Mormon's high rate of *wroth* is partly due to archaism and partly due to a higher textual frequency of the notion 'angry.'

In summary, after duly considering a variety of evidence, a number of critics and researchers have concluded that the Book of Mormon isn't

20. Of course, the constraints of academia virtually force the conclusion, while the constraints of LDS scholarship do not force one to declare that Joseph was or was not the English-language translator. Consequently, I consider Bowen's conclusion on page 61 to be *de rigueur* and uninteresting.

21. The entry for *hypercorrect*, *adj.* in the Oxford English Dictionary has the following: "*Linguistics.* Of a spelling, pronunciation, or construction: falsely modelled on an apparently analogous prestigious form."

22. See Bowen, *Sounding Sacred*, 86.

genuinely archaic, and that its language is close to that of Gilbert J. Hunt's *The Late War* and similarly styled texts. Some see direct influence from *The Late War*, others see indirect influence. Yet no one has drilled down to the foundational elements of style beyond shared lexical and phrasal usage in context and simple morphological studies; all have ignored independent archaic semantic usage, syntactic structure, and in-depth morphosyntactic research. Those are the things that can tell us most reliably and convincingly whether the Book of Mormon is similar to pseudo-biblical texts in terms of style and archaism. My primary concern in this study is with syntactic structure and morphosyntax. To my knowledge, a substantive syntactic comparison of the Book of Mormon with pseudo-biblical writings has never been performed. There is much to compare; I only touch on a few things here.

Summary of Analyses

Topics covered include agentive *of* and *by*, *lest* syntax, relative-pronoun usage with personal antecedents, periphrastic *did*, *more-part* usage, *had (been) spake*, the {-th} plural, and verbal complementation after five common verbs as well as the adjective *desirous*.

Agentive *of* and *by*

In most syntactic domains, Book of Mormon archaism turns out to be different from that of the King James Bible, while exceeding that of the four pseudo-biblical writings. The following is one example. Agentive *of* is biblical syntax, but it is the kind that was apparently more difficult for pseudo-biblical authors to imitate. Its use is less obvious than that of lexical items like *thou*, *saith*, *unto*, or past-tense *spake* (to this we may also add the prominent lexical phrase *it came to pass*).

In late Middle English, just before the early modern period, the chief preposition used in passive constructions to indicate the agent was *of*, later giving way to *by*.²³ (Late Middle English ended around the time William Caxton began to print books in English in the final quarter of the 15th century, and Early Modern English continued to the end of the 17th century.) An example is the following sentence from a book found in the EEBO database: "God requireth the law to be kepte **of** all men" (1528, EEBO A14136). By the late modern period this expression would have

23. See the heading for definition 14 of the preposition *of* in the online, third edition of the Oxford English Dictionary (definition 15 in the second edition). We are not concerned with Old English or even early Middle English, when the prepositions *from* and *through* were used to indicate the agent as well.

almost always been worded “God requires the law to be kept **by** all men.” A Book of Mormon example is “Moses was commanded **of** the Lord” (1 Nephi 17:26), equivalent to “Moses was commanded **by** the Lord.”

Royal Skousen has carried out systematic but incomplete sampling of past participles followed by either agentive *of* or *by* in the two scriptural texts (mostly from an inspection of the syntax of regular verbs ending in {-ed} that are immediately followed by *of* or *by* and an animate agent). I have done the same for the four pseudo-biblical writings. This research has yielded the following estimates:

Estimated agentive *of* rates

- King James Bible 72%
- Book of Mormon 46%
- Scottish pseudo-biblical text < 20%
- American pseudo-biblical texts < 10%

In this domain we find that the King James Bible has the greatest archaism, followed by the Book of Mormon, and followed more distantly by the four pseudo-biblical writings. The one by the Scottish author Matthew Linning comes closest to the scriptural texts in its level of archaism at less than 20 percent agentive *of*. The Book of Mormon exhibits considerable biblical influence, while the pseudo-biblical texts exhibit slight biblical influence.

The King James Bible favors the use of agentive *of* (estimated at 72 percent), but there are still significant levels of use of agentive *by*. The Book of Mormon slightly favors the use of agentive *by* (estimated at 54 percent), but there is almost as much agentive *of* usage. In contrast, the four pseudo-biblical writings do not use much agentive *of*, strongly preferring the modern alternative.

The kind of verb and agent involved in the syntax influence the selection of the agentive preposition (*of* or *by*), complicating matters. Yet the large differences in agentive *of* rates permit one to reliably observe that while the Book of Mormon is quite archaic in agentive *of* usage, pseudo-biblical writings are not — especially the American ones.

Agentive *of* is used with a wide variety of verbs in the scriptural texts, and the usage in many cases is not overlapping. In other words, the King James Bible employs agentive *of* with some verbs quite frequently whereas the Book of Mormon does not; the Book of Mormon also employs agentive *of* with some verbs quite frequently while the King James Bible does not. An example of this is the passive construction “commanded *of/* *by*.” The King James Bible has four examples of “commanded **by**” but no

examples of “commanded **of**”; the Book of Mormon has nine examples of “commanded **of**” and three examples of “commanded **by**.” This means it is not inaccurate to state that the Book of Mormon’s agentive *of* usage approaches but is independent of biblical usage. This is statistically verifiable.²⁴

Pseudo-biblical texts are not that archaic in this regard, especially the three American ones. Of the four pseudo-biblical writings considered in this study, the Scottish one contains the highest rate of agentive *of* usage — estimated to be 15 percent. This is about one-third the rate found in the Book of Mormon. The three American pseudo-biblical writings have been estimated to be below 10 percent in their agentive *of* usage. Some details follow:

- Leacock’s text (1774–1775) has no examples of agentive *of* out of about 10 possibilities. The agentive *of* rate in this text is 0%.
- Snowden’s text (1793) has three instances of “beloved **of** the people” (5:14, 19:13, 26:2). The estimated agentive *of* rate in this text is 7% (3 of 43 regular verbs). (There are also three instances of “beloved **by**,” with various noun phrases [3:13, 45:7, 52:3].)
- Linning’s text (1809) has four instances of agentive *of*: “despised **of** men” (twice: 12:7; 14:2), “favoured **of** Heaven” (14:5) and “approved **of** men” (21:19). The estimated agentive *of* rate in this text is 15% (4 of 27 regular verbs).
- Hunt’s text (1816) has only one example of agentive *of*: “the king was possessed **of** an evil spirit” (1:14). The estimated agentive *of* rate in this text is 2.5% (1 of 40 regular verbs).

Lest syntax

Next, we consider the syntax of sentences that occur after the conjunction *lest*. The 1611 King James Bible consistently employs the subjunctive mood in sentences following this conjunction. About 80 percent of the

24. Royal Skousen created a table with 82 verbs which will appear in his forthcoming book *The Nature of the Original Language*. I performed a standard correlation calculation for this agentive *of* / *by* table, finding it was only 0.102 (specifically, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient calculated by the Microsoft Excel CORREL formula). I also performed another correlation by excluding those cases where either text doesn’t have examples. This reduced the 82 verbs to only 38, and the correlation was even lower: 0.065. By either test, and even more so by the reduced test, which is arguably more rigorous, the agentive *of* / *by* usage of the King James Bible and of the Book of Mormon are uncorrelated.

time no modal auxiliary verb is used. This of course means that about 20 percent of the time a modal auxiliary verb is used with an infinitive after *lest*, most frequently *should*.

A fairly comprehensive search of the 1611 King James Bible (including the Apocrypha) yielded 63 *lest–should* constructions. This tally is probably close to the actual figure and is equivalent to a textual rate of 68 wpm. But because *lest–should* usage continued into the late modern period robustly (after the year 1700), use of *lest–should* syntax in pseudo-biblical texts isn't actually a good candidate for possible biblical hypercorrection. Some of it could represent late modern usage.

A few details of *lest* constructions in the other texts are the following:

- The Book of Mormon employs a modal auxiliary verb in sentences after *lest* about 80 percent of the time, usually *should*. It has much higher levels of modal auxiliary usage after *lest* than the biblical text does. Its 44 *lest–should* constructions translate to a rate of 175 wpm — 2.6 times the biblical rate.
- Leacock's *American Chronicles* (1774–1775) and Linning's *Book of Napoleon* (1809) have six and five instances of *lest*, respectively, without any following modal auxiliary usage. These pseudo-biblical texts are more closely aligned with biblical patterns than the other two pseudo-biblical texts.
- Richard Snowden's *The American Revolution* (1793) has 14 *lest–should* constructions, a rate of 284 wpm. Snowden's *lest–should* rate is more than four times that of the King James Bible, and higher than the Book of Mormon's.
- Gilbert J. Hunt's *The Late War* (1816) has six instances of *lest*, and five times the sentences that follow employ a modal auxiliary: three with *should* and two with *might*. Its *lest–should* rate of 70 wpm is very close to the biblical rate.

Continuing our investigation, we find that there is only one short passage in the entire King James Bible (including the Apocrypha) where the modal auxiliary verb *shall* occurs in sentences following *lest*:

2 Corinthians 12:20–21

For I fear **lest** when I come, I **shall** not find you such as I would,
and that I **shall** be found unto you such as ye would not, ...
And **lest** when I come again, my God **will** humble me among
you, and that I **shall** bewail many which have sinned already,

The phrase *when I come* may have triggered the *shall* usage. This passage also has a simple case of *lest there be* (not shown), as well as one instance of the auxiliary verb *will* ("my God will humble me").

In descending order of frequency, the auxiliaries most commonly found in the Early Modern English textual record after the conjunction *lest* are *should*, *might*, *may*, *would*, *will*, and *shall* (based on extensive searches of the EEBO Phase 1 database).²⁵ Consequently, we wouldn't have expected there to be many *lest* constructions with *shall* in the King James Bible, and this expectation is borne out by the text. Taking into account the close to one million words found in the 1611 Bible (including the Apocrypha), these three instances mean that the *lest–shall* rate of the biblical text is 3.2 wpm. Because *lest–shall* usage did **not** continue into the late modern period robustly, heavier usage in other texts could qualify as a biblical hypercorrection.

Yet the four pseudo-biblical writings do not have any examples of *lest–shall* syntax. As noted, Snowden's *The American Revolution* and Hunt's *The Late War* do have *lest–should* constructions — 14 and 3 instances, respectively — but the other two pseudo-biblical texts do not. So, *lest–should* syntax, which is both biblical and persistent usage, is fairly well represented in the pseudo-biblical set, while the *lest–shall* usage of 2 Corinthians 12:20–21 is not represented at all.

Specifically, Snowden's text had five contexts in which he might have employed *lest–shall* syntax and Hunt's text had one;²⁶ all 11 of Leacock's and Linning's *lest* sentences could have employed *shall*. Because *lest–shall* syntax is missing in 17 possible cases, it is possible that the

25. In terms of the historical record, the *lest–shall* construction was used at its highest rate in the 16th century. This observation is based on isolating 90 EEBO Phase 1 examples of *lest* occurring within three words of some form of *shall* (including spelling variants). The highest usage rates are found in the 1530s and 1540s, and there are three instances in a 1549 translation of an Erasmus New Testament paraphrase. This book has the largest number of examples of *lest–shall* syntax that I have encountered in the EEBO Phase 1 database. Hence it is possible that the Book of Mormon has more *lest–shall* constructions than any other book. The EEBO Phase 1 database also shows that *lest–shall* syntax occurred in the 17th century at one-quarter the 16th-century rate, dropping off noticeably in the 1680s and 1690s. Continuing robust *should* usage after the conjunction *lest* is found in the modern period, but what is not found is much *shall* usage. The Google Books *Ngram Viewer* currently indicates that on average *shall* was used after *lest* less than one-tenth of one percent of the time in the early 1800s. A recent Google Books search of “lest he/they shall,” limited to before 1830, yielded five examples, found in publications dated between 1720 and 1828. Therefore, the *lest–shall* construction was most heavily represented in the 16th century, and can be said to be characteristic of that century. Several syntactic features of the Book of Mormon are a good fit with the 16th century; this appears to be one of them.

26. *The American Revolution* 15:17 (twice), 35:23, 37:7, 55:5; *The Late War* 19:35.

pseudo-biblical authors were unaware of the rare biblical usage (only three times after 240 instances of *lest*), and this was also possible for Joseph Smith.

Nonetheless, the Book of Mormon has 14 cases of the conjunction *lest* followed immediately by sentences with the modal auxiliary verb *shall*, as in the following example:

Mosiah 2:32

But O my people, beware **lest** there **shall** arise contentions among you, and ye list to obey the evil spirit which was spoken of by my father Mosiah.

Present-tense *ye list*, conjoined to *there shall arise*, suggests the *shall* may primarily be a subjunctive mood marker. The Book of Mormon variation — “lest there shall arise . . . and ye [ø] list” — has been found in the textual record after *lest* and *should*.

These 14 cases represent an extraordinary amount of *lest–shall* usage. It is equivalent to a rate of approximately 55 wpm, which is slightly more than 17 times the rate of the King James Bible. An analyst such as Bowen would call this outsized use of *lest–shall* in the Book of Mormon a biblical hypercorrection. As noted, however, there is no supporting pseudo-biblical usage; in this domain Joseph Smith rather obviously exceeded the four pseudo-biblical texts in reproducing hardly noticeable, archaic biblical syntax. This same set of circumstances is encountered in the Book of Mormon in many different linguistic domains and raises the possibility that Book of Mormon authorship might have involved Early Modern English competence (implicit knowledge).

The argument for the Book of Mormon’s *lest–shall* usage not being a biblical hypercorrection, but rather representing Early Modern English competence, gains a measure of support from a passage in the olive tree allegory, which displays triple variation in auxiliary selection after *lest*:

Jacob 5:65

[A]nd ye shall not clear away the bad thereof all at once, **lest** the roots thereof **should** be too strong for the graft, and the graft thereof **shall** perish, and I [ø] lose the trees of my vineyard.

Here we read three clauses after the conjunction *lest*: the first one has the auxiliary *should*, the second one *shall*, and the third one has no auxiliary (shown by [ø]). Initially, without any knowledge of past grammatical possibilities, we might assign the auxiliary mixture in Jacob 5:65 to Joseph making a mistake. Yet there are rare textual precedents found in the early modern period to consider, as in this example:

1662, Abraham Wright, *A Practical Commentary*
 [on] the Pentateuch [EEBO A67153]

Lest either Abraham **should** not do that for which he came, or **shall** want means of speedy thanksgiving for so gracious a disappointment;

Here and below the spelling of EEBO examples has been regularized. In this case, only a hyphen has been deleted from *thanks-giving*.

The auxiliary variation of this 1662 example and Jacob 5:65 provide us with a clear syntactic match. Neither the King James Bible nor pseudo-biblical texts contain this variation. It slightly strengthens the position against biblical hypercorrection and for Early Modern English competence. Without further support, however, this should be regarded as a coincidence. As it turns out, however, there are dozens of coincidences in the earliest text — of one kind or another — some of them edited out. These things taken together materially strengthen the position against biblical hypercorrection in this specific case and for the entire Book of Mormon text.

Personal *that*, *which*, and *who(m)*

The cataloguing of relative-pronoun usage after human antecedents in the Book of Mormon has much to tell us about the issue of authorship. That is because the majority of such usage is generated subconsciously. This contrasts with the mostly conscious use of content-rich phrases and words, some of which are obviously biblical.

Just as speakers and writers today rarely pay attention to whether they use *that* or *who(m)* to refer back to human antecedents (in phrases like “those **who** were there” or “the people **that** heard those things”), 400 years ago speakers and writers would have paid little attention to whether they employed *that*, *which*, or *who(m)* — the three options available in the early modern period — to refer back to human antecedents. They would have followed personal and dialectal preferences, almost always subconsciously.

Personal *that* was the most common option coming out of late Middle English and throughout most of the 1500s and 1600s, and it has persisted to this day, at close to a 10 percent usage rate.²⁷ Over time, personal *which* (e.g. “Our Father **which** art in heaven”) became less and less common and personal *who* took over from personal *that* as the dominant form. Personal *which* is the option that has become very rare except in narrowly confined contexts.

27. According to the Google Books *Ngram Viewer*, *he that* has persisted most robustly, currently occurring in texts nearly 20 percent of the time (as opposed to *he who*).

Syntax and the antecedent affect relative pronoun selection. Also, the antecedent cannot always be determined. Yet enough clear data exists to lead to the conclusion that the Book of Mormon usage is different from modern *who–that* usage and from the usage patterns of the four pseudo-biblical writings considered in this study. Book of Mormon usage is also significantly different from the dominant form of Early Modern English represented in the King James Bible. Book of Mormon usage is not derivable from any of these sources, but it is similar to less-common Early Modern English usage.

Details for the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible are as follows:

- The Book of Mormon’s personal *which* usage rate probably exceeds 50%; one sampling involving four different types of high-frequency antecedents — *those/they/them*, *he/him*, *man/men*, and *people* — shows an interesting diversity in usage patterns and an overall personal *which* usage rate of 52%; personal *that* (30.5%) and *who(m)* (17.5%), taken together, are used slightly less than half the time after these antecedents in the earliest text.²⁸
- The King James Bible employs personal *which* only 12.5% of the time after these same antecedents; personal *that* is dominant (83.5%), with *who(m)* occurring only 4% of the time; only when the relative pronoun’s antecedent is *he/him* are these two scriptural texts correlated; otherwise their usage is uncorrelated or negatively correlated.²⁹

Personal *which* was extensively but incompletely edited out of the Book of Mormon by Joseph Smith for the 1837 second edition.³⁰ It is more likely this was a case of Joseph’s attempting to grammatically

28. Significant Early Modern English writings that employ personal *which* more than personal *that* after the antecedent *people* include Richard Hakluyt’s *The Principal Navigations ... of the English Nation* (1589–1600, EEBO A02495, 57% “people which”) and Edward Grimston’s translation titled *The Estates, Empires, and Principalities of the World* (1615, EEBO A23464, 54% “people which”). From these we find that dominant usage of *people which* is not unattested in the earlier textual record. The EEBO database also shows that the same is true of *those which*.

29. One can see rather quickly that the King James Bible employs personal *that* more than personal *which*, and personal *which* more than personal *who*, by counting instances of “people that/which/who,” “men that/which/who,” and “a man that/which/who” in WordCruncher.

30. See Royal Skousen, *History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: The Grammatical Variation* (Provo, UT: FARMS and BYU Studies, 2016), 1188–1247.

change and partially modernize the text rather than attempting to achieve original authorship aims.³¹

On the topic of personal *which*, Bowen recently wrote the following in his dissertation: “Smith modernized this feature aggressively in the 2nd edition and only a few instances of the older form remain.”³² However, in the process of performing thorough text-critical work, Skousen has noted that 952 of 1,032 instances were changed in 1837 and only several more later.³³ Consequently, calling the remaining instances of personal *which* “a few” gives the wrong picture; there aren’t fewer than 10 remaining (the typical upper-bound meaning of “a few”) but actually almost 80. If we take “a few” to mean less than 10 percent, then it works. As we might expect, in changing so many instances of *which* to *who*, Joseph occasionally over-edited *which* to *who*, making mistakes.³⁴

Three of the pseudo-biblical writings have examples of personal *which* but are dominant in *who* or *that*: Leacock’s text (six instances of personal *which*), Linning’s text (two instances: “multitudes/captives which”), and Hunt’s text (one instance: “false prophets which come”). No examples of personal *which* in Snowden’s text were found in a recent search. All pseudo-biblical writings but the earliest one, Leacock’s, are strictly modern in their profile. Thus, three pseudo-biblical authors didn’t break from the preferences they learned as native speakers and writers of late modern English.

Recent counts yielded the following details (here I exclude prepositional contexts):

- Leacock’s text has 45 instances of personal *that* (58%), 6 instances of personal *which* (8%), and 26 instances of *who(m)* (34%). The relative order of use of these relative pronouns (in descending frequency) — *that*, *who(m)*, *which* — makes this text a biblical–modern hybrid.
- Snowden’s text has about 20 instances of personal *that* (10%), no instances of personal *which* (0%), and about 180 instances

31. Skousen, *Grammatical Variation*, 37: “Overall, Joseph’s inconsistency in his editing argues that he had no systematic method in mind when he edited the text. Sometimes he neglected to make a change that he usually made; other times his decision to make a particular change was carried out only intermittently.”

32. Bowen, *Sounding Sacred*, 145.

33. Skousen, *Grammatical Variation*, 41, 1224–25.

34. For example, on page 1217 of *Grammatical Variation*, Skousen points out an overcorrection of *which* to *who* that Joseph made at Alma 51:7. This error persists in the LDS text.

of *who(m)* (90%); this text exhibits a strong preference for *who(m)* over *that*.

- Linning’s text has 8 instances of personal *that* (20%), 2 instances of personal *which* (5%), and 31 instances of *who(m)* (75%); this text exhibits a strong preference for *who(m)* over *that*.
- Hunt’s text has 44 instances of personal *that* (47%), 1 instance of personal *which* (1%), and 49 instances of *who(m)* (52%); this text exhibits a slight preference for *who(m)* over *that*.

As a side note, Joseph Smith’s 1832 History is strictly modern in its profile since it contains 10 instances of the relative pronoun *who(m)*, two instances of personal *that*, but none of personal *which*. This agrees generally with the contemporary textual record and independent linguistic research.³⁵ Moreover, Bowen’s 2016 dissertation provides supporting evidence from Joseph Smith’s letters (see pages 167 and 171). This means, of course, that Book of Mormon usage is different from Joseph’s own linguistic preferences.

It is relevant and important to note that the short 1832 History has quite a few archaizing, biblical features in it. Thus, if a desire for archaism on the part of Joseph Smith had been the driver of the heavy usage of personal *which* in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon,³⁶ we would expect some personal *which* to have been employed in the History. The lack of it there weakens the position that heavy doses of personal *which* in the Book of Mormon emanated from Joseph’s attempts to be archaic and biblical.

To recap, here is the breakdown of usage in the texts considered in this study:

Table 1. Percentage usage of relative pronouns with personal referents.

Text	that	which	who(m)
King James Bible (est.)	83.5	12.6	3.9
Book of Mormon (est.)	30.5	52.0	17.5

35. For an overview, see Matti Rissanen, “Syntax” in Roger Lass, editor, *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 293–95 (§4.6.2.2.1).

36. This is what Bowen indicates on page 155 of his thesis, consistent with his general view of Joseph Smith attempting to project a prophetic identity through archaism (see page xii).

Text	that	which	who(m)
American Chronicles	58.4	7.8	33.8
The American Revolution (est.)	10.0	0.0	90.0
Book of Napoleon	19.5	4.9	75.6
The Late War	46.8	1.1	52.1

As mentioned, the Book of Mormon is uncorrelated with the King James Bible in this domain. The Book of Mormon is negatively correlated with all four pseudo-biblical writings, usually strongly negatively correlated, and especially with Gilbert J. Hunt's *The Late War*, the text compared most often to the Book of Mormon. Based on the above figures, *The Late War* correlates with the King James Bible at 0.32 and with the Book of Mormon at -0.96 . Two of the pseudo-biblical writings are positively correlated with the King James Bible — the oldest one, Leacock's text, correlates most strongly at 0.8.

Again, an analyst might claim the Book of Mormon overuses personal *which* as a biblical hypercorrection.³⁷ I will briefly note two things here. First, heavy use of personal *that* is the most likely biblical hypercorrection. Second, it is unlikely Joseph Smith could have successfully dictated against subconscious relative-pronoun tendencies approximately 1,000 times. The four pseudo-biblical texts support this view. The more likely divergence from Joseph's own linguistic tendencies would have been something like Leacock's distribution, which is heavy in personal *that*. Familiarity with biblical usage and internalizing it to a degree might have led to such a result.

Periphrastic *did*

In this section, periphrastic *did* means the use of the auxiliary *did* or *didst* in declarative contexts with an infinitive and without *not*, as in

37. Bowen, *Sounding Sacred*, 155: "The BoM text initially followed the KJB lead in primarily using *which* for relative clauses with human antecedents". Table 27 on page 145 of his dissertation gives us figures of five percent personal *which* in the 1840 Book of Mormon and 70 percent in the King James Bible. But the King James Bible's primary personal relative pronoun is *that*. For example, in Genesis and Matthew, the books Bowen examined, there are four instances of "those which," three of "those that," and none of "those who(m);" there are also 49 instances of "he that," three of "he which," and one of "he who(m)." I have looked for a discussion and analysis of personal *that* in Bowen's thesis but haven't encountered any. If I am not mistaken, he may have neglected this important feature of the biblical personal relative-pronoun system. The exclusion of personal *that* clouds the true picture of usage.

“they did go forth,” without full or contrastive emphasis on the auxiliary. To be clear, I have counted phraseology such as “neither did they go,” headed by a negative conjunction, as an instance of periphrastic *did*, since “neither went they” was possible in earlier English, and the simple, non-periphrastic option was available to pseudo-biblical authors. Phraseology such as “neither did they go” could be considered a type of negative usage along with *did not*, but I have chosen to follow Ellegård 1953 in the matter.³⁸

The two main syntactic types of non-emphatic periphrastic *did* are differentiated by whether *did* and the infinitive are adjacent. It is important to note that non-emphatic non-adjacency has persisted in English, in limited fashion, while non-emphatic adjacency has not. Thus, the two syntactic types followed distinct paths, diachronically speaking. Texts with very high levels of adjacency are uncommon and mainly confined to the first half of the early modern period (specifically, from the 1530s to the 1560s).³⁹

Other than a recent dissertation by Bowen referred to above, I have not read any studies by linguists of the Book of Mormon’s periphrastic *did*. (Bowen’s treatment is only preliminary, and besides some brief comments [see page 156], he doesn’t treat present-tense and past-tense usage separately.) My own analysis of periphrastic *did* in the Book of Mormon, following Alvar Ellegård’s approach in his wide-ranging work on the subject, has shown that the Book of Mormon’s past-tense syntax matches some 16th-century texts in their rate and syntactic distribution. There also appears to be some correlation with individual verb tendencies of the early modern era, as I discovered by performing many nearly comprehensive searches of the EEBO Phase 1 database.⁴⁰ Thus, the Book of Mormon contains an early and robust form of periphrastic *did*, something chiefly found in the middle of the 16th century. A book written by the Cambridge theologian and mathematician Isaac Barrow, *A Treatise of the Pope’s Supremacy* [1683, EEBO 31089], first published posthumously in 1680, may be the latest one whose past-tense rate exceeds that of the Book of Mormon.⁴¹

38. Alvar Ellegård, *The Auxiliary Do: The Establishment and Regulation of Its Use in English* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1953).

39. This observation is based on the detailed observations of Ellegård, *The Auxiliary Do*, 161 (Table 7), 162 (diagram), 182 (Table 9 and the accompanying diagram).

40. Stanford Carmack, “The Implications of Past-Tense Syntax in the Book of Mormon,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 14 (2015): 158–59, 169–72.

41. Isaac Barrow, *A Treatise of the Pope’s Supremacy* (London: M. Flesher and J. Heptinstall, 1683). The periphrastic *did* usage of the book was anomalous

Ellegård estimated that the King James Bible's overall periphrastic *do* rate (both present-tense and past-tense) was 1.3 percent.⁴² In 2014 I estimated that its past-tense periphrastic *did* and *didst* rate was 1.7 percent.⁴³ This rate, however, is conspicuously skewed by more than 95 percent usage of *did eat* instead of *ate* and an outsized rate of periphrastic *didst* (more than 10 times the overall periphrastic *did* rate, and about 20 times the periphrastic *did* rate when *did eat* is excluded). Notably, there is no significant skewing present in the Book of Mormon with either *did eat* or any other verb, and not even with periphrastic *didst*, since neither type of periphrastic *did* makes up a significant percentage of examples.

Joseph Smith's own language, as determined from an analysis of his 1832 manuscript history, lacked periphrastic *did*.⁴⁴ Bowen's dissertation provides supporting evidence from Joseph's letters (see Table 37 on page 167). This agrees with independent linguistic assessments.

None of the four pseudo-biblical writers produced anything like what the Book of Mormon has in this regard. One text barely employed periphrastic *did*. The two pseudo-biblical texts with the most examples — Snowden's and Hunt's — are almost completely modern in their implementation of the periphrasis, especially in their wholly modern syntactic distribution of *did* and the infinitive (non-adjacent). Specifically, Snowden and Hunt almost always inverted the order of the grammatical subject and the auxiliary. Their syntactic distribution is negatively correlated with that of the Book of Mormon: about -0.4 and -0.6 , respectively.

The Book of Mormon is much closer to the King James Bible in syntactic distribution of the *did* auxiliary and the infinitive. The Book of Mormon has more than 90 percent *did*-infinitive adjacency, while current estimates indicate that the King James Bible has close to

for the 1670s. One later edition I consulted, published in the 18th century, had silently eliminated a lot of the original *did*-periphrasis. But an even later 1818 edition maintained it. Philemon Stewart's *A Holy, Sacred and Divine Roll and Book* (Canterbury, NH: United Society), written in early 1842 and published in 1843, has a fairly high periphrastic *did* rate (currently estimated to be between six and seven percent). But that rate is about three-and-a-half times lower than the Book of Mormon's rate, and periphrastic *did* non-adjacency occurs in the *Sacred Roll* close to 45 percent of the time, well above that of the Book of Mormon, and at a rate that is between the biblical and the modern.

42. Ellegård, *The Auxiliary Do*, 169.

43. Carmack, "Past-Tense Syntax," 123 (Table 1), 143.

44. See Stanford Carmack, "How Joseph Smith's Grammar Differed from Book of Mormon Grammar: Evidence from the 1832 History," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 25 (2017): 240–41.

72.5 percent *did*-infinitive adjacency. The inescapable difference between the two scriptural texts is that they are very far apart in overall textual rates of periphrastic *did*. And their individual verb use with *did* is also substantially different, correlating at only 0.3.⁴⁵

Three of the four pseudo-biblical texts have very little *did*-infinitive adjacency. The oldest one, Leacock's text, has 10 cases of adjacency, but eight of these occur in one stretch of about 500 words in the context of proving, feeling, and concluding; all but one of these eight instances appear to be emphatic. The first two adjacency examples are *did eat* (biblical). Another candidate of *did*-infinitive adjacency is exceptional since it is a case of *did* resumption, at the end of a complex intervening adverbial used in a proclamation (the lengthy adverbial phrase is bracketed below):

1774–1775, John Leacock, *American Chronicles*, 4:28d

the Usurper . . . **did** [most daringly, wantonly, abominably, wickedly, atrociously and devilishly, and without my knowledge, allowance, approbation, instruction or consent first had and obtained, and without my name, and the imperial signet of the Commonwealth affixed thereunto,] **did** presume, and *ipso facto* issue forth and publish a most diabolical and treasonable proclamation,

I have counted this as an intervening adverbial example. Ultimately, Leacock's text doesn't have much interesting periphrastic *did* usage in it. It is infrequent and sporadically concentrated.⁴⁶

There are 11 examples of periphrastic *did* found in Snowden's book. The only time he used the periphrasis with adjacency was when he wrote "thou didst take," thereby avoiding simple past-tense *tookest*, a verb form that is found five times in the 1611 King James Bible.⁴⁷ The syntactic

45. Carmack, "Past-Tense Syntax," 185–86.

46. A count of the three non-emphatic *did*-infinitive adjacency cases in Leacock's text gives a rate of about 210 words per million. This is well below the biblical *did*-infinitive adjacency rate of approximately 700 wpm that I found for Genesis and Matthew, the two books Bowen used in his dissertation as a proxy for the King James Bible. If we break down usage of *did* and the infinitive according to adjacency and non-adjacency, we see that Leacock's non-adjacency rate is 57 percent, well above the 24 percent rate of Genesis and Matthew. By way of comparison, the Book of Mormon's *did*-infinitive adjacency textual rate is close to 6500 wpm, and its non-adjacency rate is less than 10 percent.

47. The biblical text frequently avoided simple past-tense forms ending in {-e(d st)}, and the Book of Mormon did so as well, but its periphrastic *didst* instances don't make up a significant part of the overall periphrastic *did* usage as they do in the biblical text.

distribution of periphrastic *did* in Snowden's text is 9% adjacency, 91% inversion, and 0% intervening adverbial.

Linning's text has only one example of periphrastic *did*, with inversion of *did* and the subject: "nor **did they** seek further to molest the Albions" (63). As far as archaic periphrastic *did* is concerned, there is nothing of note in this pseudo-biblical text.

The sole use of *did*-infinitive adjacency in Hunt's text is "the king did put ... and give.": The syntactic distribution of periphrastic *did* in Hunt's text is 4.8% adjacency, 95.2% inversion, and 14.3% intervening adverbial (in three cases there is both inversion and an intervening adverbial phrase).

The following table summarizes these periphrastic *did* findings:

Table 2. Estimates of periphrastic *did* adjacency rates and shares of non-adjacency.⁴⁸

	Past-tense rate of <i>did</i> -infinitive adjacency	Share of <i>did</i> -infinitive non-adjacency
King James Bible	1.2	> 25 percent
Book of Mormon	24.0	< 10 percent
American Chronicles	0.8	> 50 percent
Book of Napoleon	0.0	ONE EXAMPLE
Snowden's and Hunt's texts	0.1	> 90 percent

In summary, the text of the Book of Mormon does not follow scriptural-style authors, the King James Bible, or Joseph's own language in its past-tense usage. Book of Mormon periphrastic *did* usage is well distributed in past-tense passages throughout the text, although usage rates do ebb and flow, as is the case in some high-rate, 16th-century EBO texts. No single verb dominates periphrastic *did* in the Book of Mormon, and periphrastic *didst* makes up a small part of the overall usage.

In contrast, both *did eat* and periphrastic *didst* in the King James Bible are noticeably out of line with the rest of its periphrastic *did* usage. If these two types are eliminated from rate calculations, then the biblical rate of *did*-infinitive adjacency drops significantly, to less than one percent. On the other hand, neither eliminating *did go* from Book of Mormon rate calculations (the most frequently occurring

48. Bowen also examined an 1843 Shaker text by Philemon Stewart (see note 37) with high *did*-infinitive adjacency. (My preliminary estimate is that its rate falls between six and seven percent; further work is required to verify this or obtain a more accurate estimate). The non-adjacency share of *did* and the infinitive, however, is more than 40 percent, which is a biblical-modern pattern.

periphrasis) nor eliminating periphrastic *didst* causes its *did*-infinitive adjacency rate to change appreciably.

More-part usage

In the Book of Mormon, the phrase *the more part* (and close variants) is used at nearly 40 times the rate of the King James Bible. It is accurate to state that the Book of Mormon follows the most common Early Modern English formulation of this phrase (Coverdale's usage in Acts 27:12: *the more part of them*), and not King James style (*the more part*), since a prepositional phrase always follows *part* (or *parts*), 26 times. In addition, *the more part of X* in the Book of Mormon cannot be said to stem from pseudo-biblical writings, since they have no examples of the obsolete phrase. And it matches several historical works from the late 15th century and the 16th century, both in usage frequency and in the various forms of the era (some rare). One text that stands out is a 1550 translation of Thucydides by Thomas Nicolls [EEBO A13758]. It employs *more-part* phraseology at nearly double the rate of the Book of Mormon.

	n	Comment
• King James Bible	2	Never post-modified by a prepositional phrase
• Book of Mormon	26 (3 rare)	Always post-modified by a prepositional phrase
• Pseudo-biblical texts	0	NO EXAMPLES

The two exceptional forms of this phrase type — with an indefinite article (*a more part of it*, Helaman 6:32) and with plural *parts* (*the more parts of his gospel*, Helaman 6:21; *the more parts of the Nephites*, 4 Nephi 1:27) — provide support for the view that *more-part* phraseology in the Book of Mormon is Early Modern English usage and not a conscious revival by Joseph Smith of earlier language, which is what we find in some of Robert Louis Stevenson's novels and elsewhere.

Those who used the archaic phraseology *the more part* in the second half of the 19th century (and later) were literate authors who had read widely from older writings. Joseph certainly did not fit their educational or experiential profile in the 1820s. Based on what is currently known, linguistic revivalists of the usage, such as the Oxford historian Edward Freeman, the medievalist William Morris, and the novelist Stevenson, did not employ *a more part* or *the more parts* with this particular meaning. Because the phrase *the more part* was in obsolescence and not productively used in

the late 19th century, they naturally did not employ rare, alternate forms (which they may not have encountered), but merely reproduced the most frequent and more easily known form.

The Book of Mormon's *more-part* usage is quite unexpected from a perspective of Joseph generating it from his own biblically-styled language. One must go back in time 250 years to Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577) to encounter a text with the level of usage found in the Book of Mormon.⁴⁹ As a result, its *more-part* profile fits the occasional use found in the first half of the early modern period and no other time. Intimate knowledge of neither the King James Bible nor pseudo-biblical texts would have led to the distinctive and relatively heavy use of *the more part* found in the Book of Mormon.

Had (been) spake

There are 12 instances of pluperfect *had spake* in the Book of Mormon, but none in the King James Bible or in pseudo-biblical writings. There are also 48 instances of *had spoken* found in the earliest text (for both these counts I exclude passive constructions involving *had been*). The more common form of the past participle occurs 80 percent of the time in the pluperfect tense in the Book of Mormon; the less common form, *had spake*, occurs 20 percent of the time.⁵⁰

I have found, by carefully searching EEBO and Google Books and rejecting many false positives, that the only time *had spake* wasn't rare in the textual record was the latter half of the early modern era.⁵¹ Even then, however, this particular leveled past participial usage was quite uncommon. The other minority variant of the past participle used in the pluperfect — *had spoke* — is found much more often than *had spake* in earlier English. (*Had spoke* is typical Shakespearean usage, but it is not found in either the Book of Mormon or the King James Bible.) After the year 1700 we hardly encounter original instances of *had spake* in the textual record. Because of an explosion of publishing there are cases of it, but very few. One example is found in an 1812 book published in Troy,

49. Legal books containing old statutory language with the wording do not have as many instances as the Book of Mormon has.

50. The leveling does not occur in the present perfect.

51. It does occur earlier, as shown by an early Oxford English Dictionary example and at least two late 16th-century instances, one from EEBO and one from Google Books. The second edition of the OED has the following example under **sp^{ea}k**, *verb*, at the end of section A4(ε), which contains forms of the past participle: “*[circa]* 1500 *Three Kings' Sons* 61 That he had spake to hym”.

New York. As a result, we must accept that there is a slight possibility the Book of Mormon's *had spake* could have come from Joseph Smith's dialect. As a result, we must rely on ancillary evidence to determine whether the Book of Mormon's 12 occurrences of *had spake* are best viewed as examples of Early Modern English or modern dialectal usage.

Two items of related past participle evidence lend support for viewing the 12 instances of *had spake* in the Book of Mormon as an archaism rather than examples of rare modern usage. First, we note that *had been spake* occurs once at Alma 6:8. As of now, the two-word passive phrase *been spake* has been found only three times in the textual record: "this had not **been spake** of at all" [1646, EEBO A26759]; "the spiritual afflictions have **been spake** of much" [1659, EEBO A30566]; and "one had **been spake** to about it" [1699, EEBO A48010]. The bigram *been spake* has not yet been found after the year 1699, suggesting that any late modern example that might turn up in the future will be quite rare. Second, we note that the distinctive five-word phrase "of which hath been spoken" — meaning 'previously mentioned' or 'aforementioned' — occurs twice in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. (Variants with the expletive subject *it* are known — that is, of the form "of which **it** hath been spoken," so the syntax is probably singular.) Currently there are approximately 30 known instances of this phraseology in the EEBO database of approximately 60,000 texts, but none attested after the year 1685. These two related items support the Book of Mormon's use of *had spake* as an archaism.

In summary, it is unlikely that we would read "had (been) spake" and "of which hath been spoken" a total of 15 times in the canonical Book of Mormon text if Joseph Smith had been responsible for its wording, from either his own language or an attempt to follow King James style. We encounter this same set of circumstances repeatedly in the Book of Mormon: lexis and syntax that Joseph probably would not have produced by following 1820s American dialect, pseudo-biblical writings, or King James language.

The {-th} plural

Lengthy biblical passages in the earliest text contain instances of what may accurately be called Early Modern English modifications that are **not** biblical in nature. These include cases of {-th} inflection used with persons other than the third-person singular,⁵² such as "them that

52. This inflection usually occurred with the third-person plural, but not always. It could occur with *we* and *ye* or *you* as well. There is also attested usage of {-th} inflection with first-person and second-person **singular** subjects.

contendeth” (2Nephi 6:17), “they dieth” (2 Nephi 7:2), and “I have put ... and hath covered” (2Nephi 8:16).

Even though {-th} inflection could occur historically in all person-number contexts, linguists have come to call the inflection — when used with subjects that aren’t third-person singular — the {-th} plural, since that was the primary usage in the past. It was a less-common option of the early modern period, emanating from southern varieties of Middle English. The {-th} plural can be found throughout the early modern era, but it was used at a diminishing rate over time. By the 18th century, only vestigial use of the {-th} plural remained, usually with the auxiliary verbs *doth* and *hath*.⁵³

The two earliest pseudo-biblical writings examined in this study have examples of the {-th} plural, with the earliest one containing five of them:

1774–1775, John Leacock, *American Chronicles*, 1:5, 1:10, 2:33, 4:15, 6:47
 their SHIPS, *that goeth* upon the waters
 these LETTERS in mine hand **witnesseth** sore against them
 these are the EXTORTIONERS ... *that causeth* the kingdom
 to pass away
 the pious ashes of THEM *that sleepeth*
 for blessed are all THEY *that shaketh* hands with them in peace

Leacock employed a somewhat limited variety of the {-th} plural, four times after the relative pronoun *that*, and once in a possible case of proximity agreement with singular *hand*.

Snowden’s text has two examples:

1793, Richard Snowden, *The American Revolution*, 18:14, 34:17
 Nevertheless there were some who maintained their integrity,
 and were as the strong OAKS in the forests of Columbia,
that feareth not the windy storm and tempest.
 for vice and luxury weaken the people,
 and the RULERS **causeth** them to err.

In verse 18:14 the agreement controller is *oaks*. In this case there is also the possibility of proximity agreement with the nearest singular

53. For some discussion of this linguistic phenomenon, see Charles Barber, *Early Modern English* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997), 169; Roger Lass, “Phonology and Morphology” quoted in Roger Lass, ed., *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 165–66.

nominal *Columbia*. In verse 34:17 the {-th} plural occurs after a plural noun-phrase subject, something that was very rare by the end of the 18th century. Notice that there is also nearby variation, since *weakeneth* wasn't used after the complex subject "vice and luxury."

Linning's text has two possible examples, but the subjects are probably singular:

1809, Matthew Linning, *Book of Napoleon*, 6:11, 12:7

by means of your WISDOM and COUNSEL,
which **reacheth** from the earth beneath unto the heaven above,
so in like manner **doth** the PRINCE and his PEOPLE.

The first example has two conjoined abstract nouns; multiple nouns of this kind often resolve to a singular noun phrase in English, even up to the present day. This example is similar to the language of 1 Kings 10:7 — "thy WISDOM and PROSPERITY **exceedeth** the fame which I heard"⁵⁴ — where the verb translated as *exceedeth* precedes the abstract nouns in the Hebrew and is singular in form (although many later translations into English do use a plural verb). In the second case, the conjoined agreement controllers follow the verb, and the closest one to the verb is singular. It may be helpful to consider that for many English speakers — if not most — similar phraseology would be unobjectionable (e.g. "so **does** the queen and her people").

At first blush, Leacock's and Snowden's {-th} plural usage suggests that Joseph Smith might have been able to produce the archaic {-th} plural of the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. I will mention here a few things to consider on this point.

First and foremost, there is no {-th} plural usage immediately following pronouns in these pseudo-biblical texts, such as "they dieth" or "we layeth" or "ye doth." The Book of Mormon has 13 of these, setting it apart from what we find in the King James Bible and in the four pseudo-biblical texts.

Second, there are close to 150 instances of the {-th} plural in the Book of Mormon. Despite its relatively late date of composition, the earliest text of the Book of Mormon employs the {-th} plural at nearly twice the rate of Leacock's text and at about 20 times the rate of Snowden's text.

Third, overall usage patterns in the earliest text match Early Modern English tendencies non-superficially.⁵⁵ The {-th} plural is employed with

54. See Stanford Carmack, "The Case of the {-th} Plural in the Earliest Text," *Interpreter* 18 (2016): 88; also see the more general discussion on pages 86–89.

55. See Royal Skousen, *Grammatical Variation* (Provo, UT: FARMS and BYU Studies, 2016), 465–74.

all the variety of earlier English: after noun phrases and pronouns; after relative pronouns and in conjoined predicates, with different kinds of nearby variation; and with first-person and second-person subjects. Also, there is little of its usage after pronouns and heavier rates of use after relative pronouns, as in EEBO Phase 1 texts.⁵⁶ None of the pseudo-biblical texts have enough data to be sure of this; they have no usage after pronouns or first- and second-person subjects, and none in conjoined predicates. The fact that there is no usage of the type “they dieth,” or “we layeth,” or “ye doth,” or “I have ... and hath,” as we encounter in the Book of Mormon, means that these texts are somewhat limited in their usage of the {-th} plural.

Fourth, taking the two Linning examples shown above to be singular means that the 19th-century pseudo-biblical writings do not have examples of the {-th} plural. These pseudo-biblical authors were further removed from the end of the 17th century, when the {-th} plural was becoming rare. Consequently, they were less likely to be aware of the historical usage of this particular verb morphology. Therefore, it isn’t surprising that they didn’t employ the {-th} plural, and it also makes the robust usage of the Book of Mormon exceptional.

The following Book of Mormon passage contains two examples of the {-th} plural as well as nearby variation:

Mosiah 3:18

but MEN **drinketh** damnation to their own souls
 except THEY **humble** themselves *and* **become** as little children,
and **believeth** that salvation was, and is, and is to come, in and
 through the atoning blood of Christ, the Lord Omnipotent.

In this verse {-th} inflection is employed after the noun *men* (similar to Snowden’s “rulers causeth”) and also in a conjoined predicate. “**They humble themselves and become ... and believeth**” is an example of an optional Early Modern English THEY-constraint, where the {-th} inflection is used only in a predicate linked to *they* but not immediately after *they*.⁵⁷ It should be noted, however, that in both Early Modern English and in the Book of Mormon counterexamples are found — that is, where the {-th} inflection is found immediately after *they*, but not in the conjoined predicate. The reason linguists write of a THEY-constraint is that in Early Modern English and later the pronoun *they* used next to a verb in {-th} was much less common than verbs in {-th} used in conjoined predicates (and in relative clauses).

56. See Carmack, “The Case of the {-th} Plural,” 103–4.

57. Laura Wright, “Third Person Plural Present Tense Markers In London Prisoners’ Depositions, 1562–1623,” *American Speech* 77, no. 3 (2002): 242–45.

Thorough analysis of the earliest text's {-th} plural patterns demonstrates that the Book of Mormon's systematic usage in this domain is attested, archaic, and well-formed from the point of view of Early Modern English. This is one way the present-tense verbal system of the Book of Mormon is archaic and extra-biblical. This also points to the occasional third-person singular usage of {-s} forms in the earliest text being typical Early Modern English variation rather than occasional slip-ups by Joseph Smith.

Verbal complementation patterns after five verbs

This next section mainly focuses on whether the verbal complement following five high-frequency verbs — *cause*, *command*, *desire*, *make*, and *suffer* — is infinitival or finite. Also of concern is whether finite cases are simple or complex, and whether a modal auxiliary verb occurs in the complement. As an example, consider the following Book of Mormon excerpt:

3 Nephi 2:3

causing [them]_{object 1}

[**that** they **should** do great wickedness in the land]_{object 2}

This is ditransitive or dual-object syntax: the verb *cause* takes two objects. The first object in the above example is a pronoun and the second object is a clause: a sentence follows the conjunction (or complementizer) *that*. In this case the following sentence is “they should do great wickedness in the land,” and it contains the modal auxiliary verb *should*. Modal auxiliary usage is a sign of archaism, especially *shall*, and the Book of Mormon has plenty of it. The above syntax can also be called a **complex** finite construction, since an extra constituent occurs before the *that*-clause. Complex finite syntax is a strong marker of archaism.

The one-object equivalent of the above 3 Nephi 2:3 language would have no *them*: “causing [Ø] that they should do great wickedness in the land.” Such simple finite syntax is by far the most common type of finite complementation found in the textual record of English.

The infinitival equivalent of this 3 Nephi 2:3 language would have *to* instead of *that they should*: “causing them **to** do great wickedness in the land.” Infinitival complementation is the most common type in English after many verbs, including the five studied here. The Book of Mormon has more than 100 examples of all three types: the infinitival, the simple finite, and the complex finite.

There are different ways to count complementation, each with their own advantages and disadvantages. For the following analyses I have adopted a conservative approach and have not counted any conjoined cases unless there is a switch in complementation type. There are arguably errors in the counts I have made, and perhaps a few examples that have been overlooked, but none that should affect the results materially.⁵⁸

In general, the Book of Mormon has much more finite complementation than the King James Bible and pseudo-biblical texts. The differences are quite large with four of the five verbs, none more so than in the case of *cause*.

Complementation patterns following the verb *cause*

Finite complementation rates

(finite clauses governed by the verb *cause*)

- King James Bible 1.0% (out of 303 instances)
- Book of Mormon 57.6% (out of 236 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0.0% (out of 37 instances total)

Instances of archaic, ditransitive syntax

- King James Bible 0
- Book of Mormon 12
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0

These two short lists show that verbal complementation following the verb *cause* in the Book of Mormon is utterly different from that of the King James Bible and the pseudo-biblical texts. As indicated, the above figures are based on an examination of hundreds of examples in both the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible, and 37 examples total in the four pseudo-biblical texts. Chi-square tests run on simple finite, complex finite, and infinitival counts — comparing the Book of Mormon with the King James Bible or with the four pseudo-biblical texts — are statistically significant to a very high degree. This is true for the verbal complementation patterns after four of the verbs.⁵⁹ This means that the

58. Royal Skousen has independently counted examples of verbal complementation, and I have incorporated some of his work here.

59. In the case of the *desire*, which is the verb with the weakest chi-square test of Book of Mormon and King James verbal complementation, the probability is

syntactic differences are almost certainly not accidental. In the case at hand, it means either that Joseph deliberately produced these syntactic structures (since the patterns were vastly different from his own modern patterns), or that they were part of the English-language translation transmitted to him.

As indicated, pseudo-biblical texts only employ infinitival complementation after the verb *cause*. The chi-square test indicates consistency with biblical influence, in this case. For Leacock's text, I have counted 14 infinitival instances of extended *cause* syntax, for Snowden's text 11, for Linning's text 4, and for Hunt's text I have counted 8. This consistent pattern matches modern tendencies and is similar to what we see in authors contemporary with the initial publication of the Book of Mormon, such as Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper. I made two small corpora of about five million words each from dozens of texts written by these prolific authors. After isolating hundreds of examples in past-tense contexts, I found that these two authors employed only infinitival *cause* syntax.

The King James Bible is 99 percent infinitival in its *cause* complementation: it has only three instances of finite *cause* syntax. In contrast, the Book of Mormon has 136 cases of finite *cause* syntax. One might assert that Book of Mormon usage was a vast expansion based on these three biblical examples. But what about the other extra-biblical, archaic *cause* syntax present in the earliest text? Most obviously, how does one account for the 12 dual-object causative constructions, exemplified by 3 Nephi 2:3 above? How are they biblical hypercorrections when there is no such syntax in the King James Bible? These are the kinds of questions a thorough analyst must confront.

The level of finite *cause* syntax in the Book of Mormon is very high — much higher than Early Modern English averages, which probably varied between three and one percent, in a roughly descending trend over time. Of course, outliers do exist in the print record. For example, one mid-16th-century text I inspected employed finite *cause* syntax about 13 percent of the time (6 out of 45 instances).⁶⁰ Thus, a textual rate

still quite low, just not vanishingly small: $p < 0.001$. There isn't enough data in the pseudo-biblical texts to make a valid comparison for this verb.

60. Giovanni Battista Gelli, *Circes of Iohn Baptista Gello, Florentine*, trans. Henry Iden (London: 1558) (EEBO A68089). Royal Skousen independently counted 6 finite instances out of 44 possible cases. These two separate counts provide confidence that the actual number of cases of *cause* syntax with verbal complementation in this 1558 text is either 44 or 45 or very close to it.

significantly higher than the currently estimated upper-bound average of three percent is attested.

Overall, *cause* syntax with verbal complements was implemented in the Book of Mormon in a variety of contexts in a principled manner, pointing to tacit knowledge of various tendencies of Early Modern English.

First, the Book of Mormon has 12 instances of dual-object complementation, as in the above example from 3 Nephi 2:3. This uncommon archaic construction can be found a few dozen times in EEBO, but it may have been obsolete by the late modern period. The high number of archaic ditransitive structures decisively marks Book of Mormon *cause* syntax as Early Modern English in character.

Second, the Book of Mormon exhibits extra-biblical auxiliary usage in the embedded clause with *shall* (13 times) and *may* (3 times). Although such usage can still be found in the late modern period, its rate of use by then was low compared to the rate of the earlier period.

Third, the earliest text contains one case of mixed complementation, also characteristic of the earlier period:

Mormon 8:40

why do ye ... **cause that** widows **should** mourn before the Lord, and also orphans **to** mourn before the Lord, and also the blood of their fathers and their husbands **to** cry unto the Lord from the ground, for vengeance upon your heads?

1643, William Prynne, *The Popish Royal Favorite* [EEBO A56192]

He **caused** the image of the cross **to** be redressed, and **that** men **should** not foul it under their feet.

The following nominal example has the same order of complementation as Mormon 8:40:

1651, Jeremiah Burroughs (died 1646), *An Exposition [on] the Prophecy of Hosea* [EEBO 30575]

for the act was so foul, that it could not but make all the people (as Jacob thought) to abhor him, and would be a **cause that** they **should** all rise against him, and utterly **to** cut him off,

Fourth, the earliest text optionally leaves out *that* in finite complementation with the verb *cause*, but only in conjoined syntax, as in the following example (where [∅] indicates a missing *that*):

3 Nephi 3:14

he **caused that**, fortifications **should** be built round about them, and [∅], the strength thereof **should** be exceeding great

These constructions can be explained by possible analogous usage after many other verbs, but the *that*-ellipsis is constrained in Book of Mormon causatives — that is, restricted to this particular syntactic context. The *that*-ellipsis is similar to the syntax of the following Early Modern English examples, which have mixed complementation:

1566, William Adlington (translator),
Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* [EEBO A20800]
When the people was desirous to see me play qualities,
they **caused** the gates **to** be shut, **and** [Ø] such
as entered in **should** pay money,

1629, Nathanael Brent (translator),
Paolo Sarpi's *The History of the Council of Trent* [EEBO A11516]
He **caused** a bull **to** be made, **and** in case he should
die before his return, [Ø] the election **should** be
made in Rome by the College of Cardinals.

The following nominal example has more obvious *that*-ellipsis:

1678, Thomas Long, *Mr. Hales's Treatise of Schism
Examined and Censured* [EEBO A49123]
It was none of the old **cause, that**, the People **should** have liberty,
and [Ø]_i the Magistrate **should** have no power,

To finish this subsection on extended *cause* syntax, we consider the following rare language, which was removed after the 1830 edition (page 513, line 10):

3 Nephi 29:4
if ye shall spurn at his doings
he will **cause it that it shall** soon overtake you

The first *it* was removed for the 1837 edition, although not marked in the printer's manuscript for deletion by Joseph Smith. The reader may consult Skousen, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon* for a good discussion, as well as Skousen, *Grammatical Variation*, 308, 1050.

The above excerpt is a poor candidate for biblical hypercorrection for the following three reasons (arranged according to currently perceived significance):

- the pronominal *it* redundancy isn't implemented in other similar, dependent complementation in the biblical text where an infinitival *to* could have replaced the *that it shall* part (generally, "that it [<auxiliary>]");⁶¹

61. Specifically, the 3 Nephi 29:4 example could have been phrased as "he will cause it **to** soon overtake you." In infinitival complementation the adverb *soon*

- the verb *cause* never governs a dual-object complement in the biblical text (the above construction was rare in the early modern period, and is currently unattested in the late modern period, suggesting 18th-century obsolescence);
- the auxiliary *shall* is not used in the complement after the verb *cause* in the biblical text.⁶²

Here are the four examples of the “CAUSE it that it” phraseology of 3 Nephi 29:4 that I have found thus far:

1616, translation of *La maison rustique* [EEBO A00419]

To prevent the decay of beer,
and to **cause it that it may** continue and stand good a long time,

1626, Henry Burton, *A plea to an appeal
traversed dialogue wise* [EEBO A17306]

For how is it mere mercy, if any good in us foreseen,
first **caused it, that it should** offer a Savior to us?

The larger context does not clearly point to the comma indicating a purposive or resultative reading.

1634, Thomas Johnson (translator), Ambroise Paré *Works* [EEBO A08911]

which **causeth it that it cannot** be discussed and resolved
by reason of the weakness of the part and defect of heat

1697 [commonly misattributed to John Locke] *A common-place book
to the Holy Bible* [EEBO A48873]

When this Epistle is read among you,
cause it that it be read also in the Church of Laodicea,

Earlier and later editions don’t have the ditransitive syntax.
This is a paraphrase of Colossians 4:16, which reads as follows:

And when this Epistle is read amongst you,
cause [ø] that it be read also in the church of **the** Laodiceans;

From all the causative structures I’ve been able to study and compare — in EEBO, Google Books, the scriptural texts, and elsewhere — neither the King James Bible nor the four pseudo-biblical writings appear to

would split *to* from the infinitive. In Early Modern English an adverbial constituent increased the likelihood of finite complementation after the verb *command*. This phenomenon would have had general applicability to other high-frequency complementation verbs like *cause*.

62. However, the related auxiliary *should* is used twice after the verb *cause*, at John 11:37 and Revelation 13:15, and *shall* is used once after the closely related verb *make* at 2 Peter 1:8.

have been adequate models for the archaic implementation of *cause* syntax found in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon.

Complementation patterns following the verb *command*

In the case of the verb *command*, both the King James Bible and the four pseudo-biblical texts have appreciable levels of finite complementation, but nothing that approaches Book of Mormon levels:

Finite complementation rates
(finite clauses governed by the verb *command*)

- King James Bible 25.5% (out of 167 instances)
- Book of Mormon 77.2% (out of 165 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 25.7% (out of 35 instances total)

Instances of archaic, ditransitive syntax

- King James Bible 19
- Book of Mormon 99
- Pseudo-biblical texts 1 (Snowden)

The Book of Mormon is again markedly different from both the King James Bible and the four pseudo-biblical texts in terms of extended *command* syntax, in the two ways shown above and in other ways. The four pseudo-biblical writings analyzed for this study do not employ dual-object syntax except in one complex case involving mixed complementation.⁶³ Their finite complementation rates are similar to the King James Bible's.

We must go back almost 350 years to find a text that has close to the number of instances of dual-object *command* syntax that the Book of Mormon has. William Caxton's translation of *The Golden Legend* [1483, EEBO A14559] has about 65 instances of dual-object *command* syntax in fully active constructions; the Book of Mormon has about 75 instances

63. Snowden's case of mixed complementation could be analyzed either way, but a ditransitive reading for "that they should make all speed" is likely if we take the following complex infinitival "to sail . . . and help" to be governed by the verb *command*: "he **commanded** his sea-captains, **to make** ready a navy of ships; and **take** large store of the destroying engines, and other implements for war; and **that they should make** all speed, **to sail** for the land of Columbia, and **help** the people of the Provinces, against their mighty adversaries, the men of Britain." (*The American Revolution*, 38:2).

of dual-object *command* syntax in fully active constructions. (These texts have many additional examples in passive structures.)

The biblical hypercorrection view takes the Book of Mormon's heavy finite usage — both simple and complex — to be an overexpansion of the King James Bible's finite syntax. Yet there are other considerations that a thorough analyst must take into account.

First, the Book of Mormon employs the auxiliary *shall* in the complement clause seven times. This is absent from the King James Bible and from pseudo-biblical writings and is either early modern usage or uncommon late modern literary usage.

Second, the tendency of Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577) to not use a modal auxiliary verb after second-person embedded subjects is present in the Book of Mormon, as is an infinitival tendency when the verb *command* is in the passive voice.⁶⁴

Third, the Book of Mormon is almost completely consistent in employing finite complementation in several specific contexts with complex embedded syntax: with embedded negation, reflexives, passives, and multiple verb phrases. In other words, "heavy" verbal complements are usually finite.

Fourth, *should* (not *shall*) is used after non-past passive *command* verbs (e.g. "we **are** commanded that we **should** ..."), in line with Early Modern English tendencies (this conclusion is based on extensive searches of the EEBO Phase 1 database).

Fifth, there is an unlikely match with the nearby *shall/should* variation employed by the following prolific translator:

1608, Edward Grimeston (translator), Jean François le Petit's
A general history of the Netherlands [EEBO A02239]

The said magistrates therefore **command**
that every man **shall** govern himself ...,
and that every one **should** behave himself peaceably,
without upbraiding or crossing one another,

Textual analysis reveals that the presence of the reflexive pronouns in this example made the choice of finite complementation more likely for the translator Grimeston. For example, the King James Bible employs finite complementation at a significantly higher rate with embedded reflexives.

64. These observations are based on an analysis of more than 600 instances of *command* syntax that take verbal complements in Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577). The embedded second-person subject pattern is probably more significant than the passive pattern, which may be derivable by analogous usage in many other cases.

Alma 61:13

But behold he doth not **command** us that we **shall** subject ourselves to our enemies, but that we **should** put our trust in him, and he will deliver us.

Alma 61:13 combines several Early Modern English possibilities: finite complementation with a reflexive verb, a dual-object construction, and a switch in modal auxiliary marking (from *shall* to *should*). It seems unlikely that Joseph would have produced such a mix of archaic syntax.

In conclusion, had Joseph followed the usage of pseudo-biblical writings or the King James Bible to formulate the Book of Mormon's extended *command* syntax, either consciously or subconsciously, we would expect few instances of the archaic, ditransitive construction, not 99 of them. In addition, complementation would have been mostly infinitival, similar to what is found in the pseudo-biblical texts. All this reduces the likelihood that Joseph was responsible for formulating the wording of the text in this case.

Complementation patterns following the verb *desire*

For this subsection I have examined contexts in which the subject of the verb *desire* and the subject of its complement are **distinct**. This keeps the analysis in line with the syntactic structures involving the verbs *cause* and *command* (in the active voice).⁶⁵

Finite complementation rates

(finite clauses governed by the verb *desire*)

- King James Bible 66.7% (out of 18 instances)
- Book of Mormon 93.1% (out of 58 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 50.0% (out of 2 instances total)

Instances of archaic, ditransitive syntax

- King James Bible 9
- Book of Mormon 16
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0

Finite complementation in the Book of Mormon in this domain exceeds what is found in the King James Bible, both in numbers and in rate: 58 instances versus 18 instances; 93 percent finite versus 67 percent

65. There are no passive instances of the verb *desire* with verbal complements.

finite. But against what we see in extended *cause* and *command* syntax, an object occurs before a *that*-clause at a lower rate in the Book of Mormon than it does in the King James Bible: 30 percent of the time versus 75 percent of the time. In other words, ditransitive *desire* syntax is the most common type in the King James Bible but not in the Book of Mormon, which often employs a **simple** finite structure. Furthermore, while the biblical text strongly prefers the auxiliary *would*, the Book of Mormon prefers the auxiliary *should*, the least common of the three principal modal auxiliaries used after the verb *desire* in the earlier print record of English (shown by extensive searches of the EEBO Phase 1 database).

In the four pseudo-biblical texts examined for this study, there are only two instances of *desire* used with verbal complementation — one is finite, the other infinitival:

1809, Matthew Linning, *Book of Napoleon*, 18:9

And the angel yet again **desired** me **to** turn
mine eyes the way toward the north,

1793, Richard Snowden, *The American Revolution*, 33:14

Now he had **desired that** the usual ceremonies
of the dead **should** be omitted,⁶⁶

The Book of Mormon employs a wider range of auxiliaries than the King James Bible does, including *may* and *might* as well as non-past *shall* (EEBO shows that *shall* auxiliary usage after the verb *desire* was uncommon in Early Modern English). In addition, the Book of Mormon also matches earlier English by employing several objects in *of*-constructions and two instances of *that*-ellipsis in contextually favored environments: in a conjoined clause and after a *wh*-phrase.

The wide array of archaic, finite syntax after the verb *desire* found in the Book of Mormon clearly could not have been derived from pseudo-biblical writings, since they only have two examples total. Rather, the Book of Mormon is the consummate example of archaic possibilities in this domain.

66. This Snowden excerpt ends as follows: “and that he might be privately buried by his own servants.” The Book of Mormon also has two examples of this same, co-referential *desire* syntax with “that <subject> might.” In Snowden’s text it occurs after a case of finite complementation with a *that*-clause and a distinct subject. Snowden could have employed infinitival *to* instead of “that he might,” but he probably chose “that he might,” perhaps subconsciously, in order to parallel prior finite “that <subject> should.” In other words, Snowden probably chose to avoid mixed complementation in 33:14.

The closest match between the scriptural texts occurs in the case of infinitival complementation; in both texts the infinitival option is employed with verbs whose argument structure is simple (usually intransitive), but the Book of Mormon is stricter in this regard.

Complementation patterns following the verb *make*

Finite complementation rates

(finite clauses governed by the verb *make*)

- King James Bible 0.3% (out of 291 instances)
- Book of Mormon 55.6% (out of 9 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0.0% (out of 11 instances total)

Instances of archaic, ditransitive syntax

- King James Bible 1
- Book of Mormon 4
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0

One apparent difference between the scriptural texts resides in the frequency of verbal complementation after the verb *make*. The Book of Mormon has far fewer examples of this syntax than the King James Bible. The rate of usage of this syntactic structure in the biblical text is about 10 times higher. The Book of Mormon prefers to express the notion with the verb *cause*.

The Book of Mormon is close to 56 percent finite in its verbal complementation after the verb *make*. In contrast, the King James Bible is nearly 100 percent infinitival, and pseudo-biblical writings are 100 percent infinitival. Specifically, Leacock employed seven infinitival instances, Snowden three,⁶⁷ Linning one, and Hunt zero.

Clearly, syntactic patterns involving the verb *make* and verbal complements in the Book of Mormon are distinct from both King James and pseudo-biblical patterns. The one biblical example of finite complementation was apparently too obscure for pseudo-biblical writers to notice or to prompt them to adopt language mirroring this characteristically archaic usage. This particular case stems from Tyndale's earlier phraseology:

67. Snowden's three examples occur in an appended poem, *The Columbiad*, which has not been included in other analyses, and is not currently in the WordCruncher version. It can be found online at <https://archive.org/stream/americanrevoluti00snow#page/n367>.

2 Peter 1:8

they **make you that ye shall** neither be barren nor unfruitful
in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1534, William Tyndale, *The New Testament* [EEBO A68940]

they will **make you that ye** neither **shall** be idle nor unfruitful
in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

they wyll make you that ye nether shalbe ydle nor vnfrutefull
in the knowledge of oure lorde Iesus Christ

If one wished to sound archaic, this would be an ideal structure to emulate. Yet the pseudo-biblical texts do not have anything that comes close to it. In contrast, the Book of Mormon employed this type of syntax several times (with different auxiliaries, both with and without a noun-phrase object after the verb *make*). In this way, it once again surpassed pseudo-biblical writings in archaic usage. And in the case of the verb *make*, the Book of Mormon also exceeded the King James Bible in archaic usage, implementing the less common finite construction at 15 times the rate of the biblical text and employing three specific structures not found in the biblical text.

Embedded auxiliary usage in the Book of Mormon is varied after the verb *make* — *may*, *could*, *shall*, and no auxiliary — and the match in this regard with broader Early Modern English is solid. As one example, the simple finite syntax of 1 Nephi 17:12 (“will make that they food shall become sweet;” structurally “MAKE that <subject> shall <infinitive>”) matches earlier English usage, including one translation of an Ezekiel passage by Tyndale.

Finally, there is a striking match between the curious language of Ether 12:24 and that found in a 1675 example with the verb *cause*:

Ether 12:24

for thou madest **him**_i that **the things which he**_i wrote were mighty
even as thou art, unto the overpowering of man to read them

1675, John Rowe, *The Saints' Temptations* [EEBO A57737]

it was Christ's prayer for Peter,
that caused **him**_i that **his**_i **faith** did not fail.

In both cases — ditransitive causative constructions — the first object of the causative verb (*him*) and the subject of the complement clause are distinct, but the embedded subject contains a pronoun (*he* or *his*) that refers to the preceding object (shown by the index *i*).

Complementation patterns following the verb *suffer*

Finite complementation rates

(finite clauses governed by the verb *suffer*)

- King James Bible 4.6% (out of 65 instances)
- Book of Mormon 62.6% (out of 99 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 6.9% (out of 29 instances)

Instances of archaic, ditransitive syntax

- King James Bible 2
- Book of Mormon 15
- Pseudo-biblical texts 2 (Leacock and Snowden)

The Book of Mormon is the text that exhibits a comprehensive match with much of Early Modern English usage after the verb *suffer*. It easily surpasses the four pseudo-biblical texts in the use of a variety of syntactic structures found in earlier English with the archaic verb *suffer*. Though King James translators knew of this usage, they employed very little of it.

The Book of Mormon employs finite complementation after the verb *suffer* nearly 63 percent of the time. Dual-object constructions occur 15 times in the text after the verb *suffer*: five times with *should*, four times with *shall*, twice with *may*, and four times with no auxiliary. This is an exceptional level of archaic usage. In contrast, the four pseudo-biblical texts contain 29 instances total of the archaic verb *suffer* used with verbal complements; their combined **infinitival** rate is 93 percent. The King James Bible's infinitival rate is close to this at 95.4 percent. The Book of Mormon's infinitival rate of 37.4 percent is clearly very much lower than either of these.

Early Modern English employed infinitival complementation exclusively (or nearly so) with reflexive objects (e.g. "Christ suffered **himself to be taken**").⁶⁸ The Book of Mormon is sensitive to this tendency, employing infinitival complementation in such contexts 12 out of 14 times, strongly against its typical usage. This makes it difficult to argue that finite complementation in the Book of Mormon was employed in an

68. It is, of course, possible that a finite reflexive example of extended *suffer* syntax is somewhere in EEBO or elsewhere.

unprincipled fashion, without regard for tendencies of earlier English. Instead we find that finite *suffer* syntax wasn't employed indiscriminately in the Book of Mormon text.

The best fit between the Book of Mormon and the textual record of English in this domain is the 16th century. My current conclusion is that neither the King James Bible nor pseudo-biblical writings could have served as adequate templates for the wide variety of syntactic forms found in the Book of Mormon after the archaic verb *suffer*.

A comparison of verbal complementation after five verbs

Now that we have considered the verbal complementation of five high-frequency verbs — *cause*, *command*, *desire*, *make*, and *suffer* — we can make a side-by-side comparison of the patterns found in the Book of Mormon, the King James Bible, and the four pseudo-biblical writings:

Table 3. Finite complementation rates
(object clauses governed by the verb).

Verb	King James Bible	Book of Mormon	Pseudo-biblical texts
desire	66.7	93.1	50.0
command	25.5	77.2	25.7
suffer	4.6	62.6	6.9
cause	1.0	57.6	0.0
make	0.3	55.6	0.0

The large differences in finite complementation rates are apparent. Simple statistical tests of standard deviation indicate that Book of Mormon verbal complementation after these five verbs is more consistent than that of the King James Bible and more consistent than that of the pseudo-biblical set of texts, taken as a whole. The five-term correlations are all strong, but the closest is between the King James Bible and the pseudo-biblical set at 0.998. What is more noteworthy, statistically speaking, is that the pseudo-biblical set does not approach the Book of Mormon's rate of finite complementation in every case but the verb *desire*, which isn't sufficiently represented in the four pseudo-biblical texts.

The Book of Mormon adopts higher finite complementation rates across the board, independent of biblical usage, and similar to the high *command* syntax rates found in at least two of William Caxton's

late 15th-century translations.⁶⁹ By employing high doses of finite complementation after verbs, the Book of Mormon contains language that is, from a syntactic standpoint, plainer and more versatile.

Such high finite rates are neither biblical, pseudo-biblical, or modern. Averages of the early modern period are also lower than Book of Mormon rates, though closer than the very low averages of the late modern period. Auxiliary usage of the earlier period is a very good match with Book of Mormon usage, as well as dual-object tendencies and other less noticeable features mentioned previously. This means that if Joseph Smith was the author or English-language translator of the Book of Mormon, then he must have deliberately produced all this divergent finite syntax that was a best fit with early modern usage, including ditransitive syntax:

Table 4. Archaic, ditransitive rates (instances per million words).

Verb	King James Bible (~ 790,000 words)	Book of Mormon (~ 250,000 words)	Pseudo-biblical texts (~125,000 words total)
command	24	396	8
desire	11	64	0
suffer	2	60	16
cause	0	48	0
make	1	16	0

Moreover, Joseph must have dramatically increased biblical levels of finite complementation while not doing so indiscriminately — that is, he must have occasionally departed from heavy finite usage in a principled manner. It seems quite unlikely that he would have been successful at such a task. No pseudo-biblical author came close to what is found in the Book of Mormon. There are a number of archaic features of complementation missing from the four pseudo-biblical writings in this domain. This argues against Joseph having been the author or English-language translator of the Book of Mormon.

If we approach this from the angle of the pseudo-biblical authors, we realize that they give us an indication of the archaism that Joseph Smith was likely to have produced in this domain, if his effort was a conscious attempt to imitate biblical archaism. He went beyond them in almost every

69. *Recueil of the histories of Troy* [1473 or 1474, EEBO A05232] and *Legenda aurea sanctorum [The Golden Legend]* [1483, EEBO A14559].

way possible. We reasonably assume that he lacked native-speaker Early Modern English competence, as the pseudo-biblical authors did. They could only go as far as persistent use and biblical knowledge could take them, along with making a reasonable number of analogical connections. Joseph exceeded biblical archaism in a number of ways, matching broader Early Modern English usage as he did so. The pseudo-biblical set informs us that the verbal complementation he dictated was unlikely for him, on multiple levels: rates of finite complementation and ditransitive syntax, as well as modal auxiliary usage. On top of that, the Book of Mormon text contains archaic variational patterns that are not present or discoverable in the pseudo-biblical texts.

To finish this discussion of verbal complementation after these five high-frequency verbs, I present here a case of a passive *command* verb whose embedded verb is *suffer*, which itself takes an infinitival complement:

1523, John Bouchier (translator),
Froissart's *Chronicles* (Books 1 and 2) [EEBO A71318]
but they **were** straitly [strictly] **commanded**
that they should in no wise **suffer** him **to** pass out of the castle

The Book of Mormon example that matches this language is particularly interesting because of the ungraceful switch from a *that*-clause (after the verb *suffer*) to an infinitival complement:

Mormon 6:6
And knowing it to be the last struggle of my people,
and having **been commanded** of the Lord
that I should not **suffer that** the records
which had been handed down by our fathers, which were sacred,
to fall into the hands of the Lamanites⁷⁰

Yet there are occasional cases in the textual record of this same mid-stream complementation switch. Here is one with the same verb *suffer*:

1598, A.M. (translator),
Jacques Guillemeau's *The French Chirurgery* [EEBO A02364]
which was also an occasion of his resanation [cure],
because he **suffered that** the truncheon of the lance,
which stuck clean through his head,
to be with force and violence drawn thereout.

And here is another example of this same syntax, after the verb *command*:

70. See Skousen, *Grammatical Variation*, 450.

1485, Thomas Malory, *Le Morte d'Arthur* (written about 1469) [EEBO 21703]

And anon the king **commanded that** none of them upon pain of death **to** mis-say them [revile them] ne [nor] do them any harm

And anone the kynge commaunded that none of them vpon payne of dethe to myssaye them ne doo them ony harme

Various idiosyncrasies of earlier English, such as the above finite-to-infinitival complementation switch, are often found in the earliest text of the Book of Mormon. Many of these textual oddities are not clear candidates for being examples of the “bad grammar” that Joseph Smith might have employed.

Verbal complementation after the adjective *desirous*

Closely related to verbal complementation after the verb *desire* is complementation after the adjective *desirous*. This subsection briefly discusses the usage, since once again Book of Mormon syntax is utterly different from the corresponding biblical and pseudo-biblical syntax.

Finite complementation rates

(finite clauses governed by the adjective *desirous*)

- King James Bible 0.0% (out of 3 instances)
- Book of Mormon 43.1% (out of 58 instances)
- Pseudo-biblical texts 0.0% (out of 3 instances)

The sheer number of instances of the adjective *desirous* taking verbal complements in the Book of Mormon differs from the usage found in the King James Bible and in the four pseudo-biblical writings considered here. An examination of the EEBO database suggests that this Book of Mormon syntax corresponds best with language from the middle of the early modern period.

Pseudo-biblical texts have very few examples of this language (Leacock’s and Hunt’s texts do not have any instances of the adjective *desirous*). The few instances they do contain are either infinitival or participial (modern) in construction:

1793, Richard Snowden, *The American Revolution*, 9:4

yet he was **desirous to** do something to please the king his master, and gain a little honor to himself;

1809, Matthew Linning, *Book of Napoleon*, 13:12, 36

and that thou art **desirous to** foretaste the dreary night of death?

If, O people of Albion, ye are truly **desirous of** preserving
and enjoying the many and invaluable blessings which
the goodness of Providence has vouchsafed to you,

Linning's second example employs *of* with two present participles rather than *to* with infinitives. According to the Google Books Ngram Viewer, *desirous of* became the favored form only after the middle of the 18th century. By the year 1800, *desirous of* was more than twice as common as *desirous to*. The Book of Mormon doesn't have *of* usage after the adjective *desirous*. In this way, syntactically speaking, it is not a modern text in its verbal complementation following the adjective *desirous*, dozens of times.

Excluding the Apocrypha, the adjective *desirous* takes verbal complements in the King James Bible only three times, despite having nearly three times as many words as the Book of Mormon. This means that the biblical usage rate of *desirous* in this regard is less than two percent the rate of the Book of Mormon. In each of the three biblical cases the complements are infinitival:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Luke 23:8 | for he was desirous to see him of a long season, |
| John 16:19 | Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to ask him, |
| 2 Corinthians 11:32 | In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me: |

The governor is the understood subject of the *desirous*-clause, and the verb *be* is ellipted.

Based on little data, the finite complementation rate of the King James Bible following this adjective is zero percent. In contrast, the Book of Mormon's finite complementation rate is close to 43 percent (25 of 58 instances).

Because the King James Bible and two of the pseudo-biblical texts are strictly non-finite in their scarce usage of the adjective *desirous* with verbal complements, they have no examples of the following finite syntactic structures, which are fairly common in the Book of Mormon:

<subject>_i <be verb> desirous
that <subject>_j **should** <infinitive> (19 instances)

<subject>_i <be verb> desirous
that <subject>_j **might** <infinitive> (6 instances)

The Book of Mormon has six examples of the second type listed above — where the subjects are the same (shown by the index *i*): 1 Nephi 10:17, 1 Nephi 17:18, Mosiah 25:17 (two instances), Alma 14:2, Alma 23:16. Two of these are shown below. That the Book of Mormon has six of these is noteworthy, since this figure is close to the number that I have currently been able to isolate in approximately 25,000 EEBO Phase 1 texts. As a result, had Joseph Smith been responsible for the wording found in the six examples of this grammatical construction, it is very likely that the phraseology would have been infinitival or participial.

In the two examples that follow, I have recast the language into what I have determined to be the more likely wording for Joseph to have used if he had been responsible for rendering the words into English. In the following recasting of these excerpts, the same substantives are used along with the adjective *desirous*:

1 Nephi 17:18

And thus my brethren **did complain** against me
and were desirous **that they might not** labor,

RECAST: And thus my brethren **complained** against me
and were desirous **not to** labor.

Alma 14:2

But **the more part** of them were desirous
that they might destroy Alma and Amulek;

RECAST: But **most** of them were desirous **to** destroy Alma and Amulek.

This same reality is present throughout the text of the Book of Mormon, making it highly improbable that the wording flows from what Joseph's own biblically influenced language might have been.

Summary of Findings

Areas addressed in this study have included the following items of linguistic usage: agentive *of* and *by*, *lest* syntax, personal *that*, *which*, and *who(m)*, periphrastic *did*, obsolete *more-part* phraseology, pluperfect *had spake*, the {-th} plural, and patterns of verbal complementation governed by the verbs *cause*, *command*, *desire*, *make*, and *suffer* (also the adjective *desirous*). Here is a summary of the comparative grammatical findings:

- **Agentive of and by:** The Book of Mormon is broadly archaic in this regard, approaching King James levels; pseudo-biblical writings have little agentive *of* usage.

- **Lest syntax:** The overall Book of Mormon pattern is not biblical, pseudo-biblical, or modern; *shall* is used as a modal auxiliary more than a dozen times and there is rare, mixed *should/shall* use; the entire King James Bible has only one passage with *shall* (three instances) and no mixed *should/shall* use; pseudo-biblical writings do not have any examples with *shall*.
- **Relative-pronoun usage with personal antecedents:** The Book of Mormon's overall personal relative-pronoun usage pattern is not biblical, pseudo-biblical, or modern; this solid authorship marker argues strongly against Joseph Smith wording the earliest text.
- **Periphrastic *did*:** Joseph Smith was unlikely to have produced the ubiquitous past-tense syntax of the Book of Mormon; its high rate and syntactic distribution are 16th-century in character, not pseudo-biblical or biblical.
- **More-part phraseology:** Book of Mormon usage is similar to what we see in several writings of the first half of the early modern era; we don't find this obsolete phrase in pseudo-biblical writings; scant King James usage left no impression on them in this regard.
- ***Had (been) spake*:** This leveled past-participial form is absent from the King James Bible and pseudo-biblical writings; the Book of Mormon's use of "had been spake" and "of which hath been spoken" — rare and very uncommon usage of the 17th century, respectively — strongly suggest that the 12 instances of *had spake* in the earliest text are best classified as Early Modern English morphosyntax.
- **The {-th} plural:** The Book of Mormon provides a nearly complete view of the diverse possibilities of {-th} inflection in earlier English; neither the King James Bible nor pseudo-biblical writings do.
- **Verbal complementation:** One cannot generate the Book of Mormon's heavy finite complementation rates from biblical, pseudo-biblical, or modern syntactic patterns; only deep knowledge of Early Modern English possibilities generates its archaic auxiliary usage, heavy doses of ditransitive syntax, and principled variation.

The above comparative linguistic evidence indicates that the Book of Mormon was not fashioned in the image of pseudo-biblical writings, or in the image of the King James Bible, or in the image of Joseph Smith's own language. Nevertheless, Book of Mormon language contains a wealth of archaic forms and structures. This runs counter to the received view of many commentators who have imagined it to be a flawed imitation of biblical language. A variety of substantive linguistic evidence argues that Book of Mormon grammar is deeply and broadly archaic and very different, in one case after another, from both pseudo-biblical grammar and King James style. Many more types of syntax could be given, but the above is sufficient to dismiss the view that pseudo-biblical writings approach the Book of Mormon in archaic form and structure. Those who espouse such a view have ignored crucial syntactic and morphosyntactic evidence.

Biblical Hypercorrection

It is often possible to come up with creative links between Book of Mormon and King James usage. It would be no problem for me to do so in many instances. However, if biblical hypercorrection is properly constrained to cases of actual biblical usage, then it ultimately lacks explanatory value vis-à-vis Book of Mormon grammar, as it fails to explain many individual cases and plenty of systematic usage. In the following list, I mention a few of the issues beyond a lack of pseudo-biblical support (which is generally the case):

- **Agentive of and by:** This is a potential case of considerable biblical influence rather than hypercorrection. Joseph Smith outperformed the four pseudo-biblical authors in this domain.
- **Lest syntax:** The Book of Mormon's heavy *lest–shall* usage is a candidate for biblical hypercorrection, but there is mixed *should/shall* use to account for. If this is a hypercorrection, then Joseph was successful in noticing and expanding on rare biblical usage and matching rare Early Modern English variation.
- **Relative-pronoun usage with personal antecedents:** If one views the Book of Mormon's heavy personal *which* usage as a biblical hypercorrection, then one must (1) ignore the more likely hypercorrection of personal *that*, (2) accept Joseph being able to dictate about 1,000 times against subconscious preferences, (3) disregard correspondence with some less-

common Early Modern English usage, and (4) dismiss counterevidence from Joseph's 1832 History, which has archaizing elements in it.

- **Periphrastic *did*:** Bowen views this as a biblical hypercorrection. Things to be explained are the Book of Mormon's possibly unmatched rate of *did*-infinitive adjacency (in the 19th century) and the good correlation with individual verb tendencies of the early modern period, as discoverable in the EEBO database.
- **More-part phraseology:** The case for biblical hypercorrection must be weighed against Book of Mormon usage of "the more parts of his gospel," "the more parts of the Nephites," and "a more part of it." Joseph was successful in consistently modifying the phraseology against rare biblical usage as well as matching rare Early Modern English variants.
- ***Had (been) spake*:** There is no direct biblical support for this morphosyntax: the King James Bible doesn't employ leveled past participles (although the American pseudo-biblical authors do occasionally, with other verbs). As a result, it's a stretch to say that the use of past-tense *spake* as a past participle is a biblical hypercorrection.
- **The {-th} plural:** There is partial pseudo-biblical support but virtually no biblical support (a handful of potential cases that are less than clear). The case for biblical hypercorrection is weakened by, among other things, the Book of Mormon's high usage rate compared with that of the 18th-century pseudo-biblical texts and its non-biblical use of {-th} forms with plural pronouns, as occurred in earlier English.
- **Verbal complementation:** Biblical hypercorrection cannot explain several features of the Book of Mormon's extended *cause* syntax without recourse to analogy, and there is no biblical precedent for the ditransitive causative with a repeated *it*. In addition, there are quite a few grammatical features and patterns associated with the other four verbs that lack a direct biblical connection. Finally, the Book of Mormon's finite complementation rates with four of these verbs are drastically different from biblical and pseudo-biblical rates.

If one decides to view Book of Mormon grammar as a case of biblical hypercorrection, then one must have a liberal interpretation of hypercorrection in order to place so much extra-biblical Early Modern English usage under this umbrella. An analyst must be quite creative to argue that Joseph could have produced all the archaic grammar.

The pseudo-biblical texts indicate that each of the following Book of Mormon features was unlikely to have been produced by Joseph Smith: robust agentive *of*, *lest–shall* syntax, heavy personal *which*, high rates of *did*–infinitive adjacency, indefinite and plural *more-part* phraseology, “had been spake” and “of which hath been spoken,” diverse {-th} plural usage, and syntactically rich verbal complementation. The multiplication of unlikely features is a textual scenario that was extremely unlikely for Joseph to produce. In every case listed above, and in many others not discussed here, he outperformed the pseudo-biblical authors in generating archaisms of earlier English, both biblical and non-biblical.

Alternative LDS Views

Some LDS commentators have assumed that a transmitted-words view of Book of Mormon translation involved a one-time translation of the text by a single English speaker who lived during the early modern period. This tends to make the position of revealed words or tight control appear untenable and naïve. If it was a one-time translation, then it could have been close in time to 1828 and 1829, but with multiple inputs that reflected varied English competence. It also could have been a series of translation events. We have no way of being sure of these things without further revelation. There are quite a few possibilities from our limited perspective, which might prevent us from coming close to a knowledge of how the translation of the Book of Mormon into English transpired.

As mentioned toward the outset of this study, a number of LDS scholars believe that Joseph Smith’s mind was saturated with biblical language and that on that basis he could have produced the text of the Book of Mormon from a mixture of biblical language and his own dialect (see note 7). Opposed to this position is a growing body of descriptive linguistic evidence that there is a substantial amount of archaic vocabulary and syntax in the Book of Mormon that does not match King James idiom. The text is archaic and non-biblical in many structural ways. If we accept that Joseph’s mind was saturated with biblical language, then the earliest text’s overall form and structure argue that he did not produce it. Ultimately, the descriptive linguistic

facts overturn views of Book of Mormon language that depend on his mind being imbued with biblical ways of expression.

That being the case, Gardner 2011 and Barlow 2013 have effectively ended up arguing (unintentionally) **against** Joseph's being the English-language translator or author of the Book of Mormon text. Had he produced the text from his own biblically saturated language, the form and structure of the Book of Mormon would be quite different and much more pseudo-biblical in its structure. Theoretically speaking, the profile of the person required for crafting much of the English language of the Book of Mormon was a first-rate, independent philologist — someone extremely knowledgeable in the linguistics and literature of earlier English, but not beholden to following King James patterns.

Conclusion

This data-driven study has provided substantial linguistic evidence against the view that at least one pseudo-biblical writing — usually thought to be Gilbert J. Hunt's *The Late War* — had a noticeable influence on the composition of the Book of Mormon. Ultimately, I find this position to be indefensible because of a large amount of contradictory descriptive linguistic data of the kind that has high probative value. Relevant (morpho)syntactic analysis tells us that the form and structure of the Book of Mormon could not have been produced from a knowledge of pseudo-biblical writings, or for that matter from a knowledge of only late modern English and biblical English. As a result, even if Joseph had grown up reading and re-reading *The Late War*, it would not have given him the ability to produce Book of Mormon grammar. That required extensive knowledge of a wide range of extra-biblical earlier English, mostly 16th- and 17th-century in character, but also including usage from before and after the early modern period.

In a nutshell, the Book of Mormon text exhibits high levels of archaic (morpho)syntax; the pseudo-biblical texts exhibit much lower levels of archaic (morpho)syntax.

A sufficient and accurate knowledge of the form and structure of the earliest text of the Book of Mormon reveals that *The Late War* pales in comparison with the Book of Mormon in terms of archaic usage. In fact, the other three pseudo-biblical texts are more archaic than Hunt's text in many different linguistic domains. In view of these linguistic facts, had Joseph created literature like *The Late War*, or had this pseudo-biblical writing or another comparable text taught Joseph how to fashion older, biblical language (or influenced his dictation to scribes, etc.), the form of

the earliest text of the Book of Mormon would be very different. It would be both more biblical and more modern in character, as we find is the case with the four pseudo-biblical writings considered in this study.

Because the Book of Mormon has so much extra-biblical vocabulary and syntax, its usage cannot be classified as a biblical–dialectal mixture either. Furthermore, there is plenty of “bad grammar” not attributable to Joseph Smith. In addition, as shown in a recent paper, Joseph’s 1832 History is different syntactically from the earliest text in three important ways.⁷¹ Moreover, the suspect verb agreement and forms that have led LDS scholars to attribute the language to Joseph for so many years have turned out to be a good fit with some language of the early modern period. Newly available digital databases make this clear. Because we now have a critical text and searchable databases of earlier English, the Book of Mormon can be shown to be genuinely archaic. Although these facts may clash with favored ideologies, the view that the Book of Mormon is, in its form and structure, a “clumsy parody of the King James Bible” no longer holds up to scrutiny.⁷²

Stanford Carmack has a linguistics and a law degree from Stanford University as well as a doctorate in Hispanic Languages and Literature from the University of California, Santa Barbara, specializing in historical syntax. In the past he has had articles published on Georgian verb morphology and object–participle agreement in Old Spanish and Old Catalan. He currently researches Book of Mormon syntax as it relates to Early Modern English and contributes, by means of textual analysis, to volume 3 of the Book of Mormon critical text project, directed by Royal Skousen.

71. See Carmack, “Joseph Smith’s Grammar,” 240–46.

72. Walter A. McDougall, *Throes of Democracy: The American Civil War Era 1829–1877* (New York: Harper, 2008), 182.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN OLD TESTAMENT MARRIAGE

Noel B. Reynolds

Review of Gordon Paul Hugenberger, *Marriage as a Covenant: A Study of Biblical Law and Ethics Governing Marriage Developed from the Perspective of Malachi* (Supplements to Vetus Testam, Book 52). Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994. Pp. xx + 414. Paperback reprint edition with a modified subtitle published in 2014 by WIPF & STOCK, Eugene, Oregon. 343 pages, plus bibliography and four indices.

Abstract: *In his book Marriage as a Covenant, author Gordon Paul Hugenberger begins with the late 20th century Bible-studies insight that in Israel, covenants were devices used to make binding on unrelated persons the same obligations blood relatives owed to each other. So by covenant, marriage partners became one bone and flesh. This thorough study of the Hebrew Bible and related literatures argues that the view of marriage as a covenant in Malachi 2:10-16 echoes the first marriage in Genesis 2 and is consistent with the other passages in the Bible that have often been mistakenly interpreted to promote a patriarchalist view denigrating the position of wives vis-à-vis their husbands.*

Whereas first-hand acquaintance with the 39 books of the Old Testament is becoming increasingly rare in our times, a number of general impressions of the teachings and practices the Old Testament promotes persist in contemporary culture. Prominent among these are beliefs about how ancient Israelites understood the structure of the family and the relationships of men and women to each other and to their god. Many scholars have promoted the view that women were seen as property, that men could own as many as they

pleased, and that prohibitions on adultery were applied primarily to women. Few if any have seen much effective equality between men and women in the structure of marriage in ancient Israel.

The rise of feminist approaches to biblical studies over the last half-century may have diverted attention from the 1994 publication of Gordon Paul Hugenberger's Oxford dissertation and the findings presented there that undermined the reigning perspective on these matters. Or maybe his rigorous linguistic analysis of all the relevant biblical and nonbiblical texts discouraged most potential readers. But his careful and comprehensive treatment of the subject is winning more serious interest among today's biblical scholars, as can be seen in the central importance given to Hugenberger's findings in the most comprehensive treatment of Old Testament teachings and practices about covenant published in the last decade.¹

Reversing the usual approach, Hugenberger begins with Malachi because of its straightforward characterization of marriage as a covenant (Malachi 2:10–16) and then works backwards through all the relevant texts to see how they do or do not fit with that. He points out that the large number of 20th-century studies on biblical marriage largely ignored this suggested linkage between marriage and covenant, an approach perhaps not surprising, given the persistent confusion and disagreement in scholarly studies of covenant itself. While every page is informed by linguistic analysis, the author is constantly aware of non-Hebraists and has produced a text that can be fully understood and appreciated by a wide range of readers.

After a very helpful review of the leading scholarly literature on the topics of marriage and covenant in his long introduction, Hugenberger devotes his first five chapters to a detailed treatment of other scholars' arguments, the text of the Hebrew Bible, and the relevant nonbiblical literature. He accepts the arguments for dating Malachi to the early post-exilic period of Nehemiah, which provides helpful context for language and cultural issues. He also recognizes two levels of concentric organization that provide added constraints to the interpretation of Malachi. Because it would be impractical to recapitulate the extensive arguments and evidence Hugenberger provides in this extensively documented and well organized treatise, I will provide in this brief review only a summary list of his most significant conclusions. In each

1. See, for example, Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 5–9.

case, these conclusions follow a detailed examination of other scholars' theories and interpretations and are buttressed with the reasons he finds adequate for overriding alternative views.

1. The marriage language in Malachi is not just figurative but should be taken literally to refer to actual human marriages.
2. The phrase "your wife by covenant" cannot refer to Yahweh's covenant with Israel but must derive from Malachi's view that marriage is a covenant.
3. Challenging traditional interpretations, Hugenberger shows linguistically that both Deuteronomy 24 and Malachi 2:14 judge divorces based on aversion negatively.
4. While the Old Testament never describes polygyny as illegal, most texts present monogamy as the marital ideal. Further, actual marital practices in Israel would have been monogamous, with few exceptions.
5. The marriage of Adam and Eve was covenantal and paradigmatic for Malachi,
6. As suggested in the linguistic echoes of Genesis 2 in Malachi 2:
 - a. The language of "leaving father and mother" and "cleaving unto" one's wife as well as the claim that she would be "bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh" is primarily covenant language signaling the intensely shared identity of two persons not genetically related.
 - b. The absence of a covenant oath in both scriptures is overcome by the requirement of consummation through sexual union for a marriage to be valid. That union is "the decisive means by which an individual 'acknowledges' his or her spouse as covenant partner."
7. Hugenberger proposes a definition of covenant that resolves and incorporates the differences and contributions of prior scholars: Covenant is "an elected, as opposed to natural, relationship of obligation established under divine sanction."
8. Recognition of the covenantal nature of Israelite marriage renders unnecessary the tenuous efforts to explain it in ancient near eastern contractual terms, which have no biblical support.
9. Contrary to widely held views, no biblical texts condone a husband's sexual infidelity.

- a. Many make clear that “whether or not there was a *legal* obligation, there was definitely a *moral* obligation for exclusive sexual fidelity on the part of a husband.”
- b. Old Testament marriage was considered to be “a divinely protected covenant between husband and wife.”

As Hugenberger’s work gains wider recognition in contemporary biblical studies, it should be expected that longstanding assumptions about the inequality of men and women in the marital practices and norms of ancient Israel will be modified and that scholars will gain a new appreciation for the connections between family relations and the biblical concept of covenant.

Noel Reynolds (*PhD, Harvard University*) is an emeritus professor of political science at Brigham Young University, where he taught a broad range of courses in legal and political philosophy, American heritage, and the Book of Mormon. His research and publications are based in these fields and several others, including authorship studies, Mormon history, Christian history and theology, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

EASTERS: THE ETERNAL ATONING SACRIFICE TESTIFIES OF THE EVERLASTING REDEEMING SAVIOR

Alan C. Ashton

Abstract: Easters come year after year, reminding us of new life brought to the children of men by the eternal atoning sacrifice of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. He grants us peace, forgiveness, grace, mercy, contentment, and joy in our hearts, and thus we gratefully testify of our everlasting redeeming Savior. All things bear witness of Jesus Christ. The Lord spoke thus face-to-face with Moses upon a high mountain: “And behold, all things have their likeness, and all things are created and made to bear record of me, both things which are temporal, and things which are spiritual; things which are in the heavens above, and things which are on the earth, and things which are in the earth, and things which are under the earth, both above and beneath: all things bear record of me.”¹ The intent of this article is to discuss scriptures that bear testimony of the reality of the Lord’s infinite atonement, to express deep gratitude for our Savior, and to praise Him for His grace, mercy, wisdom, power, and holiness.

Easter is a special time for us to treasure gifts from on high and to express thanksgiving and gratitude to our Father in Heaven for the supreme gift of His Son, Jesus Christ, who died for us all that we might live forever. “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”² Our contemplation of the Savior and His atoning sacrifice increases our humility, meekness, and gratitude. We are filled with inexpressible love for Jesus Christ and for our Father in Heaven when we think of the condescension of God, even the matchless love of the Father

-
1. Moses 6:63.
 2. 1 Corinthians 15:22.

and of the Son. As the scriptures and modern prophets attest, They have come personally at times from the heavens to the earth to reveal to us the covenant path which will lead us back to Them, that we might dwell with Them in heaven in a state of never-ending happiness.³

At Easter we express joy in the Savior's overcoming death and hell: "O how great the goodness of our God, who prepareth a way for our escape from the grasp of this awful monster; yea, that monster, death and hell, which I call the death of the body, and also the death of the spirit."⁴ The way for our escape from spiritual death is the covenant path that God has prepared for us to return safely to our heavenly home. Such a covenant path is of major importance and consideration in this article, especially because President Russell M. Nelson in his first message as president of the Church implored members to "keep on the *covenant path*."⁵ (Throughout this text emphases are added.)

This article concerns Easter, the mission of the Savior, His eternal plan of happiness, and our blessings if we keep on the covenant path.

To that end, the acrostic E-A-S-T-E-R-S will serve as an anchor to discuss the following paschal topics: Everyone, Atonement, Spirit, Temple, Everlasting, Repentance, and Savior.

Everyone

The Savior's sacrifice, which is tied inextricably to Easter, has comprehensive effects on everyone and everything; "All things become new."⁶ As mentioned above, *all* shall be made alive again. The resurrection from the dead for all mankind is universal: "There is a time appointed that *all* shall rise from the dead."⁷ Alma testified to his son, Corianton, "Behold, it is requisite and just, according to the power and resurrection of Christ, that the soul of man

3. Mosiah 2:41; Alma 28:12.

4. 2 Nephi 9:10.

5. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, "New First Presidency Speaks to Members Worldwide," *Church News*, January 16, 2018, <https://www.lds.org/church/news/new-first-presidency-speaks-to-members-worldwide?lang=eng>. Also, R. Scott Lloyd, "President Russell M. Nelson gives first address to members as the 17th President of the Church, selects counselors," *Deseret News*, January 16, 2018, LDS Church News, <https://www.deseretnews.com/article/865695096/President-Russell-M-Nelson-gives-first-address-to-members-as-the-17th-President-of-the-Church.html>.

6. D&C 63:49; 29:24; Revelation 21:5.

7. Alma 40:5.

should be restored to its body, and that every part of the body should be restored to itself.”⁸

As I was writing this, I was by the bedside of my wife in the hospital. She had just undergone an operation on her heart, a second cardiac ablation, and I saw how subject mankind is to the pains, frailties, and sicknesses of mortality. I sensed how temporary our mortal lives are. I got up from her bedside and walked the halls of the hospital, hoping for peace and solace. There, to my surprise, I met my daughter’s mother-in-law being propelled in a wheelchair by her loving husband. This beautiful mother was struggling with a vicious, debilitating attack of cancer. Again I thought of the temporal nature of our earth life.

It brought back thoughts of my being in the hospital a number of years ago while my wife hovered between life and death when a cancerous lump was removed from her body and when she subsequently received chemotherapy and radiation that repeatedly brought her near to death. I am grateful beyond expression for the extension of life she received. Not all are so fortunate. What about those whose loved ones unexpectedly leave this mortal sphere?

Because Christ is risen, the resulting hope in the resurrection of all mankind takes the sting out of death.⁹ When my wife was young, before we were married, she attended the funeral of the father of one of her friends. This family did not have a hope in the resurrection; the members of the family were inconsolable and uncomforted in their mourning, supposing they would never see their deceased loved one again.

Such suffering can be soothed in the hope that through the atonement of Christ and the power of His resurrection, we will all be raised to immortality and that everyone has the possibility, through diligent faithfulness, to obtain life eternal. Moroni testified that such hope comes because of faith in Christ “according to the promise.”¹⁰ This promise is the promise of eternal life, as proclaimed by our Heavenly Father: “Wherefore, ye must press forward with a steadfastness in Christ, having a perfect brightness of hope, and a love of God and of all men. Wherefore, if ye shall press forward, feasting upon the word

8. Alma 41:2, 4.

9. 1 Corinthians 15:55; Mosiah 16:7-8. One should not assume that “taking the sting out of death” removes all pain experienced with the passing of a loved one. Knowledge of the atonement and resurrection, and the hope that can flow from that knowledge, does not fully remove grief, nor does it eradicate mourning. It can, though, allow us to see our loss as temporary and our separation from loved ones as fleeting.

10. Moroni 7:41; Acts 24:15.

of Christ, and endure to the end, behold, thus saith the Father: Ye shall have eternal life.”¹¹

The supreme promise of eternal life is for those who come unto Christ and follow Him by doing the things He has done, and by obeying His commands.¹² This is the covenant path. He invites us to come unto Him by entering in at the gate, which is repentance and baptism. He has shown the way by submitting His will to the Father in fulfilling all righteousness by being baptized of water Himself. He was sinless and did not need baptism for the remission of sins but showed His obedience to the Father’s will and His willingness to keep all His Father’s commandments. This brings about the companionship of the Holy Ghost, promised to all who repent and are baptized in the name of Christ. The Savior testified that the Father would give them the Holy Ghost, “like unto me.”¹³

The promise of the companionship of the Holy Ghost, even the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost, is available to everyone who obeys the commandments of God. We all are invited to travel the covenant path and to have the Holy Ghost as our constant guide, but we must make the choice to be obedient to the Lord’s gospel in order to receive this gift of the Holy Ghost.

In the scriptures there is a great or dreadful day associated with the resurrection and subsequent judgment — great for the righteous, dreadful for the disobedient. All of us will be raised from the dead, and all of us will be brought before the Lord on bended knees to be judged according our works. Jacob, the brother of Nephi, explained that by the suffering of Jesus Christ, the resurrection would be brought to pass upon *all* men, that *all* might stand before Him at the great and judgment day.¹⁴ The future prospect of our kneeling before our Lord and Maker can bring awe and wondrous anticipation into our hearts. It is a strong motivating force for us to love and serve the Lord with all our heart, might, mind, strength, and will. Easters, as they roll along year after year, are special reminders for us to remember the loving kindness of our beloved Savior and Redeemer, Jesus Christ.

11. 2 Nephi 31:20.

12. 3 Nephi 9:14; 27:21; 2 Nephi 31:10.

13. 2 Nephi 31:12.

14. 2 Nephi 9:21-23; Alma 11:41.

Atonement

Sometimes the atonement of Jesus Christ is defined as His suffering and sacrifice of His life for the sins of mankind, and that definition can be limiting. There is more, however. Isaiah proclaimed that we are healed by His stripes.¹⁵ The atonement of Jesus Christ encompasses His entire ministry and His infinite love — all that He has done, all that He does now, and all that He will yet do for the salvation of mankind. Thus, it can be understood that the atonement also includes the Lord’s planning and actions in the pre-mortal realm, His creating the heavens and the earth, His willingness to be sent as an example and sacrifice for mankind on the earth according to the will of the Father, His revealing the will of the Father as Jehovah in the scriptures, His sending prophets and apostles upon the earth, His life and example as He lived on earth, His teachings and miracles, His great and last sacrifice (even His own life, infinite and eternal),¹⁶ His ministry in the spirit world, His resurrection, His ministry to His disciples in the Holy Land, His ministry to the Nephites and other peoples (His other sheep), His appearances to latter-day prophets (beginning with Joseph Smith), His future Second Coming to usher in the Millennium, His future millennial reign, His eternal judgment of mankind, and His continuing ministering forevermore. There is no end to His works, no end to His words, and no end to His worlds.¹⁷ Indeed, there is no end to His atonement and the effects of His atonement. The apostle Paul said, “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.”¹⁸

President David O. McKay’s son Lawrence, while on his mission, wrote his father asking why it was necessary for Christ to give up His life. President McKay expressed his views in a beautiful letter discussing the atonement.¹⁹ He referred to Alma 34:14-16 as a good scripture addressing this subject, where Amulek taught “And thus [the Son of God] shall bring salvation to all those who shall believe on his name; this being the intent of this last sacrifice, to bring about the bowels of mercy, which overpowereth justice, and bringeth about means unto men that they may have faith unto repentance.” Without the death of the Eternal Jehovah,

15. Isaiah 53:5; 1 Peter 2:24; Mosiah 14:5.

16. Alma 34:14.

17. Moses 1:38.

18. Romans 5:10.

19. David Lawrence McKay, *My Father, David O. McKay* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1989), 114-17.

mercy could not overpower justice, the atonement would not be infinite, and mankind would not have the power or means to be able to have faith unto repentance.

Continuing in the letter referring to the atonement of Jesus Christ, President David O. McKay spoke of being moved more by the life of the Savior than by the payment of sins by His death. President McKay wrote:

In His life and death, therefore, Christ not only fulfilled the law of sacrifice but He fulfilled every conceivable condition necessary for man to know in order to rise or progress from earthly life to eternal life. ... In this I think I glimpse, though ever so dimly, a reason for Christ's shedding His blood — in addition to the one generally offered for the redemption of man from the Fall. I confess that the latter has moved me less than the realization that in His life He lived for his fellow men, and in his death — he triumphed over all earthly elements, over the power of *Death*, Hell, and the Evil One, and arose from the *grave* an eternal Being — our Guide, our Saviour, our God.²⁰

The Savior's example, His life and teachings, show the way to eternal life.

The work and glory of the Father and the Son are to bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man.²¹ The atonement, or reconciliation of mankind to God, is brought about by the unified actions of the Father and the Son and by man's obedience to the laws and ordinances of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The Savior constantly reminded His listeners that all He did was what the Father commanded Him to do: "Then said Jesus unto them, When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things. And he that sent me is with me: the Father hath not left me alone; for I do always those things that please him."²²

Book of Mormon scriptures concerning the atonement are plentiful and enlightening.²³ These passages contain light and knowledge that are among the plain and precious truths which were lost from the Bible.²⁴ Mosiah chapter 3 is an especially powerful message concerning the

20. Ibid., 116-17.

21. Moses 1:39.

22. John 8:28-29.

23. See for example, 1 Nephi 11; 2 Nephi 2, 9, 10, 11, 25, 31, 33; Jacob 4; Mosiah 3, 4, 12-16; Alma 5, 7, 11, 22, 34, 42; Helaman 5; 3 Nephi 9, 11, 27; Ether 3; Moroni 8, 10.

24. 1 Nephi 13:24-35; 19:3.

atonement because it is revelation directly from the bosom of the Lord as delivered by an angel of God to a prophet of God. There we learn that we must put off the natural man, who is an enemy of God, and become a saint through the atonement of Christ, by yielding to the enticings of the Holy Spirit and by becoming as a child, “submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father.”²⁵

Even though the Savior’s atonement is infinite and universal, humankind’s receiving the promises of the atonement is predicated upon obedience. The Savior came to redeem His people by taking upon Himself “the transgressions of those who believe on his name; and these are they that shall have eternal life, and salvation cometh to none else.”²⁶

The Savior’s atonement is to bring about unity, reconciliation, and at-one-ment. Our Savior makes it possible for us to be one with God. The Savior declared, “if ye are not one ye are not mine.”²⁷ Easter is a celebration of the Savior, of His life, of His ascendancy over death and hell, of His infinite atonement.

Spirit

Receiving the Spirit of God and following its warm, exalting influence is necessary for us to be reconciled unto Christ, to become at-one with God. The Spirit of the Lord, the Holy Ghost, is a great gift of God because of the Son and His atonement.²⁸

All the children of God can feel the influence of the Holy Ghost as the Spirit or Light of Christ. It will lead one to the covenant path. Those who exercise faith in Jesus Christ are invited to embark upon this path by repenting and being baptized in His name.²⁹ Then comes the confirming gift of the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands.

The gift of the Holy Ghost is the constant companionship of the Spirit for those who are faithful to the will of the Lord and seek, pray for, and receive this presence. The Holy Ghost testifies of the Father and of the Son, sanctifies us, and can tell us all things we must do to remain

25. Mosiah 3:19.

26. Alma 11:40.

27. D&C 38:27.

28. 3 Nephi 28:11.

29. 2 Nephi 31:17.

true in the covenant path.³⁰ This path leads to exaltation and eternal life, the greatest gift of all the gifts of God.³¹

The following message from the deceased prophet Joseph Smith to Brigham Young in a dream at Winter Quarters in early 1847 underscores the importance of seeking, receiving, and maintaining the companionship of the Holy Ghost. Brigham Young asked what most important message Joseph would have for the Saints. Young recorded Joseph's response:

Tell the people to be humble and faithful, and sure to keep the spirit of the Lord and it will lead them right. Be careful and not turn away the small still voice; it will teach you what to do and where to go; it will yield the fruits of the Kingdom. Tell the brethren to keep their hearts open to conviction, so that when the Holy Ghost comes to them, their hearts will be ready to receive it. They can tell the spirit of the Lord from all other spirits; it will whisper peace and joy to their souls; and it will take malice, hatred, envying, strife, and all evil from their hearts; and their whole desire will be to do good, bring forth righteousness and build up the kingdom of God. Tell the brethren if they will follow the spirit of the Lord they will go right.³²

If the Spirit is not obeyed, its sacred presence wanes. As we see in the fifteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, one of the first beliefs to be challenged and then discarded when people lose the Spirit is belief in the resurrection.

The apostle Paul, writing to the saints in Corinth, gave evidence and assurance of the resurrection because he heard that some among them said there was no resurrection of the dead.³³ He reminded them of Christ's burial and rising from the grave, that Christ was seen of Peter and other apostles, that the resurrected Christ was seen by more than five hundred brethren, most of whom were still alive, and by James and then of all the apostles. Then Paul testified that he himself beheld the resurrected Christ, proclaiming, "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen ... for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."³⁴

30. Moses 5:9; 3 Nephi 27:20; 2 Nephi 32:2-5.

31. D&C 14:7.

32. William S. Harwell, ed, *Manuscript History of Brigham Young, 1847-1850*, (Salt Lake City: Collier's, 1997), 35.

33. 1 Corinthians 15:12.

34. *Ibid.*, 15:13-14; 22.

Paul also referred to the practice of baptism for the dead to show that the resurrection is a reality. He asked, “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?”³⁵ The resurrection was a sure reality to those who met and interacted with resurrected beings, especially with the Savior Himself.³⁶ We are blessed to have their personal witnesses of the resurrection.

The baptism of fire and the Holy Ghost cleanses and brings about a remission of sins.³⁷ The Savior said, “Repent, all ye ends of the earth, and come unto me and be baptized in my name, that ye may be *sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost*, that ye may stand spotless before me at the last day.”³⁸ Sanctification and cleansing by the remission of sins comes by the Holy Ghost, even the Holy Spirit of Promise, which is the seal certifying to the pure in heart that they are clean before the Father, that they are sanctified in Christ by the grace of God through the shedding of the blood of Christ, and that they can enter into His rest where no unclean thing can dwell.³⁹

We celebrate our knowledge of and our hope in the holy resurrection at Easter. The Spirit of God — freely available to all — whispers to our spirits the truth of this reality. How grateful we are for the Spirit-borne witness that our beloved Savior conquered death and became the firstfruits of them that slept.⁴⁰ The Spirit confirms that He made it possible that we all will be released from the bondage of physical death in the eternities.

Temple

The temple of the Lord is connected with Easter because of new life. Sacred ordinances of the temple promise new life, even eternal lives, and bind families together forever, according to individual faithfulness. The Savior proclaimed, “strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leads to life, and few there be that find it.”⁴¹ This scripture was given by the Lord to Joseph Smith in the revelation concerning marriage for time and all eternity, which is a culminating ordinance of the temple, as follows: “For strait is the gate, and narrow the way that leadeth unto the exaltation and

35. Ibid., 15:29.

36. 3 Nephi 12:2.

37. D&C 19:31.

38. 3 Nephi 27:20.

39. Ibid., 27:19; Moroni 10:33.

40. 1 Corinthians 15:20.

41. 3 Nephi 27:33; Matthew 7:14.

continuation of the *lives*, and few there be that find it, because ye receive me not in the world neither do ye know me.⁴²

Thus, on the covenant path which leads to eternal life, or more explicitly, to eternal lives, there are necessary temple ordinances of the Holy Priesthood which we must make, enter into, and have sealed upon us by the Holy Spirit of promise in order for us to fully receive the Savior and the fullness of blessings in the kingdom of God.⁴³

The Lord declared to the prophet Joseph Smith, “This is eternal lives — to know the only wise and true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. I am he. Receive ye, therefore, my law.”⁴⁴ This law is the order of the priesthood, meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, mentioned in D&C 131:1-4: “In the celestial glory there are three heavens or degrees; And in order to obtain the highest, a man must enter into this order of the priesthood [meaning the new and everlasting covenant of marriage]; And if he does not, he cannot obtain it. He may enter into the other, but that is the end of his kingdom; he cannot have an increase.” We come to know God and His Son, Jesus Christ, as we enter into and continue faithfully within the sacred, everlasting covenant of eternal marriage. This is eternal lives, that is, God’s life. We too may have it, but we must receive and obey this holy law of God.

As President of the Provo Temple, I witnessed many who testified of new life and a softening of the heart as they attended the temple often. I saw how frequent temple attendance brought an increase of love, consideration for others, patience, and kindness for both patrons and temple workers.

For those living in the Northern Hemisphere, Easter reminds us of regenerating life, as new life springs forth from the earth at springtime. Temple ordinances draw our minds toward the reality of our eternal nature, of new life in the resurrection, and of the continuation of family lives.

Everlasting

Everlasting, Endless, Eternal, and Eternity are names of God.⁴⁵ Revealing a godly mystery, the Lord explains that Eternal punishment is God’s punishment. In a like manner, Eternal life, or Everlasting Life, is God’s life.⁴⁶ It is life like God’s life. In D&C 132 the Lord gives us a glimpse of those who have this exaltation and glory sealed upon their heads:

42. D&C 132:22.

43. D&C 132:7.

44. *Ibid.*, 132:24.

45. D&C 19:10-12; Psalms 90:2; Abraham 2:16.

46. John 3:16.

which glory shall be a *fulness and a continuation of the seeds forever* and ever. Then shall they be gods, because they have no end; therefore shall they be *from everlasting to everlasting, because they continue*; then shall they be above all, because all things are subject unto them. Then shall they be gods, because they have all power, and the angels are subject unto them.⁴⁷

Our Father, by the power of His Only Begotten Son, gives His fulness to His children, and they become exalted parents able to give their fulness to their children.

At the end of the Kirtland Temple dedicatory prayer, which was given to Joseph Smith by revelation just before he gave the three-fold plea, “O hear, O hear, O hear us, O Lord!” he beseeched the Lord as follows: “O Lord God Almighty, hear us in these our petitions, and answer us from heaven, thy holy habitation, where thou sittest enthroned, with glory, honor, power, majesty, might, dominion, truth, justice, judgment, mercy, and an infinity of fulness, from everlasting to everlasting.”⁴⁸ These ten attributes of deity are worth repeating, and memorizing, along with the additional two items, “an infinity of fulness” and “from everlasting to everlasting”: “glory, honor, power, majesty, might, dominion, truth, justice, judgment, mercy.”

There is deep significance in these ten godly characteristics and in the phrase “an infinity of fulness.” God has a fulness of glory, a fulness of honor, a fulness of power, and so on. As we consider other good qualities such as kindness, holiness, godliness, and goodness, we recognize that God has a fulness of all of these and of infinitely more godly traits.

The phrase “*from everlasting to everlasting*” in this scripture has significance in relation to time and possibly to space and certainly to continuation of lives; might it not also be understood as “*from God to God*” (everlasting being a name for God)? The infinity of fulness of godly attributes constitutes everlasting life, eternal life, or more exactly, eternal lives — from God to God.

Easter is a time to be grateful to the Father and the Son for Their perfections of everlasting life. It is a time for us to praise Them and exult over Their everlasting kindness towards us, Their children.

47. D&C 132:19-21.

48. D&C 109:77-78.

Repentance

President Thomas S. Monson’s insights pertaining to repentance are thrilling, humbling, and inspiring. He said, “One of God’s greatest gifts to us is the joy of trying again, for no failure ever need be final.”⁴⁹ Repentance is the glorious gift that gives us access to the purifying effects of Christ’s atonement. It is not our repentance by itself that brings forgiveness of sins and the purifying of our hearts, but it is the Lord’s grace because of the shedding of His blood.⁵⁰ We must repent, but it is His blood and the baptism of fire and of the Holy Ghost which sanctify us.

The Savior emphasized the importance of repentance Himself declaring,

And no unclean thing can enter into [the Father’s] kingdom; therefore nothing entereth into his rest save it be those who have washed their garments in my blood, because of their *faith*, and the *repentance* of all their sins, and their *faithfulness unto the end*. Now this is the commandment: Repent, all ye ends of the earth, and come unto me and be baptized in my name, that ye may be sanctified by the reception of the Holy Ghost, that ye may stand spotless before me at the last day.⁵¹

Thus faith, repentance, and enduring faithfully unto the end are prerequisites to having our garments washed clean in the blood of Christ. Such a washing and cleansing is clearly a sublime miracle. A white shirt dipped into a vat of blood certainly would not come out clean and spotless!

Because the Lord has granted us repentance, we can get up and try again when we stumble. If we stray from the covenant path, we can return to it where there is safety and joy. The Savior’s atoning sacrifice gives us means to exercise sufficient faith unto repentance. When we confess our sins, fully forsake them, soften our hardened hearts, and change our wayward behaviors, the Lord has promised us that He will forgive us and remember our sins no more.⁵²

As mentioned above, God has declared that His work and glory are to bring about the immortality and eternal life of man. Without the gift of repentance, which is a positive blessing and not a negative burden, we could not reach our potential of everlasting life. We all make mistakes, and so we could not otherwise accept the Lord’s personal invitation to us: “Therefore, what manner of men ought ye to be? Verily I say unto you,

49. Thomas S. Monson, “The Gift of Repentance,” *Ensign* (January 2018), 4.

50. D&C 20:30-31.

51. 3 Nephi 27:19-20.

52. Jeremiah 31:34; D&C 58:42-43; Ezekiel 18:21-22; 1 John 1:9.

even as I am.”⁵³ With repentance, sanctification by the Spirit, and the grace of Jesus Christ we can stand unspotted before the Lord at the last day.

Easter is time for us to reflect upon things we can do to become more like the Savior and, through repentance, to begin anew in our lives. It is a time to show gratitude to God for His mercy and loving kindness by humbling ourselves, repenting of those things in our lives that demand repentance, serving one another, and lifting up those around us.

Savior

Easter is a time to think deeply about and remember the Savior Jesus Christ. He commands us to come unto Him, to follow Him, and to do all that we do in His name.⁵⁴ All of the above subjects I have mentioned — Everyone, Atonement, Spirit, Temple, Everlasting, and Repentance — center upon the Savior and His work and glory. In each case Easter gives us pause to contemplate and appreciate more fully the Savior’s covenant path. This covenant path enables us to become perfect, even as Jesus Christ and the Father are perfect.⁵⁵

In the scriptures the covenant path, among other names, is referred to as the rod of iron, the word of God, the strait and narrow path, the way, the truth, the merciful plan of the great Creator, the great and eternal plan of deliverance from death, the great plan of redemption, the plan of salvation, the plan of mercy, the plan of happiness, the new and everlasting covenant, the fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the laws and ordinances of the gospel, and the only and true doctrine of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.⁵⁶ (See the Appendix for additional names.) Jesus Christ is the covenant path. He is the truth, the way, the life, and the only name whereby man can be saved in the kingdom of God.

Jesus Christ is the *word*⁵⁷ which the Father has given unto the children of men as mentioned in the center (verse 19) of the Savior’s own definition of His Gospel in 3 Nephi 27:13-22. The Savior is at the beginning of this explanation (verse 13, “Behold I have given unto you my gospel, and this is

53. 3 Nephi 27:27.

54. 3 Nephi 9:14; 2 Nephi 31:10; Moses 5:8.

55. 3 Nephi 12:48.

56. John 14:6; 1 Nephi 8:20; 11:25; 2 Nephi 9:6; 11:5; Jacob 6:8; Alma 17:16; 18:39; Jarom 1:2; Alma 42:8, 11, 15; D&C 22:1; 66:2; 76:14; 132:4; Articles of Faith 1:3-4; 2 Nephi 31:21. See also Noel B. Reynolds, “The Ancient Doctrine of the Two Ways and the Book of Mormon,” *BYU Studies Quarterly*, 56/3 (Fall 2017): 49-78 and “This is the Way,” *Religious Educator*, 14/3 (2013): 71-83.

57. Alma 38:9; John 3:16; 2 Nephi 18:1; 19:8; Moses 1:32.

the gospel which I have given unto you — that I came into the world to do the will of my Father, because my Father sent me”), and He is again at the end (verse 21, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, this is my gospel; and ye know the things that ye must do in my church; for the works which ye have seen me do that shall ye also do”). Not only is Jesus Christ the beginning and the end of His Gospel, He is also the center.

He invites us to follow Him and assures us that we can do the works that we have seen Him do.⁵⁸ He was baptized, received the Holy Spirit, taught the truth, served liberally, demonstrated love, healed the sick physically and spiritually, raised the dead, endured suffering for the truth’s sake, and submitted to the will of the Father in all things. With His grace and the power of His infinite atonement, we can emulate Him in these works. He gives meaning, efficacy, power, and honor to our righteous, humble works of goodness. Because of Him the Father grants us the Holy Ghost, who inspires us, ennobles us, and leads us in all good things as we submit our will to His will.

Paul testified of Jesus that, “being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.”⁵⁹ In my scripture studies over many years I have found over 1,000 names for the Savior plus a number of other name-like references that bring the total to more than 1,400, many of which describe His omnipotence, omniscience, and other divine attributes.⁶⁰ Easter is a wonderful time to read through a list of the Savior’s names and attributes (available in the topical guide of the LDS Scriptures) and to reflect upon all He has done for us. We will find that we become stronger in our humility, deeper in our gratitude, and firmer in our faith in Christ as we come to know Him through study and emulation.⁶¹

Certainly the Eternal Atoning Sacrifice Testifies of the Everlasting Redeeming Savior. Everyone who draws upon the power of Christ’s atonement and seeks the Spirit to guide him or her along the covenant path toward everlasting life, and who repents to keep on the covenant path, will be called up in heaven to dwell in never-ending happiness with our beloved Savior. He invites us to follow Him on His covenant path

58. 3 Nephi 27:21; 2 Nephi 31:12.

59. Hebrews 5:9.

60. Alan C. Ashton, “Oh How Surely Christ Sanctifies His Own” (lecture, The 2012 Neal A. Maxwell Institute Lecture, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, April 12, 2012), <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/fullscreen/?pub=1073>; Appendix “Names of Jesus Christ Found in the Scriptures.”

61. Helaman 3:35.

and to become one with Him, that He might sanctify us with eternal life, endless holiness, and everlasting joy.⁶²

Alan C. Ashton *founded Thanksgiving Point. He was a Computer Science professor at BYU and co-founder of WordPerfect Corporation. He has served as an Elders' Quorum president and gospel doctrine teacher several times, a stake president, president of the Canada Toronto West Mission, a bishop, and president of the Provo Temple. He is currently a Sealer in the Provo Temple. He is married to Karen Ashton and they are the parents of 11 children, 61 grandchildren, and 5 great grandchildren.*

Appendix

Scripture References for Other Names for the Covenant Path

<p>Bond of the Covenant, Ezekiel 20:37 Calling upon God in the name of the Son, Moses 1:17; 5:8. Christ's doctrine with authority, Matthew 7:28-29. Coming unto and following the Savior, 3 Nephi 9:14, 2 Nephi 31:10. Commandments, statutes, judgments of God, Alma 58:40. Copractice of virtue and holiness before the Lord, D&C 46:33. Counsel of the Lord, D&C 78:2; 100:2. Covenant, oath and law to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Psalms 105:9-10. Covenant of an everlasting priesthood, Numbers 25:13. Covenant of God, Psalms 78:10. Covenant of peace, an everlasting covenant, the Lord's sanctuary set in the midst of His people evermore, Ezekiel 37:26. Covenant of the Lord God, Deuteronomy 4:23. Covenant of the Lord's peace, Isaiah 54:10.</p>	<p>Covenant that the Lord will make with the house of Israel, His laws into their mind, Hebrews 8:10. Covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed, Acts 3:25. Covenant which should be fulfilled in the latter days, made to our father Abraham, 1 Nephi 15:18. Covenant with our God to do his will and to be obedient to his commandments, Mosiah 5:5. Covenant with the Lord and enter into his oath, Deuteronomy 29:12. Covenant of saints with the Lord by sacrifice, Psalms 50:5. Covenant with the Lord that ye will serve him and keep his commandments, Mosiah 18:10. Doctrine according to godliness, 1 Timothy 6:3. Doctrine of Christ, 2 Nephi 31:21. Doctrine of God, John 7:16-17. Doctrine of God our Savior, Titus 2:10. Doctrine of repentance, D&C 68:25.</p>
--	--

62. D&C 66:2, 11.

<p>Doctrine of the Lord, Acts 13:12. Doctrine which the Father hath given unto Christ, 3 Nephi 11:32. Everlasting covenant, Genesis 17:7; D&C 45:9. Everlasting gospel, Rev 14:6; D&C 36:5. Faith hope and charity, D&C 4:5-6. Fulness of the Gospel, 1 Nephi 10:14. Fulness of the gospel of Jesus Christ, D&C 20:9. Fulness of the gospel of the Messiah, 1 Nephi 15:13. Fulness of the gospel of the Lord, 1 Nephi 13:24. Fulness of the Lord's everlasting gospel, D&C 27:5. Fulness of all truth, D&C 93:26. Glad tidings, D&C 76:40. Glad tidings of good things, Romans 10:15. Glad tidings of great joy, Mosiah 3:3; D&C 31:3. Glory of God, intelligence, light and truth, D&C 93:36. Godly walk and conversation, D&C 20:69. God's course: one eternal round, Alma 7:20; D&C 35:1. God's covenant for ever, Psalms 111:9. God's covenant of peace, Numbers 25:12. God's covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob, Exodus 2:24. God's great and eternal purposes, prepared from the foundation of the world, Alma 42:26. God's ordinances, D&C 52:15-16. God's plan, good, Abraham 4:21. God's promise in Christ, Ephesians 3:6. Good way, 1 Kings 8:36; Jeremiah 6:16. Gospel, 3 Nephi 21:26 Gospel of Abraham, D&C 110:12 Gospel of Christ, Romans 1:16 Gospel of God, Romans 1:1. Gospel of God's son, Romans 1:9. Gospel of Jesus Christ, Mark 1:1. Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, 2 Thessalonians 1:8. Gospel of peace, Romans 10:15; D&C 27:16.</p>	<p>Gospel of repentance and of baptism, D&C 13:1. Gospel of salvation, Ephesians 1:13; D&C 90:10; 93:51. Gospel of the grace of God, Acts 20:24. Gospel of the kingdom, Matthew 9:35; D&C 84:80. Gospel of the Lamb, 1 Nephi 13:26. Gospel, or the doctrine of Christ, Jacob 7:6. Gospel, preached from the beginning, being declared by holy angels sent forth from the presence of God, and by his own voice, and by the gift of the Holy Ghost, Moses 5:58. Gospel, rock, and salvation of the Lamb, 1 Nephi 13:36. Gospel preached unto Abraham, Galatians 3:8. Gospel which should be preached among the Jews, 1 Nephi 10:11. Great and eternal plan of deliverance from death, 2 Nephi 11:5. Great and eternal plan of redemption, Alma 34:16. Great and eternal purposes of God, Alma, 42:26. Great and marvelous work, 1 Nephi 14:7. Great knowledge, 2 Nephi 32:7. Great plan of mercy, Alma 42:31. Great plan of redemption, Alma 34:31. Great plan of salvation, Alma 42:5. Great plan of the Eternal God, Alma 34:9. Highway, Isaiah 35:8. Highway for our God, Isaiah 40:3. Highway or way of the upright, Proverbs 16:17. Inheritance of the saints in light, Col 1:12. Keep(ing) the commandments of God, Mosiah 2:4. Keys, and powers, and glories to be revealed from the days of Adam, D&C 128:18. Knowledge of the Lord's will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, Col 1:9. Knowledge of the true Messiah, 1 Nephi 10:14.</p>
--	---

<p>Law, put in their inward parts and written in their hearts by the Lord, Jeremiah 31:33.</p> <p>Law of Christ, D&C 88:21.</p> <p>Law of God, Psalms 78:10.</p> <p>Law of the Lord's gospel, D&C 104:18.</p> <p>Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, Gal 5:1.</p> <p>Light and truth, D&C 93:40.</p> <p>Light of the glorious gospel, 2 Cor 4:4.</p> <p>Light of the Lord, 2 Nephi 12:5.</p> <p>Light to the world, D&C 45:9.</p> <p>Lord God's work and glory, Moses 1:39.</p> <p>Lord's covenant and his testimonies, Psalms 25:10.</p> <p>Lord's everlasting covenant, D&C 1:15; 45:9.</p> <p>Lord's everlasting covenant, even the fulness of his gospel, D&C 66:2.</p> <p>Lord's holy covenant, Luke 1:72.</p> <p>Lord's own way, D&C 104:16.</p> <p>Lord's word, his rock, his church, and his gospel, to know of a surety his doctrine, D&C 11:16.</p> <p>Love of God and of neighbor, Matthew 22:37-40; Moroni 10:32.</p> <p>Manner of God's work, 2 Nephi 31:3.</p> <p>Manner of happiness, 2 Nephi 5:27.</p> <p>Manner of love the Father hath bestowed, 1 John 3:1.</p> <p>Manner of persons: be in all holy conversation and godliness, even as Christ is, 2 Pet 3:11; 3 Nephi 27:27.</p> <p>Manner of the workings of the Spirit, Moroni 6:9.</p> <p>Life and light of men, D&C 93:9.</p> <p>Meekness of Christ's spirit, D&C 19:23.</p> <p>Merciful plan of the great Creator, 2 Nephi 9:6</p> <p>Message from the Most High, JS — History 1, footnote by Oliver Cowdery.</p> <p>Message heard from the beginning, 1 John 3:11.</p> <p>Message of redemption, D&C 138:37.</p> <p>Messenger before the Lord's face to prepare the way before Him, D&C 45:9.</p>	<p>More excellent way, 1 Corinthians 12:31; Ether 12:11.</p> <p>Mountains (temples) a way, exalted highways, Isaiah 49:11; 1 Nephi 21:11.</p> <p>Narrow gate and strait path which leads to life, and continue in the path, 2 Nephi 33:9.</p> <p>Narrow way for man, in a straight course, 2 Nephi 9:41.</p> <p>New and an everlasting covenant, even that which was from the beginning, D&C 22:1.</p> <p>New and everlasting covenant, instituted for the fulness of God's glory, for those who abide the law, D&C 132:6.</p> <p>New and living way, Hebrews 10:20.</p> <p>New covenant, JST Gal 3:20; Hebrews 8:8.</p> <p>Lord's way(s), paths, truth, law and word, Psalms 25:4-5; Psalms 86:11; 2 Nephi 12:3.</p> <p>New covenant of the Lord with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, Jeremiah 31:31.</p> <p>New doctrine, Acts 17:19.</p> <p>None other way, save by the gate, the Holy One of Israel, 2 Nephi 9:41.</p> <p>Only and true doctrine of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost 2 Nephi 31:21.</p> <p>Order of the priesthood, the new and everlasting covenant of marriage, D&C 131:2.</p> <p>Ordinances of the holy Priesthood, D&C 84:19-22.</p> <p>Path of judgement, Isaiah 40:14.</p> <p>Path of life, Psalms 16:11.</p> <p>Path of righteousness leads to the kingdom of God, Alma 7:19.</p> <p>Path of the just, Proverbs 4:18; Isaiah 26:7.</p> <p>Path of the Lord's commandments, Psalms 119:35.</p> <p>Path of the low valley, 2 Nephi 4:32.</p> <p>Path of their duty, Helaman 15:5.</p> <p>Path which led to the tree of life, 1 Nephi 8:21.</p> <p>Path which leads to the kingdom of God, Alma 7:19.</p> <p>Paths of righteousness, Alma 7:19.</p>
--	---

<p>Paths of the Lord are mercy and truth, Psalms 25:10.</p> <p>Paths of uprightness, Proverbs 2:13.</p> <p>Pathway of righteousness, Proverbs 12:28.</p> <p>Perpetual covenant with the Lord, Jeremiah 50:5.</p> <p>Pattern in all things, D&C 52:14-19.</p> <p>Plain path, Psalms 27:11.</p> <p>Plain road, 2 Nephi 4:32.</p> <p>Plan of happiness, Alma 42:16.</p> <p>Plan of mercy, Alma 42:15.</p> <p>Plan of our God, 2 Nephi 9:13.</p> <p>Plan of redemption, Alma 12:32; 29:2.</p> <p>Plan of redemption prepared from the foundation of the world through Christ, Alma 22:13.</p> <p>Plan of restoration, Alma 41:2.</p> <p>Plan of salvation, Jarom 1:2; Alma 24:14, Moses 6:62.</p> <p>Plenteous redemption, Psalms 130:7.</p> <p>Power of God unto salvation, Romans 1:16.</p> <p>Power of the redemption and the resurrection in Christ, Jacob 6:9.</p> <p>Promises of the Lord, Mosiah 1:7.</p> <p>Reasoning, speech, and prophecy of the Lord, D&C 45:15.</p> <p>Redemption: He sent redemption unto his people; he hath commanded his covenant for ever, Psalms 111:9.</p> <p>Redemption from everlasting woe, Alma 26:36.</p> <p>Redemption in Christ, Romans 3:24.</p> <p>Redemption of God, Mosiah 13:32.</p> <p>Redemption of/unto the world, 1 Nephi 1:19 / 3 Nephi 9:21.</p> <p>Redemption prepared from the foundation of the world, Mosiah 15:19.</p> <p>Right and proper way, D&C 101:63.</p> <p>Right paths, Proverbs 4:11.</p> <p>Right way, 2 Nephi 25:28; Morm 9:20.</p> <p>Righteous covenant, Mosiah 5:6.</p> <p>Righteous paths of the Lord, 2 Nephi 9:41.</p> <p>Rock of our Redeemer, who is Christ, Helaman 5:12.</p> <p>Rod of iron, 1 Nephi 11:25; Revelation 12:5.</p> <p>Sacrifices in obedience, D&C 132:50.</p>	<p>Salvation of the Lord, Mosiah 15:28.</p> <p>Sayings in the records (scriptures) of the fathers (prophets), Mosiah 1:6.</p> <p>Service of your fellow beings, the service of your God, Mosiah 2:17.</p> <p>Shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day, Proverbs 4:18.</p> <p>So great a cause, D&C 128:22.</p> <p>Song of redeeming love, Alma 5:26.</p> <p>Songs of everlasting joy, D&C 101:18.</p> <p>Sound doctrine, Titus 2:1.</p> <p>Spirit of truth, D&C 93:9.</p> <p>Standard for the Lord's people, D&C 45:9.</p> <p>Straight course to eternal bliss, Alma 37:44.</p> <p>Straight highway for the Lord, Isaiah 40:3.</p> <p>Strait and narrow path which leads to eternal life, 2 Nephi 31:18.</p> <p>Strait gate and narrow way that leads to life, 3 Nephi 14:14; 27:33; D&C 132:22.</p> <p>Strait path which leads to life, 2 Nephi 33:9.</p> <p>Sure covenant, Nehemiah 9:38.</p> <p>Sure foundation, Helaman 5:12.</p> <p>Sure mercies of David, Isaiah 55:3.</p> <p>Testimony of God's word, Alma 7:20.</p> <p>Theory, principle, doctrine, law of the gospel, all things that pertain unto the kingdom of God, that are expedient for you to understand, D&C 88:78.</p> <p>Things and mysteries of the kingdom out of the scriptures, D&C 71:1.</p> <p>Truth, a knowledge of things as they are, and as they were, and as they are to come, D&C 93:24.</p> <p>Truth, light, and knowledge of all things, D&C 93:28; John 8:32</p> <p>Truth of the Lord, Psalms 117:2.</p> <p>United order, and an everlasting order, D&C 104:1.</p> <p>Voice of gladness! A voice of mercy from heaven; and a voice of truth out of the earth; glad tidings for the dead; a voice of gladness for the living and the dead; glad tidings of great joy, D&C 128:19.</p>
---	---

<p>Voice of the Lord, D&C 35:1. Walk after the holy order of God, Alma 7:22. Walk guiltless before God, Mosiah 4:26. Walk in truth, in righteousness and uprightness before God, 1 Kings 3:6; Helaman 6:34. Walk uprightly before God, 1 Nephi 16:3; Mosiah 18:29. Walk worthy of God, 1 Thessalonians 2:12. Walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord, Luke 1:6; Lev 18:4. Walking with a clear conscience before God, Mosiah 2:27. Way, Isaiah 35:8; 2 Nephi 28:11; Alma 41:8. Way before the Lord's face for the time of his coming, D&C 39:20. Way everlasting, Psalms 139:24. Way for fulfilling the Father's words and covenants, 1 Nephi 9:6; 14:17. Way into the holiest of all, Hebrews 9:8. Way of deliverance of our God, 2 Nephi 9:11. Way of eternal life, 2 Nephi 10:23. Way of God, Acts 18:26. Way of holiness, Isaiah 35:8. Way of life, Proverbs 15:24; Jeremiah 21:8. Way of peace, Romans 3:17. Way of righteousness, Proverbs 12:28; Helaman 6:31. Way of the just, Isaiah 26:7. Way(s) of the Lord, Genesis 18:19; Proverbs 10:29; Isaiah 40:3; Alma 25:14; D&C 33:10. Way of the Lord's commandments, Psalms 119:32. Way of the Lord's judgments, Isaiah 26:8. Way of the Lord's precepts, Psalms 119:27. Way of the Lord's statutes, Psalms 119:33. Way of the Lord's steps, Psalms 85:13. Way of the Lord's testimonies, Psalms 119:14. Way of the tree of life, Genesis 3:24; Alma 42:2; Moses 4:31.</p>	<p>Way of truth, Psalms 119:30; 2 Pet 2:2. Way of understanding, Proverbs 9:6; Isaiah 40:14. Way of wisdom, Proverbs 4:11. Way, prepared, that we may live forever, Alma 37:46. Way to Zion, Jeremiah 50:5. Way, the truth, and the life: Jesus Christ, John 14:6. Way where light dwelleth, Job 38:19. Way wherein I should walk, Psalms 143:8; Proverbs 22:6. Ways of truth and soberness, Mosiah 4:15. Wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Tim 6:3. Will of God, D&C 21:1; 128:5; JS — History 1, footnote by Oliver Cowdery. Wisdom of the God of Enoch, D&C 45:11. Wisdom's paths, Helaman 12:5. Witness unto all nations, Matthew 24:14. Word(s) of Christ, 1 Tim 6:3; 2 Nephi 31:20; 32:3; Alma 37:44. Word of God which leads to the fountain of living waters or to the tree of life, 1 Nephi 11:25. Word of God, quick and powerful, which shall divide asunder all the cunning and the snares and the wiles of the devil, and lead the man of Christ in a strait and narrow course across that everlasting gulf of misery, Helaman 3:29. Word of the gospel, Acts 15:7. Word of the Lord, tried, 2 Samuel 22:31. Word of truth, D&C 50:17. Word of truth and righteousness, Alma 38:9. Word which the Lord commanded to a thousand generations, Psalms 105:8. Words of wisdom, D&C 78:2. Work of the Father, 1 Nephi 14:17; 3 Nephi 21:26. Works and faith agreeable to the holy scriptures, D&C 20:69. Works of the Lord, Alma 18:39. Works of the Lord's hands and his sure commandments, Psalms 111:7.</p>
---	---

APPROACHING ABINADI

Stephen O. Smoot

Abstract: *The recently released Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise, a new book from Brigham Young University's Book of Mormon Academy, offers readers multidisciplinary approaches to Mosiah 11–17 that highlight the literary, historical, and doctrinal richness of the story of Abinadi. Students and scholars of the Book of Mormon are sure to benefit greatly from this new volume.*

Review of Shon D. Hopkin, ed. *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise* (Provo and Salt Lake City: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book, 2018), 404 pp. \$27.99.

In 2013 a group of Latter-day Saint scholars organized the Book of Mormon Academy, “an academic think tank and research group begun at Brigham Young University ... to promote scholarship and teaching on the Book of Mormon.”¹ The first publication of the Book of Mormon Academy, *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise*, offers a collection of articles that explores Mosiah 11–17 from textual, theological, historical, and anthropological perspectives.

The first section of the book (“Literary Lenses: Narratological, Sociopolitical, Biblical”) approaches Mosiah 11–17 from a narratological perspective. As Jared W. Ludlow (“A Messenger of Good and Evil Tidings: A Narrative Study of Abinadi”) explains in his contribution, “A narratological study looks at all the components that go into the telling of a story in order to appreciate its different narrative facets (the aesthetic

1. Shon D. Hopkin, “Introduction,” in *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise*, ed. Shon D. Hopkin (Provo and Salt Lake City, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book, 2018), vi. Subsequent citations of this volume appear in the body of this review.

dimension) and to better understand the purpose and emphasis of the writer (the rhetorical dimension)” (2). A narrative approach helps readers better appreciate the story of Abinadi as just that: a story. It can clarify and amplify how the story should be read and understood by looking closely at the bare bones text. As the additional articles in this section by Daniel L. Belnap (“The Abinadi Narrative, Redemption, and the Struggle for Nephite Identity”) and Frank F. Judd Jr. (“Conflicting Interpretations of Isaiah in Abinadi’s Trial”) help further demonstrate, the story of Abinadi is rich and rewarding when read closely and carefully.

The next section of the book (“Intertextual and Intratextual Lenses: The Book of Mormon and the Bible”) looks at the relationship between the Bible and the Book of Mormon as witnessed primarily in Mosiah 11–17. Nicholas J. Frederick (“If Christ Had Not Come Into the World”) explores the nature of the quotations of the King James Bible in the Abinadi pericope, while Shon D. Hopkin (“Isaiah 52–53 and Mosiah 13–14”) looks at the variants in the Book of Mormon’s quotations of biblical texts and compares them to textual witnesses, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Masoretic Hebrew Bible, and the Greek Septuagint. Combined, their articles paint a complicated picture when it comes to how exactly the Book of Mormon quotes the Bible (and the significance of such).

On one hand, as Frederick points out, the Book of Mormon is very clearly “filled with hundreds of quotations from and allusions to the King James Bible” (117), including the KJV New Testament.² At first blush this would appear to undermine the Book of Mormon’s claims to historicity. But on the other hand, at some key points the Book of Mormon’s quotations of the Bible include variant readings not found in the KJV that do nevertheless find support from ancient textual witnesses. As Hopkin explains, “In the Abinadi narrative, of the twenty variants that exist [between the Book of Mormon and the KJV], fourteen find support in an ancient manuscript witness — such as the Septuagint, the Targums, or the Dead Sea Scrolls — or they are an equally appropriate translation from the Masoretic Text” (153).

How might we reconcile this? Hopkin reasonably suggests, “The Book of Mormon may not have been a modern *creation*, but it was certainly a modern *translation*, purposefully reflecting language from Joseph Smith’s day, most importantly the King James Version, and

2. See further Nicholas J. Frederick, *The Bible, Mormon Scripture, and the Rhetoric of Allusivity* (Vancouver, B.C.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016).

departing from it only when necessary” (162, emphasis in original).³ All of this is to say that while this particular issue (the relationship between the KJV and the Book of Mormon) is still being explored, the intertextual work exemplified in *Abinadi* is precisely what is needed for further understanding.

In Part Three (“Cultural-Historical Lenses: Mesoamerican and North American”) of *Abinadi*, Kerry Hull (“An ‘East Wind’: Old and New World Perspectives”) and Mark Alan Wright (“Ethnohistorical Sources and the Death of Abinadi”) situate Mosiah 11–17 in an ancient New World context by reading some small but significant details about the Abinadi narrative in light of current archaeological and ethnohistorical knowledge. Take, for instance, Abinadi’s martyrdom. According to the Book of Mormon, the wicked priests of Noah “took [Abinadi] and bound him, and scourged his skin with faggots, yea, even unto death” (Mosiah 17:13). This method of execution — a torturous death by firebrand — has been documented to have been practiced by post- and pre-Columbian North and Central American peoples.⁴

By understanding the ethnohistorical background of this gruesome practice, Hull and Wright conclude, readers can better appreciate both evidence for the Book of Mormon’s antiquity as well as the figure of Abinadi as a true martyr.

The death of Abinadi was an act of martyrdom, an act of bravery, and a result of obedience. . . . His bold teaching in the face of certain death represents the very essence of his faith in the words and promises of his God. . . . Beyond the pains and physical anguish of possibly being burned at the stake, Abinadi likely suffered for hours if his death conformed to standard ethnohistorical accounts. (224)⁵

The final section of *Abinadi* looks at the theology of Mosiah 11–17 (“Theological Lenses: Historical and Philosophical”). Amy Easton-Flake (“Infant Salvation: Book of Mormon Theology in a Nineteenth-Century Context”) focuses her remarks on what the Book of Mormon

3. This converges nicely with the argument laid out in Brant A. Gardner, *The Gift and Power: Translating the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2011).

4. See additionally, “Why was Abinadi Scourged with Faggots?” online at <https://knowwhy.bookofmormoncentral.org/content/why-was-abinadi-scourged-with-faggots>; John W. Welch et al., eds., *Knowing Why: 137 Evidences That the Book of Mormon is True* (American Fork, UT: Covenant Communications, 2017), 221–22.

5. As a nice bonus, the “textual details on Abinadi’s manner of death given in Mosiah 17:3 echo perfectly what we find in these ancient traditions” (224).

teaches about infant baptism and the status of infants and children in the plan of salvation (Mosiah 15:25; Moroni 8:10–21). She specifically compares the Book of Mormon’s teachings on this matter to those espoused by other 19th century New England and New York Christian movements, including Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Restorationist, and Universalist sects. After looking carefully at early 19th century theological treatises and sermons from leading voices of these traditions, her research reveals that “the Book of Mormon does not prescribe to or endorse any one of the dominant theological positions in early nineteenth-century America. Instead, the book clearly resonates with different aspects of various denominational thought while also offering a more concise rationale for infant salvation and maintaining a focus on Christ’s grace that is not seen in other denominations’ treatises on the subject” (252–53).

All told, *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise* is an excellent example of the sort of scholarship that can and should be performed on the Book of Mormon. It offers something for those interested in approaching the Book of Mormon from multiple perspectives while moving the scholarly discussion forward.

Stephen O. Smoot is a graduate student in Near and Middle Eastern civilizations with a concentration in Egyptology at the University of Toronto. He previously graduated *cum laude* from Brigham Young University with bachelor’s degrees in Ancient Near Eastern Studies and German Studies. His areas of academic interest include the Hebrew Bible, ancient Egypt, Mormon studies, and German Romanticism. He blogs at www.plonialmonimormon.com.

ABINADI: A MINOR PROPHET, A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR

Andrew C. Smith

Abstract: *The new edited volume Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise, from the Book of Mormon Academy, is a valuable contribution to Book of Mormon studies. It should find a wide audience and stimulate greater and deeper thinking about the pivotal contributions of Abinadi to the Book of Mormon. It should, however, not be considered the end of the conversation. This review discusses the volume's importance within Book of Mormon scholarship generally. It also highlights certain valuable contributions from each of the authors, and points out places where more can be said and deeper analysis is needed.*

Review of Shon D. Hopkin, ed. *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise* (Provo and Salt Lake City, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book, 2018), 404 pp. \$27.99.

A strong addition to the field of Book of Mormon studies is available in a newly published volume titled *Abinadi: He Came Among Them in Disguise*. Its worth as an in-depth review and analysis of the story and character of Abinadi is enhanced by the quality of scholarship and the level of rigorous thinking that undergirded its production. Bringing together a strong collaboration of authors, Shon Hopkin has produced an edited volume that can be considered essential reading for anyone interested in better understanding the story of Abinadi before Noah and his priests as well as its impact on the rest of the Book of Mormon. This volume's importance is also heightened by the way it was produced. Published jointly by the Religious Studies Center at BYU and Deseret Book, the

volume obtains both the imprint of academic scholarship and approval by Church-owned and -operated institutions. While this may seem superficial to some, from my perspective this is an important point, for it means that *Deseret Book* is placing its stamp of approval on studies like this, which incorporate broader scholarly and academic approaches to scripture. It is also important in that this may (it is hoped!) reach certain audiences that have been historically wary or completely unaware of such academic approaches, showing that methods of academic analysis of scripture are not something to be feared and avoided.

This volume is also notable as the first major publishing effort of The Book of Mormon Academy (BOMA), “an academic think tank and research group begun at Brigham Young University in October 2013 to promote scholarship and teaching on the Book of Mormon” (vi). The value of this volume speaks well to the potential importance of such an institution. As an initial foray into the possibilities for research and production on the Book of Mormon, this volume gives me hope that such scholarship will become much more frequent. This is important, both for consideration of building the kingdom of God and also as it pertains to reaching out and speaking to the broader academic community: volumes of this type fill an important niche. As Hopkin explains in the introduction, this volume was deliberately conceived to follow upon and fit into the category of work by

scholars inside and outside of the Latter-day Saint faith [who] continue to use current academic tools and theories to produce work that takes the Book of Mormon seriously but that also seeks to be accessible to those who do not believe in the book’s divinely inspired nature ... [that] are neither polemic in nature nor “apologetically” designed to provide conclusive proof that the book of scripture is of ancient origin. (v)

There is — and always will be — a distinct need for continued scholarly thinking and writing about the Book of Mormon, particularly academic writing that is close, critical, and productive in a number of ways.

While opinions about the value of “bracketing” in scholarship may differ drastically, it is certainly a worthwhile effort to attempt to reach out to others in ways that speak to their “language, unto their understanding” (2 Nephi 31:3), in efforts to help them appreciate the beauty, depth, complexity, and value of the Book of Mormon. It should also be recognized that there is certainly room for many diverse opinions about approaches and conclusions vis-à-vis the Book of Mormon text,

even among faithful members of the Church. This is also evident in this volume, since all the contributors are professors of ancient scripture at Brigham Young University, though in some cases they come to very different conclusions about interpretation. Such a multiplicity of approaches, methods, and conclusions is something to be valued and appreciated rather than feared or disregarded. This is especially important in specific, non-mutually exclusive issues but also applies more broadly, since “the conclusions and approaches [in the volume] are not meant to be definitive” (vii). Although the volume is meant to follow norms and methods of scholarly analysis, the differing authors generally show various interpretations of what these norms and methods are and how those interact with their faith commitments. Some chapters end up leaning a little bit more, though not wholly so, toward the apologetic, while others do not. This approach is intentional: BOMA “believes that the Book of Mormon text shines best when the best tools are used to illuminate it” (vii).

Building upon these considerations, the intent of the volume is to begin filling a gap in attention to those figures who could be called “minor prophets” in the Book of Mormon, “whose important teachings span only pages instead of full books but whose recorded sermons have a powerful impact on the rest of the book and its modern-day readership. ... Abinadi seemed the logical choice as a figure whose page count is significantly smaller than his prophetic imprint” (vi).

Thus, all the authors are using the same relatively short text as their beginning point. But by bringing different scholarly approaches to bear on the same text, they reveal the internal complexity of the text and illuminate a variety of important meanings to be derived from it. These tools (and the training in them, which the authors exhibit) include a variety of types of academic analysis (textual, historical, literary, and form criticism), theological and philosophical thought, and comparative religious history.

Following these various approaches, the volume is divided into four parts, two or three chapters in each: “Literary Lenses: Narratological, Sociopolitical, Biblical”; “Intertextual and Intratextual Lenses: The Book of Mormon and the Bible”; “Cultural-Historical Lenses: Mesoamerican and North American”; and “Theological Lenses: Historical and Philosophical.” This review addresses briefly each of these headings, providing a brief overview of the topic of each as well as my reaction to the arguments or content presented (as valuation and criticism). In some cases this will be more because of their importance, or less where a simple summary suffices. In all cases, however, my strong recommendation

is that those interested in studies in the Book of Mormon pick up this volume and engage deeply with the essays.

Within the general category of Literary Lenses, the foundational chapter by Jared Ludlow, titled “‘A Messenger of Good and Evil Tidings’: A Narrative Study of Abinadi,” provides the essential “narratological” overview and analysis of the section of Mosiah devoted to Abinadi and his ministry. In this type of literary approach, Ludlow dissects the narrative into its constituent parts, showing the distinct emphases and broader literary intent of the author. He analyzes characters as protagonists and antagonists and their historical background as well as the setting and arc or progression of the story. Such a piece lays the groundwork for just about everything that follows. Ludlow’s analysis and conclusions are very well organized and articulated.

Even so, I quibble slightly with some of Ludlow’s views, specifically his use of literary approaches to scriptural text. Ludlow divides the text into parts based on how the discussion in Noah’s court moves between calls to repentance and overt interpretation of passages from Isaiah. The result is some choppy divisions and atomistic parts that, in my opinion, muddle rather than clarify the flow of Abinadi’s words. The speech seems more disjointed than seamless, and readers may not see how the divisions relate to one another. Though my quibble is minor, it may pose ramifications to how we understand Abinadi’s speech.

Daniel Belnap’s chapter, “The Abinadi Narrative, Redemption, and the Struggle for Nephite Identity,” is a remarkable analysis of the place and presence of the Zeniffite colony in the Land of Nephi and the impact of political and discursive realities on the story’s historical setting as well as its literary composition. Belnap’s impressive analysis helps clarify the dissension and colonizing efforts which Zeniff provokes: “This, then, is the scene which Mormon has set up — group of Nephites, some of whom were Nephite elites and believed that the land of Zarahemla was not part of their inheritance and certainly not the land of their fathers, left Zarahemla to reclaim the old Nephite territory, apparently believing that the greater Nephite population had gone astray through the policy of integration and that their own group therefore represented the true Nephite identity” (35). In one of his more impressive claims and arguments, Belnap construes the colony’s efforts essentially as rebellion, not simply against the state but also against God (47–48). This analysis alone is a worthy and important contribution. Overall, the piece obliges the reader to think about the sociopolitical realities of the historical situation as they interplay with the literary contextualization, or why

Mormon not only inserted the narrative of the Zeniffite colony into his broader history in the Book of Mosiah but also why he put it where he did. However, in some places — for instance the discussion and analysis of the position of Ammon₁ as a potential part of the Mulekite royal line and what that would mean for the search party sent to find the colony — I see a bit of interpretive overreach (see page 34).

The third chapter in this section devoted to Literary Lenses is Frank Judd's "Conflicting Interpretations of Isaiah in Abinadi's Trial." Judd's literary approach looks mainly at the passages of Isaiah that are pertinent to the Abinadi narrative and their places within the Book of Isaiah. It clarifies how they are interpreted by Abinadi and the priests of Noah: the difference revolves around the identity and mission of the Suffering Servant, becoming one of the major points of contention between Abinadi and the priests. While Judd's overview of the pertinent Isaiah material is valuable, it is still rather general; I found myself wishing for deeper discussion of some of the critical issues devoted to Isaiah. Likewise, while Judd's careful reading of the position of Noah's priests regarding the need for a Messiah is impressive, some distinct issues go unexplored. Judd recognizes that although the "priests of Noah accepted the legitimacy of the Law of Moses, it may be that they ... denied that the law was symbolic of the mission of the Messiah and that the Messiah played a primary role in the salvation of humankind" (84). However, in the broader issues of the denial of the Son in the Nephite record and the teachings of early Nephite leaders (particularly Jacob), additional pertinent evidence or information related to the existence of the colony and its theological project should be considered. Specifically, how could these priests firmly reject the teachings of Nephi and Lehi about the coming of the Messiah and his role, while yet strongly accepting their postulate that the Land of Nephi is the Promised Land or land of inheritance? How can the priests and Noah accept these promises and doctrines, as taught by Nephi and Jacob yet reject the divine nature of God himself descending? Perhaps the priests simply interpreted prophecies of the coming Messiah as not necessarily divine but as having been already fulfilled in someone else? I argue that this was their position with regard to the leadership of Zeniff, though other possibilities exist. Judd does not broach these possibilities.

The second major part of the book is devoted to intertextual and intratextual lenses, seeing the aspects of the Abinadi passages that echo down through the rest of the Book of Mormon as well as how they interact with biblical texts. John Hilton III's contribution, "Abinadi's

Legacy: Tracing His Influence through the Book of Mormon,” is essentially concerned with the former. Offering a wonderful introduction to the basics of method and approach of intertextuality (93–97), Hilton traces the usages, allusions, and echoes to Abinadi’s words through other major sections of the Book of Mormon. One major aspect that Hilton rightly picks up is the relationship between Benjamin and Abinadi. A major literary connection exists between the two, but as Hilton correctly points out, this is perplexing: Benjamin’s speech occurred roughly 30 years (by Hilton’s logic) after Abinadi’s martyrdom, and there is no simple or direct logical explanation of how Benjamin may have heard or been exposed to Abinadi’s teachings; no contact existed between the colony and Zarahemla.

The discrepancy may be accounted for in a number of ways. Most interpreters see Mormon as playing an editorial role (see footnote 28 on page 285 within the chapter contributed by Joseph Spencer). Hilton, however, while recognizing the influence of Abinadi’s speech on Mormon, does not engage himself with these interpretations, and presents only superficial arguments against such a possibility. Rather, Hilton points to the possible influence of the angel that visits King Benjamin, based on the fact that the strongest literary connections between Benjamin’s speech and Abinadi’s occur in the sections Benjamin quotes from the angel. Hilton broaches the possibilities (put forward by others initially) that not only did the angel teach Abinadi’s words, but the angel may have been Abinadi himself. Much of this is speculative (as Hilton points out), but Hilton presents it as being of great importance: “This potential influence is not tangential in understanding Book of Mormon teachings. If Abinadi did teach King Benjamin (or another angel taught Abinadi’s words to King Benjamin), then Abinadi is the first prophetic witness found in Mormon’s abridgement of the large plates of Nephi, influencing all prophetic voices after him” (109). However, this seems interpretive overreach. Do we really need to postulate or speculate on something like this to shore up our notions that Abinadi’s teachings were very important within the Nephite prophetic record and upon Mormon’s endeavor? What Hilton fails to discuss, though, is the possibility of further redaction of these records between the period when the original speeches were written and how they came down to Mormon. It seems much more plausible to postulate a harmonization of the records within the Church established by Alma₁, probably accomplished by Alma₂. There is even plausible literary evidence for this, specifically in the form of the gloss of the word *seed* in Mosiah 15:11, which reads, “or they are

the heirs of the kingdom of God.” This language is prominent in the writings and sermons of Alma², and it appears to be a later insertion because it breaks up the flow of Abinadi’s words in this section.¹

The next two chapters of this section deal with how the text of the Abinadi narrative interacts with and is illuminated by its intertextual relationship with biblical texts. Nicholas Frederick’s piece, “If Christ Had Not Come into the World,” deals with the interplay between specific phrases in Abinadi’s speech, Paul’s letters, and John’s writings in the New Testament. Frederick presents more information than can be dealt with in brief summary. Yet it is an extremely well thought-out piece that presents important considerations that emerge from a distinct comparison of these texts, focused not only on how the phrases are held in common but also how they are used in distinct ways, usually based in subtle shifts and added nuance. Frederick concludes that such subtle differences are integral to the way the Book of Mormon generally interweaves its narratives with textual language from the New Testament.

One of the most astonishing aspects of the Book of Mormon is the attention given to the weaving of text. To interact with the Bible to the extent the Book of Mormon does risks producing a “textual Frankenstein,” a book in which the parts have been so clumsily constructed that the seams linking the Book of Mormon to the Bible are not only visible but obtrusive. That the Book of Mormon (largely) avoids this speaks to its complexity. (131)

This interweaving supports broader points about the text of the Book of Mormon in its relation to the New Testament, specifically its confidence in using the New Testament and its demanding nature in that it presupposes or expects its reader to grasp and recognize where it specifically is in contact with the New Testament. It then expects readers to relate and analyze the differences in both texts.

Shon Hopkin, in “Isaiah 52-53 and Mosiah 13-14: A Textual Comparison,” takes a different tack on the interplay between the Book of Mormon and biblical texts, focusing on textual variants between the Abinadi materials and quotations of Isaiah and those same materials as found in the King James Version of the Bible as well as within the Great Isaiah Scroll (from the Dead Sea Scrolls). Let me point out only that this type of study is extremely valuable, perhaps essential, to future studies in

1. While the phrase “kingdom of God” is certainly used often within Nephi’s and Jacob’s writings, it is overwhelmingly found in Alma’s writings in Alma 5, 7, 9, 12, 39, 40, and 41.

this vein. Such studies may require an extremely close eye for detail and nuance, but this type of scholarship is essential to continued development of scholarly works and understanding of the Book of Mormon text. This type of engagement will pave the way for additional studies.

Part three of the volume, on cultural-historical lenses, illuminates the Abinadi narrative through contextualization within a Mesoamerican or North American setting. Kerry Hull, in the first chapter, “An ‘East Wind’: Old and New World Perspectives,” examines the usage of the phrase or image of the “east wind” that appears twice in Mosiah, in both cases connected to the Abinadi narrative (Mosiah 7:31 and 12:6). He examines the usage of such a phrase biblically, including its surprising usage in a number of places dealing with geographies outside of Palestine. This is of interest because it indicates the spread of this phrase beyond the original geographical location to which the idiom was specifically bound. In other words, the notion of an “east wind” bringing destruction or as an idiom of destruction has, in these instances, been decontextualized from the geography in which it arose (Palestine) and is applied to geographies where it does not apply directly (Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the broader Mediterranean). He presents not only several relevant connections with the Old World but also impressive information on the presence of “east winds” in Mesoamerica. He then presents distinct, plausible explanations for the usage of the phrase within a Book of Mormon set within a Mesoamerican context. Altogether, Hull shows a mastery of source materials and capabilities in a large variety of ancient contexts, cultures, and languages to make his point: the allusion to “east winds” might not be as odd as it may seem at first blush.

Kerry Hull teams up with Mark Alan Wright, another Mesoamericanist, to provide the next chapter, one of the chapters that will (and should, in my opinion) exert the most influence among Latter-day Saint readers on contemporary understandings of Abinadi’s martyrdom. Titled “Ethnohistorical Sources and the Death of Abinadi,” this chapter presents a very important study of the methods and means of painful torture and ritualized execution common throughout North and Central America. Rather than a common “colloquial” assumption of Abinadi being burned at the stake, the Book of Mormon text attributes Abinadi’s death to being beaten, or otherwise assaulted, with burning firebrands. Hull and Wright present ethnohistorical documentation on how this was accomplished broadly within an ancient American context, potentially resulting in “an extended process of torture” that could have taken hours if not days. “This refined view of Abinadi’s death

contributes to a greater appreciation of his act of willing martyrdom, knowing, as he likely did, the nature of physical torture he would have to endure” (209). This type of understanding, in my view, should become the standard interpretation and understanding of Abinadi’s execution, and an explication of context in print form is invaluable. However, it is also important to understand the broader questions this understanding evokes in LDS understanding of the Book of Mormon and scripture in general. This is an example of the type of influence of “colloquial” interpretations, which exemplifies the power of human imagination and assumptions, combined with cultural blinders, to influence our understanding of the scriptures.

The next natural question: If this is such a “spot on” case of Meso- or North American cultural practices that illuminate the narratives of the Book of Mormon, what else might we have overlooked? There is certainly much more work to be done here.

The final part of the volume consists of two papers that take a theological or philosophical approach to distinct portions of the Abinadi narrative. In “Infant Salvation: Book of Mormon Theology in a 19th-Century Context,” Amy Easton-Flake hones in on Abinadi’s statement that “little children also have eternal life” (Mosiah 15:25) and compares the Book of Mormon treatment of infant baptism with prominent views among a variety of denominations of 19th century America. Though I am not an expert in 19th century religious history, I find Easton-Flake’s exposition a model of how to understand the Book of Mormon within the context of its translation. More discussions such as this would be important contributions for viewing the Book of Mormon’s status as a 19th century document, that is, a document translated in the 19th century. Specifically, Easton-Flake notes how integral the discussion of infant baptism was to the broader issues of free will debated in the period. In comparing the teachings of the Book of Mormon with those of a variety of denominations, Easton-Flake concludes that

the Book of Mormon does not prescribe to or endorse any one of the dominant theological positions in early nineteenth-century America. Instead, the book clearly resonates with different aspects of various denominational thought while also offering a more concise rationale for infant salvation and maintaining a focus on Christ’s grace that is not seen in other denominations’ treatises on the subject. Its ability to touch on many of the most pressing issues within the nineteenth-century debate, while constructing its own unique teaching on the subject as a whole,

suggests a theological sophistication that has not often been granted to the Book of Mormon. (252–53)

The analysis and evidence that lead to this conclusion are well worth careful scrutiny.

The final chapter of the volume, Joseph Spencer’s “‘As Though’: Time Being, and Negation in Mosiah 16:5–6” builds on recent philosophical readings of Paul and his usage of the words *as* and *though* as they occur in the phrases *as though* and *as though not*. His philosophical analysis is fascinating and important. But the careful analysis and theological logic of Spencer’s argument cannot be simply summarized here. Readers are encouraged to read this essay particularly on their own. I will simply point to part of the conclusion of this impressive chapter, which mainly concerns the layering of real and possible worlds:

Sin and faith, that is, are two different ways of layering worlds. Faith amounts to a layering of the possible and the actual in such a way that the two interpenetrate, the future possible interrupting the present actual and all actuality opening directly on its fundamental possibilities. Sin, however, amounts to a layering of the possible and the actual in such a way that one entirely obscures — if not eradicates — the other, the merely possible posing as and in the place of the actual. (280)

While perhaps denser prose than many readers will be used to, this chapter pays well in dividends of deep thought that may help us understand the folly of living in the possible worlds of sin that reject and attempt to negate the reality of living in the light of our Savior.

While Spencer’s piece is the last of the essay-chapters of the volume, the book contains two appendices of distinct note. Appendix 1 is a heavily annotated critical text version of the Abinadi narrative (Mosiah 11–17). This will prove a valuable tool for students of the Book of Mormon who seek to understand the English text of the book and its connections (literary, textual, narratological, theological, and historical) to the rest of the Book of Mormon and the Bible. It is an impressive array of connections and insights, a work that will, one hopes, be the beginning of other critical textual work for other sections of the Book of Mormon to be produced by BOMA. The second appendix is a bibliography of important works (scholarly and devotional) on the Abinadi narrative. Like the first appendix, this appendix may prove to be a handy research and study aid for those who wish to deepen their understanding of this section of the Book of Mormon.

In short, this volume is a valuable resource. I heartily recommend it to all students of the Book of Mormon. It contains important original research and insights, and is as well a valuable model for future analysis of this book of scripture.

Andrew C. Smith is currently an adjunct instructor in Ancient Scripture at Brigham Young University and an associate editor of the Journal of Book of Mormon Studies. He holds a Ph.D. in Religious Studies from Claremont Graduate University. His research interests revolve mainly around comparative scriptural studies in the Abrahamic scriptural traditions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam).

**“THOU ART THE FRUIT OF MY LOINS”:
THE INTERRELATED SYMBOLISM
AND MEANINGS OF THE NAMES
JOSEPH AND EPHRAIM IN ANCIENT SCRIPTURE**

Matthew L. Bowen & Loren Blake Spendlove

ABSTRACT: To the ancient Israelite ear, the name Ephraim sounded like or connoted “doubly fruitful.” Joseph explains the naming of his son Ephraim in terms of the Lord’s having “caused [him] to be fruitful” (Genesis 41:52). The “fruitfulness” motif in the Joseph narrative cycle (Genesis 37–50) constitutes the culmination of a larger, overarching theme that begins in the creation narrative and is reiterated in the patriarchal narratives. “Fruitfulness,” especially as expressed in the collocation “fruit of [one’s] loins” dominates in the fuller version of Genesis 48 and 50 contained in the Joseph Smith Translation, a version of which Lehi and his successors had upon the brass plates. “Fruit” and “fruitfulness” as a play on the name Ephraim further serve to extend the symbolism and meaning of the name Joseph (“may he [God] add,” “may he increase”) and the etiological meanings given to his name in Genesis 30:23–24). The importance of the interrelated symbolism and meanings of the names Joseph and Ephraim for Book of Mormon writers, who themselves sought the blessings of divine fruitfulness (e.g., Lehi, Nephi, and Jacob), is evident in their use of the fuller version of the Joseph cycle (e.g., in Lehi’s parenesis to his son Joseph in 2 Nephi 3). It is further evident in their use of the prophecies of Isaiah and Zenos’s allegory of the olive tree, both of which utilize (divine) “fruitfulness” imagery in describing the apostasy and restoration of Israel (including the Northern Kingdom or “Ephraim”).

The shape and vowelings of the name of Joseph’s youngest son Ephraim (*‘eprayim*) suggests that it meant, or was thought to mean, “doubly

fruitful” or “twice fruitful” as a dual noun.¹ The lexical association between the name Ephraim and the idea of “double fruitfulness” suggests the birthright status he acquired though he was the younger of Joseph’s two named sons (see Genesis 48:13–22).² It further points to the status the tribe of Ephraim afterward held in Israel as the Lord’s “firstborn” (“I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is **my firstborn** [*bĕkōrî*],” Jeremiah 31:9; cf. *bikkûrîm* = “first fruits” and Joseph as the Lord’s “firstborn bull” [*bĕkôr šôrô*], Deuteronomy 33:17). Ephraim represented Joseph’s “portion” (*šĕkem*) above his brethren (Genesis 48:22) or “double portion” (Hebrew *pî šĕnayim*)³ belonging thereto (cf. especially D&C 133:34).

In this article, we explore the name Ephraim and its Genesis etiology, “God hath **caused me** [Joseph] **to be fruitful** [*hipranî*]” (Genesis 41:52), as an extension of the double–etiology for Joseph’s name offered in Genesis 30:23–24 (“he hath taken away” or “gathered in” [*āsap*]; and “he shall add” or “may he add” [*yōsēp/yōsēp*]). To this end, we examine the various texts in the Hebrew Bible that interpret the name Ephraim in terms of “fruitfulness,” often also employing the image of branches. When examined in the context of the biblical etiology for the name Ephraim and the prophetic biblical texts that deal with Joseph and Ephraim, the collocation “fruit of [the] loins” in JST Genesis 48 and 50 and in the Book of Mormon emerges as an important conceptual play on the name Joseph and wordplay on the name Ephraim, making the latter name an important symbol of “fruit” (posterity), being “fruitful,” and the growing and fructification of branches.

“God Hath Caused Me to Be Fruitful”: An Etiology for Ephraim

The Genesis narrative offers paronomastic explanations for all the major patriarchs: Abraham in terms of his destiny to become a “father of many nations [*’ab hāmôn gōyîm*]” (Genesis 17:4–5),⁴ Isaac in terms of “laughter” or “rejoicing” in posterity (*šāḥaq*);⁵ Jacob in terms of “grabbing the heel”

1. See, e.g., Bruce M. Waltke and Michael P. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 118.

2. See also Brian L. Smith, *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, ed. Daniel H. Ludlow (New York: Macmillan, 1992), s.v. “Ephraim.”

3. See Deuteronomy 21:17 and 2 Kings 2:9.

4. Cf. Abraham 1:2, which records Abraham’s desire to become “a father of many nations,” an apparent autobiographical wordplay on his name.

5. Genesis 17:17; 18:12–15; 21:16. The Genesis narrative further plays on the verb *šāḥaq* in additional senses (see, e.g., Genesis 21:9: “And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian, which she had born unto Abraham, mocking.”)

or “supplanting” (*ʿāqab*)⁶ “wrestling” (*ʿbq*)⁷ and “embracing” (*ḥbq*),⁸ and Joseph in terms of both “taking away” (or “gathering,” *ʿāsap*) and “adding” (*yāsap*). The Genesis text explains Joseph’s naming of Ephraim in terms of the verb *pry* (“be fruitful”): “And the name of the second called he **Ephraim** [*ʿepṛāyim*]⁹: For God **hath caused me to be fruitful** [*hipranî*] in the land of my affliction” (Genesis 41:52). Joseph’s reported explanation of his son’s name in terms of a causative verbal form of *pry* is not strictly etymological, nor is it so intended. The main narratological and rhetorical point is to tie the name Ephraim with “fruit” and “fruitfulness.”

The narrator’s inclusion of this explanation of Ephraim’s name in terms of “fruitfulness” — and implicitly as “doubly fruitful” or “twice fruitful” — speaks not simply of Joseph’s “fruitfulness” in Egypt but to Ephraim’s tribal destiny within Israel: to become (again) “fruitful” among the tribes of Israel (cf. Hosea 13:7; cf. Zechariah 10:7–10). Ephraim would embody the *tēbûʾôt* (“fruits”) which Joseph was destined to inherit.¹⁰

“I Will Make Thee Fruitful”

Jacob recounts to Joseph the blessing the Lord had given him at Luz or Bethel (Genesis 35:11),¹¹ which was formally a reiteration of the covenant the Lord had made with Abraham his grandfather and Isaac his father. Here, however, Jacob articulates the content of the blessing in such a way as to recall the first blessing and commandment given to created life (“And [I,] God blessed them, saying, **Be fruitful** [*pěṛû*], and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth” Genesis 1:22; Moses 2:22), then to Adam and Eve in the garden (“And God blessed them, and [I,] God said unto them, **Be fruitful** [*pěṛû*], and multiply, and replenish [fill] the earth,” Genesis 1:28; Moses 2:28), and subsequently reiterated with Noah (“And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said unto them, **Be fruitful** [*pěṛû*], and multiply, and replenish [fill] the earth,” Genesis 9:1).¹² However, Jacob’s description of

6. Genesis 25:26; 27:36; cf. Jeremiah 9:4.

7. Genesis 32:24–25 [MT 25–26].

8. Genesis 29:13; 33:4; 48:10.

9. Pausal form: *ʿepṛāyim* vs. *ʿepṛayim*.

10. See Moses’s final blessing upon Joseph — “the ten thousands of Ephraim, and ... the thousands of Manasseh” (Deuteronomy 33:13–17).

11. See also Genesis 28.

12. Genesis 9:7 states similarly, “And you, **be ye fruitful** [*pěṛû*], and multiply; bring forth abundantly in the earth, and multiply therein.

his blessing further plays on the name Ephraim (“doubly fruitful”) and ties its fulfillment to all of the foregoing:

And [God Almighty] said unto me, Behold, **I will make thee fruitful** [*maprĕkā*] and multiply thee, and I will make of thee a multitude of people; and will give this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession. And now thy two sons, **Ephraim** [*’eprayim*] and Manasseh, which were born unto thee in the land of Egypt before I came unto thee into Egypt, are mine; as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine. (Genesis 48:4–5)

Jacob acknowledges Joseph’s sons Ephraim and Manasseh as the particular fulfillment of the blessings and promises the Lord gave to him as recorded in Genesis 28:3 (“And God Almighty bless thee, **and make thee fruitful** [*wĕyapĕkā*], and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people”) and 35:11 (“be fruitful [*pĕrĕ*] and multiply”). The same blessings and promises regarding fruitfulness now belong to Joseph through his sons, Ephraim and Manasseh.

“The Fruit of My Loins”

In the book of Acts we read that king David received a promise from God that Christ would be descended from “the fruit of his loins.”¹³ The phrase *fruit of his loins* (hereafter referred to as FL for “fruit of X loins”) is rarely used in the scriptures. It stands unattested in the King James Version of the Old Testament¹⁴ — although it is attested in the Joseph Smith Translation (hereafter JST) — and occurs only once in the New Testament (see above), once in the Doctrine and Covenants¹⁵ and once in the Pearl of Great Price.¹⁶ However, FL, including its variations (*fruit of*

13. Acts 2:30, where the phrase “καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ [*karpou tēs osphyos autou*]” can be translated as “fruit of the loins of him.”

14. Jacob used the collocation *fruit of the womb* (*pĕrĭ-bāten* = פְּרִי־בֶטֶן) in Genesis 30:2 when angrily replying to Rachel that God was responsible for leaving her barren. Interestingly, Joseph would become Rachel’s first fruit when God eventually “opened her womb” Genesis 30:22.

15. In D&C 132:30 we read: “Abraham received promises concerning his seed, and of the *fruit of his loins* — from whose loins ye are, namely, my servant Joseph — which were to continue so long as they were in the world; and as touching Abraham and his seed, out of the world they should continue; both in the world and out of the world should they continue as innumerable as the stars; or, if ye were to count the sand upon the seashore ye could not number them.”

16. In Moses 8:2 we read: “And it came to pass that Methuselah, the son of Enoch, was not taken, that the covenants of the Lord might be fulfilled, which he

my loins and *fruit of thy loins*), is attested nearly 20 times in the Book of Mormon. All of these occurrences of FL, with one exception,¹⁷ are found in a single chapter of the Book of Mormon — in Lehi's blessing of his son Joseph (2 Nephi 3).

FL Usage in the Book of Mormon

In the first three verses of 2 Nephi 3, Lehi directly addresses and blesses his son Joseph. In verses 4 and 5 he introduces the FL phrase and transitions the attention from his son Joseph to his ancestor Joseph, for whom his son has been named:

For behold, thou art the **fruit of my loins**, and I am a descendant of Joseph, which was carried captive into Egypt. And great was the covenants of the Lord which he made unto Joseph. Wherefore Joseph truly saw our day, and he obtained a promise of the Lord that out of the **fruit of his loins** the Lord God would raise up a righteous branch unto the house of Israel.¹⁸

In verses 6 through 21, Lehi mostly quotes the writings of his ancestor Joseph, presumably from the Brass Plates, in which he records the use of the FL phrase an additional 15 times, for a total of 17 occurrences (see Table 1 below).

While both Lehi and Joseph used the FL phrase twice in this chapter, it is clear from Table 1 that the Lord is the most prolific user of the collocation, using it 13 times, as is also suggested by the distribution of its use in 2 Nephi 3. In addition to these 17 usages of the FL phrase in Table 1, the Lord also used three additional but closely related phrases which are worth mentioning (see Table 2 below).

made to Enoch; for he truly covenanted with Enoch that Noah should be of the *fruit of his loins*."

17. The exception is in Jacob 2:25 where Lehi's penultimate son repeated the same message which is found in 2 Nephi 3 — that God would "raise up" a "righteous branch from the *fruit of the loins* of Joseph" (see further below).

18. The text in these verses differs from that published by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. All Book of Mormon citations in this paper have been taken from *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text*, edited by Royal Skousen (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

Table 1¹⁹

#	Verse	Wording	Speaker	Source
1	4	fruit of my loins	Lehi	Plates of Nephi
2	5	fruit of his loins	Lehi	Plates of Nephi
3	6	fruit of my loins	Joseph	Brass Plates*
4	7	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
5	7	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
6	7	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
7	11	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
8	12	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
9	12	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
10	12	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
11	14	fruit of my loins	Joseph	Brass Plates
12	18	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates
13	18	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates
14	18	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates
15	19	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates
16	19	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates
17	21	fruit of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates

Table 2

#	Verse	Wording	Speaker	Source
1	11	seed of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates*
2	12	fruit of the loins of Judah	Lord	Brass Plates*
3	1	fruit of the loins of Judah	Lord	Brass Plates*
4	18	spokesman of thy loins	Lord	Brass Plates

19. In Tables 1 and 2, all FL references which show the source as the Brass Plates and are followed by an asterisk are also found in Genesis 50 of the JST. References without the asterisk are not found in the JST and are unique to the Brass Plates. Nephi saw in vision the Hebrew bible and wrote that it contained “many of the prophecies of the holy prophets,” and that it was “like unto the engravings which are upon the plates of brass, save there are not so many” (1 Nephi 13:23). This appears to be one example where the Brass Plates contain a more complete record “of the prophecies of the holy prophets” than the Hebrew bible since not even the JST contains much of the information that Lehi recorded from the Brass Plates in this chapter.

Why the FL Collocation?

So, why would this single chapter in the Book of Mormon use this obscure FL collocation with such frequency when it is rarely found in other books of scripture, including in the other books and chapters of the Book of Mormon? The answer to that question largely resides within the stories of Jacob's adoption of Ephraim and Manasseh as "Israel" and of Jacob blessing his sons in Genesis 49.

Just as Lehi blessed his children and grandchildren prior to his death (2 Nephi 4:12), Jacob (Israel) also gathered his sons and grandchildren around him in the land of Egypt to give them each a final blessing. When blessing Joseph, Jacob said: "Joseph is a fruitful bough [*bēn pōrāt*], even a fruitful bough [*bēn pōrāt*, fruitful son (see below)] by a well; whose branches run over the wall" (Genesis 49:22).²⁰ Twice in this verse Jacob referred to his son Joseph as "fruitful."

When Rachel's firstborn son was born "she called his name Joseph; and said, the Lord *shall add* [*yōsēp*] to me another son" (Genesis 30:24). Joseph's name in Hebrew (*yōsēp*) is a third person causative (*hiphil*) jussive form of the verb *yāsap*, meaning to "add" or "increase."²¹ Later, when Joseph's only full brother was born, his mother called this new son Ben-oni (Genesis 35:18).²² However, apparently not fully pleased with the name, Jacob renamed this son Benjamin. While Jacob did not rename Joseph, he did associate Joseph's name with the idea of being "fruitful" in his blessing, a fitting extension of its original meaning, "may he add" or "may he increase."

Earlier in the Genesis narratives, Isaac blessed Jacob that "God Almighty" would make him "fruitful" ("and make thee fruitful," *wēyaprēkā*) and "multiply" him so that he would become "a multitude of people" (Genesis 28:3). Later, the Lord himself reaffirmed the blessing when he proclaimed: "I am God Almighty: **be fruitful** [*pērē*] and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins" (Genesis 35:11). Interestingly, this divine

20. A literal rendering of this verse could be: "Son fruitful Joseph, son fruitful by spring, daughters step over (or on) wall."

21. For a detailed analysis of this topic, see: Matthew L. Bowen, "Their Anger Did Increase Against Me": Nephi's Autobiographical Permutation of a Biblical Wordplay on the Name Joseph," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 23 (2017): 115–36.

22. For a detailed analysis of this topic, see: Matthew L. Bowen, Onomastic Wordplay on Joseph and Benjamin and Gezera Shawa in the Book of Mormon, *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 18 (2016): 255–73.

imperative for Jacob to “be fruitful” comes *after* the birth of Joseph, the eleventh of twelve sons, which is suggestive of the role that Joseph and his posterity will have in making Jacob “fruitful.”

“Joseph Is a Fruitful Bough”: Fruitful “Son” Joseph

Jacob was blessed and commanded to be fruitful, and Joseph embodies the fulfillment of that promise and command. The KJV renders the opening line of Israel’s blessing to Joseph as “Joseph is a fruitful bough,” but a literal translation from Hebrew yields “a fruitful son [is] Joseph” (*bēn pōrāt yōsēp*).²³ One could even understand this wording as a blessing from Israel that his “fruitful” son “will increase” (*yōsēp/ yōsēp*, cf. Genesis 30:24). Taken together, these facts explain why the Lord repeatedly referred to Joseph’s descendants as the “fruit” of his loins in 2 Nephi 3: Joseph is “fruitful.” That Lehi and Joseph used the FL collocation to refer to their own descendants indicates that they were also aware of the special significance of the FL collocation.

Lehi told his son Joseph, “Thou art the fruit of my loins, and I am a descendant of Joseph” (2 Nephi 3:4). The first line, “Thou art the fruit of my loins” parallels the second, “I am a descendant of Joseph.” In essence, Lehi was saying that his own son Joseph, the “fruitful son,” was the fruit of his loins in the same sense that he was the fruit of his father Joseph, the “fruitful son” of Jacob. In a poetic way, Lehi’s son Joseph is both “fruit” (as the son of Lehi) and “fruitful” (named after their common ancestor Joseph, whose name is etiolozed²⁴ with the harvest verb *’āsap* (“gather [in]”; “bring in”; “take away”)²⁵ and its actual etymological source, the verb *yāsap* in the sense of “adding” a son or “branch” (*bēn*) — i.e., “fruit” or posterity. We propose that the abundant use of the FL collocation in JST Genesis 48 and 50 and in the Book of Mormon is best explained as an onomastic wordplay on an allusion to the interrelated meanings of the names Joseph (“may he add”) and Ephraim (“doubly fruitful”).

23. The use of the word *pōrāt* (פֶּרֶת) rather than *pārâ* (פֶּרֶה) in this verse is unusual, but not without explanation. “The letters ת (*taw*) and ה (*he*) sometimes alternate, especially in cases of older names. These tend to be spelled with the letter *taw*, while the word it came from evolved from being spelled with a *taw* to being spelled with a *he*. And so scholars think the name Parat most likely comes from the verb פָּרָה (*para*), bear fruit, be fruitful.” Abarim Publications’ Biblical Name Vault, s.v. “Parat,” last updated on November 21, 2017, <http://www.abarim-publications.com/Meaning/Parat.html>.

24. See Genesis 30:23–24.

25. Cf. HALOT, 74–75.

“Doubly Fruitful”: Ephraim as Fulfillment or Extension of Joseph’s Name

Prior to the seven years of famine arriving in Egypt, Joseph’s wife, “Asenath the daughter of Potipherah priest of On,” gave birth to two sons,²⁶ Manasseh and Ephraim. The Genesis narrator reports Joseph’s naming these sons as follows:

And Joseph called the name of the firstborn **Manasseh** [*měnaššeh*, participle form of *nšy/nšh*, “one who causes to forget”]: For God, said he, **hath made me forget** [*naššani*] all my toil, and all my father’s house. And the name of the second called he **Ephraim** [*’epřāyim*, a dual form from the root *pry/prh*, to be fruitful²⁷]: For God **hath caused me to be fruitful** [*hiprani*; or, **made me fruitful**] in the land of my affliction (Genesis 41:51–52).

Years after Israel and the rest of his family arrived in Egypt during the time of famine we read that Israel fell ill, so Joseph went to his father’s house and “took with him his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim” (Genesis 48:1). When Joseph arrived at his father’s house several interesting events occurred:

1. Israel first recounted how God had appeared to him years earlier and had blessed him that he would be “fruitful” and would “multiply” and make of him a “multitude of people” (Genesis 48:3–4).
2. He then informed Joseph that his two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh,²⁸ were not only to be counted as Joseph’s sons but also as Israel’s, just “as Reuben and Simeon”²⁹ (Genesis 48:5).
3. Whether at this time or another, Israel blessed his two new sons, placing his right hand on Ephraim’s head and his left hand on Manasseh. Joseph tried to correct his father, “Not so,

26. Genesis 41:50.

27. *The Jewish Encyclopedia.com*, (1907), s.v. “Ephraim,” <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/5793-ephraim>.

28. It is noteworthy that in verse 1, the two sons of Joseph are mentioned in the order of their births. However, in verse 5 Jacob listed the two sons in the opposite order of their births, placing the younger son (Ephraim) before the older (Manasseh).

29. In this verse Israel paired the two youngest and newest of his sons (Ephraim and Manasseh) with the two oldest (Reuben and Simeon). We learn later that Ephraim is given the birthright over the oldest son Reuben. This is a great example of what Jesus taught when he said: “So the last shall be first, and the first last” (Matthew 20:16).

my father: for this [Manasseh] is the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his head.” Israel, however, responded: “I know it, my son, I know it: he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations. And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and as Manasseh: and he set Ephraim before Manasseh” (Genesis 48:14–20).

4. Israel gave an extra or double portion to Joseph — twice as much as his brothers — showing that the position of firstborn had passed from Reuben to Joseph and to Joseph’s descendants³⁰ (Genesis 48:22).
5. The extra or double portion given to Joseph would also seem to reflect the name of Joseph’s youngest son Ephraim. In Hebrew, one could express “double portion” with the dual construction *pî šēnayim*³¹ (which rhymes with Ephraim), but here in Genesis 48:22, the narrator opts to use the expression “one portion above” *šēkem* (“shoulder” or “portion”) with the preposition *‘al* (“above”).

The narrator appears to have chosen the noun *šēkem* as a wordplay on Shechem (*šēkem*), the place where Jacob sent his son Joseph to check on his brothers in Genesis 37 and where he did not find them. Shechem is consistently identified with the tribal territory of Ephraim in the Hebrew Bible: Joshua 20:7 (“Shechem in mount Ephraim [*šēkem bēhar ‘eprāyim*]”); Joshua 21:21 (“For they gave them **Shechem** [*šēkem*] with her suburbs **in mount Ephraim** [*bēhar ‘eprāyim*], to be a city of refuge for the slayer”); 1 Kings 12:25 (“Then Jeroboam built **Shechem in mount Ephraim** [*šēkem bēhar ‘eprayim*], and dwelt therein”); and 1 Chronicles 6:67 (“And they gave unto them, of the cities of refuge, **Shechem in mount Ephraim** [*šēkem ... bēhar ‘eprāyim*] with her suburbs”). Slight variations on *šēkem bēhar ‘eprāyim* — “Shechem in mount Ephraim” or “Shechem in the hill country of Ephraim” — virtually constitute a stereotyped phrase.

30. “One portion more than to your brothers probably refers to the ‘double portion’ that the first-born son inherits (Deuteronomy 21:17). The word for portion (*shekhem*) in this difficult verse puns on the name of (the city) Shechem. Note that Shechem appears as a Manassite clan in Josh. 17:2 but as an Ephraimite city in Joshua 20:7.” Adele Berlin, Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible*, Second Edition, (Oxford University Press, 2014), 89.

31. E.g., Deuteronomy 21:17; 2 Kings 2:9; Zechariah 13:8.

**“The God of Thy Fathers Shall Bless Thee,
and the Fruit of Thy Loins”**

The JST version of Genesis 48 makes an explicit connection between the name Ephraim and the FL collocation. In fact, the text attributes the initial attestation of this phrase to Jacob, rather than to Joseph, who uses it most. As noted previously, Genesis 48 explains why the names Ephraim and Menasseh were “called Israel” — i.e., their respective names were used as separate tribal designations within Israel rather than coming under the name Joseph:

And now, of thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, which were born unto thee in the land of Egypt, before I came unto thee into Egypt; behold, ***they are mine, and the God of my fathers shall bless them; even as Reuben and Simeon they shall be blessed, for they are mine; wherefore they shall be called after my name. (Therefore they were called Israel.)*** And thy issue which thou begetteth after them, shall be thine, and shall be called after the name of their brethren in their inheritance, ***in the tribes; therefore they were called the tribes of Manasseh and of Ephraim.*** (JST Genesis 48:5–6; changes from the KJV in bolded italics)

JST’s etiological repetition of the name Ephraim here is significant in that it firmly sets up what follows in the restored text of Jacob’s prophecy as a prophetic wordplay on the name Ephraim. Hence, the first two instances of the FL idiom thus occur as a wordplay on the name Ephraim in JST:

And Jacob said unto Joseph when the God of my father appeared unto me in Luz, in the land of Canaan; he sware unto me, that he would give unto me, and unto my seed, the land for an everlasting possession. Therefore, O my son, he hath blessed me in raising thee up to be a servant unto me, in saving my house from death; in delivering my people, thy brethren, from famine which was sore in the land; wherefore the God of thy fathers shall bless thee, **and the fruit of thy loins**, that they shall be blessed above thy brethren, and above thy father’s house; for thou hast prevailed, and **thy father’s house hath bowed down unto thee**, even as it was shown unto thee, before thou wast sold into Egypt by the hands of thy brethren; **wherefore thy brethren shall bow down unto thee, from generation to generation, unto the fruit of thy**

loins for ever; For thou shalt be a light unto my people, to deliver them in the days of their captivity, from bondage; and to bring salvation unto them, when they are altogether **bowed down** under sin. (JST Genesis 48:7–11)

Jacob's use of "fruit" (Hebrew *pěri*) in the FL collocation to describe Joseph's posterity who would "be blessed above [Joseph's] brethren" clearly alludes both to the name Ephraim and to the birthright blessing that Ephraim's posterity would receive. Moreover, Jacob's prophecy recalls the harvest imagery of Joseph's dream: "your sheaves stood round about, and made obeisance [*wattištaḥwēnā*] to my sheaf" (Genesis 37:7), pronouncing that prophecy fulfilled ("thy father's house hath bowed down unto thee, even as it was shown unto thee," JST Genesis 48:10). The Genesis narrative mentions that this happened several times when Joseph's brothers came to buy grain (cf. sheaves) in Egypt: "And Joseph was the governor over the land, and he it was that sold to all the people of the land: and Joseph's brethren came, and bowed down themselves before him with their faces to the earth" (Genesis 42:6); "And when Joseph came home, they brought him the present which was in their hand into the house, and bowed themselves to him to the earth" (Genesis 43:26); "And they answered, Thy servant our father is in good health, he is yet alive. And they bowed down their heads, **and made obeisance**" (Genesis 43:28).

Jacob also prophecies future, iterative fulfillment of Joseph's dream ("wherefore thy brethren shall bow down unto thee, from generation to generation, unto the fruit of thy loins forever" JST Genesis 48:10). It is intriguing to consider the imagery of Lehi's dream as reflecting Joseph's dream in this light: "they came forth and **fell down** and partook of the **fruit** of the tree" (1 Nephi 8:30). It has been argued elsewhere that Mormon saw a fulfillment of this prophetic dream in the obeisance or worship of Jesus at the temple in Bountiful, a toponym incidentally, originally given to a place of **abundant** fruit (cf. the names Rabbah and Ephratah, "fruitful").³² One wonders whether Mormon considered the

32. The later Nephite toponym, rendered in translation as "Bountiful" was clearly taken from the earlier "Bountiful" on the coast of Arabia. See 1 Nephi 17:5–6: "And we did come to **the land which we called Bountiful, because of its much fruit and also wild honey**; and all these things were prepared of the Lord that we might not perish. And we beheld the sea, which we called Irreantum, which, being interpreted, is many waters. And it came to pass that we did pitch our tents by the seashore; and notwithstanding we had suffered many afflictions and much difficulty, yea, even so much that we cannot write them all, we were exceedingly

place name important to the fulfillment of Lehi's dream in terms of what transpired at Bountiful: "And when they had all gone forth and had witnessed for themselves, they did cry out with one accord, saying: Hosanna! Blessed be the name of the Most High God! And **they did fall down** at the feet of Jesus, and did **worship him**" (3 Nephi 11:16–17); "And Nephi arose and went forth, and **bowed himself** before the Lord and did kiss his feet" (3 Nephi 11:19); "And they did all, both they who had been healed and they who were whole, **bow down at his feet, and did worship him**; and as many as could come for the multitude **did kiss his feet, insomuch that they did bathe his feet with their tears**" (3 Nephi 17:10). The fruit of which the faithful Lamanites and Nephites fell down and partook was the fruit of the one who embodies everything that the tree of life represents (1 Nephi 11:16–24), the one born at Bethlehem-Ephratah, "house of bread" (see especially Micah 5:2; cf. Matthew 2:1–16; Luke 2:4, 15).

"Out of the Fruit of My Loins"

The wordplay "Joseph is a fruitful son" or "fruitful bough" from Jacob's blessing upon Joseph finds another immediate echo in the prophecy of Joseph in Egypt. Joseph takes up his father Jacob's use of the FL idiom. Prior to his death, JST Genesis 50 preserves a version of a prophecy of Joseph that Lehi had available to him on the plates of brass, from which he quotes in 2 Nephi 3: "the Lord hath visited me, and I have obtained a promise of the Lord, that **out of the fruit of my loins**, the Lord God will raise up **a righteous branch** out of my loins; and unto thee, whom my father Jacob hath named Israel, a prophet; (not the Messiah who is called Shilo;) and this prophet shall deliver my people out of Egypt in the days of thy bondage" (JST Genesis 50). Here, Joseph's prophecy primarily has the meaning of the name of his son Ephraim in mind but perhaps secondarily the interrelated meaning of his own name, "may he [God] add" in the idea of God raising up a "righteous branch out of [his] loins."

The subsequent JST Genesis 50 text of Joseph's FL prophecy about a "choice seer" in the latter-days uses the word "fruit" (Hebrew *pēri*, Egyptian *pr.t*) an additional ten times (for a total of eleven). As noted above, the abundant use of the FL idiom in 2 Nephi 3 is comprised of Lehi's quotation of a text from the brass plates akin to JST Genesis 50 and his use and interpretation of that text for his son, Joseph. These restored texts do not merely help us appreciate how much the figures

rejoiced when we came to the seashore; and we called the place Bountiful, because of its much fruit." Cf. also 1 Nephi 18:6.

and names of Joseph and Ephraim were originally bound-up with the blessings of the patriarchs and especially “fruitfulness” but also how important Joseph’s descendants are to the fulfillment of those promises. The latter-day “choice seer” would fulfill a key role — arguably the key role among these descendants.

“The Children of Israel Were Fruitful”: Israel’s Increase in Egypt

The exodus narrative records the initial fulfillment of the promises made to Jacob and Joseph. The text accordingly emphasizes that the Israelites “were fruitful”: “And **Joseph** died, and all his brethren, and all that generation. And the children of Israel were fruitful [*pārû*], and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them (Exodus 1:6–7). Here again, the narrator invokes the blessing of Jacob upon Joseph, “Joseph is a fruitful son” or “fruitful bough” — i.e., the *bēnê yiśrā`ēl* are “fruitful children.” Although the name Ephraim is not present in the text per se, in view of the foregoing wordplay on Ephraim in terms of *pārâ/pērî* the narrator creates a wordplay on “Ephraim” inasmuch as Ephraim had become the “firstborn”³³ and had received the birthright blessing.³⁴ Thus, by means of the ongoing theme of fruitfulness together with wordplay on Ephraim carried over from Genesis, the name Ephraim also becomes a symbol for Israel’s “fruitfulness” in Egypt.

The Psalmist makes an allusion to these events in Psalms 105. He includes the familiar wordplay on Ephraim in terms of fruitfulness: “And he increased [*wayyeper*, literally “made fruitful”] his people greatly; and made them stronger than their enemies” (Psalms 105:24). In this instance, the verb *pārâ* approaches the hiphil form of *yāsap* in meaning. The Psalmist emphasizes the fulfillment of Jacob’s blessing on Joseph in the “fruitfulness” of Israel in Egypt prior to the exodus.

“Though He Be Fruitful Among His Brethren”: Wordplay on Ephraim in Hosea

Far and away, the biblical prophet/writer who exhibits the most versatility in the rhetorical and literary treatment of the name Ephraim is the 8th-century prophet Hosea. He repeatedly creates paronomastic

33. Jeremiah 31:9.

34. Genesis 48:13–20.

wordplays on Ephraim in terms of the roots *pry* ("fruit") *prh*, *rp*' ("heal"),³⁵ *pr*' ("ass")³⁶ among others.

Hosea's wordplay on Ephraim finally comes home to "fruitfulness" in Hosea 13. The prophet recalls Jacob's blessing upon Joseph as "fruitful son" (Genesis 49:22) in chiding the northern kingdom of Israel, often referred to by the name of its dominant tribe, Ephraim:

The iniquity of **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] is bound up; his sin is hid. The sorrows of a travailing woman come upon him: he is an unwise son; for he should not stay long in the place of the breaking forth of children. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes. **Though he be fruitful** [*yapri'*] **among his brethren**, an east wind shall come, the wind of the Lord shall come up from the wilderness, and his spring shall become dry, and his fountain shall be dried up: he shall spoil the treasure of all pleasant vessels. Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God: they shall fall by the sword: their infants shall be dashed in pieces, and their women with child shall be ripped up. (Hosea 13:12–16)

In the Masoretic Text, the verb form *yapri'* (*pry/prh*), "though he be fruitful" clearly functions as a wordplay on Ephraim and its connotation "doubly fruitful." From a text critical perspective, however, several difficulties exist.³⁷ Some ancient witnesses (e.g., LXX, Peshitta) attest

35. E.g., Hosea 5:13: "When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] to the Assyrian, and sent to king Jareb: yet could he not **heal** [*lirpō'*] you, nor cure you of your wound." The pun here emphasizes Ephraim's sickness. The Lord however extended the opportunity for Ephraim (and all of Israel) to repent so that he might heal them: "Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for he hath torn, **and he will heal us** [*wēyirpā'ēnū*; he hath smitten, and he will bind us up" (Hosea 6:1). Ephraim's (and Israel's exile) eventuates because they do not repent: "When **I would have healed** [*kērāp'i*] Israel, then the iniquity of **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] was discovered, and the wickedness of Samaria: for they commit falsehood; and the thief cometh in, and the troop of robbers spoileth without" (Hosea 7:1). Hosea 11:3: "I taught **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] also to go, taking them by their arms; but they knew not that **I healed them** [*rēpā'tim*]."

36. In a subsequent oracle, Hosea ties the name Ephraim to the homonymic word *pere*': "For they are gone up to Assyria, **a wild ass** [*pere'*] alone by himself: **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] hath hired lovers." (Hosea 8:9)

37. See discussion in Mayer I. Gruber, *Hosea: A Textual Commentary* (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark 2017), 551–56.

a Vorlage with the verb *prđ* (“divide”) rather than *pry/prh*. Further complicating matters, the word understood in the Masoretic tradition as a preposition *byn* (*bên*, “between,” “among”) reads *bn* (*bên*, “son”) in the Leningrad Codex.³⁸ The phrase *bên/bên`ahîm* can thus be variously translated, “a son of brothers/siblings,” “among brethren” (e.g., NAB “Though he be fruitful among his fellows,” NIV “even though he **thrives** among his **brothers**”) or, understanding *`ahîm* as a plural of the Egyptian loanword *`āhû*, “among the reeds” (e.g., NRSV “Although he may **flourish** among **rushes** [or brothers]”; NJPS “Although he may **flourish** among the **reeds**”). However one chooses to render this *crux interpretum*, Hosea emphasizes the Ephraimite hill country’s rarified status (and, by extension, tribal Ephraim’s birth status). Nonetheless, by doing so, Hosea serves to condemn wickedness and apostasy that have fructified within the Northern Kingdom of Israel before and during the prophet Hosea’s time — i.e., the 8th century BCE. In consequence, Ephraim’s “fruitfulness” will — for the near and intermediate future — become unfruitfulness.

Hosea again uses wordplay on Ephraim in terms of “fruit” as subsequently describes Ephraim’s “unfruitful” condition as divine justice overtakes them: “**Ephraim** [*`eprayim*] is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no **fruit** [*pēri*]: yea, though they bring forth, yet will I slay even **the beloved fruit** [*maḥāmadê*] of their womb” (Hosea 9:16). Ephraim’s “unfruitfulness” here means deprivation of posterity including the violent loss of the “beloved fruit of their womb.”

Still another of Hosea’s prophecies, one that looks forward to the return of Ephraim (tribe and nation) to the Lord and its healing, makes abundant use of “fruit” and fructification images:

Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast fallen by thine iniquity. Take with you words, and turn to the Lord: say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously: so will we render **the calves** [*pārîm* or, **fruit** – LXX *karpon*] of our lips. Asshur **shall not save us**; we will not ride upon horses: neither will we say any more to the work of our hands, Ye are our gods: for in thee the fatherless **findeth mercy**. **I will heal** [*`erpā`] **their backsliding**, I will love them freely: for mine anger is turned away from him. I will be as the dew unto Israel: **he shall grow** [*yiprah*] as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon. **His branches shall spread**, and his beauty*

38. Ibid., 556.

shall be as the olive tree, and his smell as Lebanon. They that dwell under his shadow shall return; they shall revive as the corn, **and grow** [*wěyiprēhû*] as the vine: the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon. **Ephraim** [*'eprayim*] shall say, What have I to do any more with idols? I have heard him, and observed him: I am like a green fir tree. **From me is thy fruit** [*peryĕkā*] **found**. Who is wise, and he shall understand these things? prudent, and he shall know them? for the ways of the Lord are right, and the just shall walk in them: but the transgressors shall fall therein. (Hosea 14:1–9 [MT 14:2–10])

From a text critical standpoint, the first “fruit” image is ambiguous. The Masoretic Text (MT) understands the Hebrew consonants *prym* as “calves” (*pārīm*), while the LXX renders the same consonants in Greek as *karpon* “fruit.” In either case, we are dealing with an intentional wordplay on “Ephraim” as a profusion of additional similar sounding words suggests. We should mention here that the phrases “Asshur will not save us” and “in thee the fatherless find mercy” play on the names Hosea and Lo-ruhamah, respectively. They emphasize the mitigation of Ephraim’s punishment and thus the restoration of Ephraim’s “fruit.”

This is also the force of the next two wordplays, *yiprah*, “he shall grow” (v. 5 [MT 6]) and *wěyiprēhû* “and [they shall] grow” (v. 7 [MT 8]). In both instances, Hosea enhances the fruitfulness imagery of the surrounding text with his use of the verb *prh* (“sprout, shoot,”³⁹ i.e., “grow”). The verb forms *yiprah* and *wěyiprēhû* thus function as paronomasia on the name Ephraim and its connotation, “doubly fruitful.” Following Israel-Ephraim’s apostasy and repentance, they will again fruitfully “grow” and spread abroad.

All of this leads to the climactic wordplay in the Lord’s response to Israel-Ephraim’s repentance and denunciation of idols: “From me is **thy fruit** [*peryĕkā*] **found**.” The day will come when the Lord himself will confront Israel-Ephraim with the truth: he himself is source of Israel’s and Ephraim’s “fruitfulness.” Hosea’s prophecy seems to presuppose a time and a situation in which Israel and Ephraim — in spite of past apostasy, scattering, and exile — have grown gloriously “fruitful.”

Fruitful Branches: Wordplay on Ephraim in Isaiah

In a similar way, several texts in the corpus of Isaiah’s writings employ language that echoes or recalls Genesis material that deals with Joseph

39. HALOT, 965–66.

and Ephraim. These passages also employ forms of the root *pry/prh* and *prh* juxtaposed with “branch” terminology of different kinds, evoking the idea of fruitful branches.

**“The Branch of the Lord [Shall] Be Beautiful and Glorious,
and the Fruit of the Earth ... Excellent”**

One of the first Isaianic prophecies (in terms of the present canonical order) that looks forward to the fructification of Israel comes in Isaiah 4. Although Isaiah does not directly mention the names Joseph and Ephraim, the text hints at their names through the use of the phrase, *’ēsōp herpātēnû* “to take away our reproach,” the noun *pērî* (“fruit”), and “branch” imagery:

Genesis 30:23–24 and 49:22	Isaiah 4:1–2 (2 Nephi 14:1–2)
<p>And she conceived, and bare a son; and said, God hath taken away my reproach [<i>’āsap ’ēlōhîm herpātî</i>]; And she called his name Joseph [<i>yōsēp</i>] and said, The Lord shall add [<i>yōsēp</i>] to me another son [<i>bēn</i>] (Genesis 30:23–24)</p> <p>Joseph is a fruitful bough [<i>bēn pōrāt</i>, fruitful son], even a fruitful bough [<i>bēn pōrāt</i>] by a well; whose branches [<i>bānôt</i>, literally “daughters”] run over the wall. (Genesis 49:22)</p>	<p>And in that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach [<i>’ēsōp herpātēnû</i>]. In that day shall the branch [<i>šemaḥ</i>] of the Lord be beautiful and glorious, and the fruit [<i>pērî</i>] of the earth shall be excellent and comely [<i>tip’eret</i>] for them that are escaped of Israel.</p>

The phrase *’ēsōp herpātēnû* constitutes an echo of — and possibly a direct allusion to — the first part of the dual etiology for Joseph’s name Genesis 30:23–24 in terms of Rachel’s statement *’ēsōp herpātēnû*, “God hath taken away my reproach. Not only do we find in these two passages the only combination of the verb *’āsap* and *herpâ* in the Hebrew Bible, but, viewed together, these two passages help us see the idiom *’āsap herpâ* as an image of fructification. Rachel becomes fruitful in the birth of her son Joseph (and doubly fruitful with the birth of Benjamin when the Lord “adds” to her another “son” (*bēn*) or “bough”/“branch” (Genesis 49:22).

The northern kingdom of Israel's (Ephraim's) "fruitfulness" (or the lack thereof) can be further discerned in texts like Isaiah 28:1, 3–4, which use the name Ephraim as an inverted (negative) symbol of fruitfulness: "Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of **Ephraim** [*eprayim*], whose glorious beauty [*tip'artô*] is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine!" (v. 1); "The crown of pride, the drunkards of **Ephraim** [*eprayim*], shall be trodden under feet: and the glorious **beauty** [*tip'artô*], which is on the head of the fat valley, shall be a fading flower" (v. 3–4). Here too, however, the prophecy envisions this "unfruitful" condition's eventual reversal: "In that day shall the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of **beauty** [*tip'ârâ*], unto the residue of his people" (v. 5). This prophecy plays negatively on the name Ephraim in terms of the noun *tip'ârâ*, from the root *p'r*.

"A Branch Shall Grow Out of His Roots" (Isaiah 11; 2 Nephi 21)

Nevertheless, although some of the prophecies of Isaiah inveigh against the sinfulness of Ephraim, Isaiah 11 ultimately has a hopeful outlook. Joseph Smith records that Moroni, as an angel or resurrected personage, quoted Isaiah 11 in its entirety, no less than four times with the explanation that it was about to be fulfilled (cf. Joseph Smith — History 1:40). Thus, Latter-day Saints usually understand Isaiah 11 as constituting a prophecy regarding the latter-day gathering of Israel and the millennial reign of the Messiah. The prophecy, which concludes with a positive declaration regarding the broken and sometimes tumultuous relationship between Ephraim (Israel) and Judah begins with the description of a fruitful branch: "And there shall come forth **a rod out of the stem of Jesse**, and a Branch [*nēšer*] shall **grow out** [*yipreh*] of his roots" (Isaiah 11:1). The verb *yipreh*, from *pry/prh* ("to be fruitful") echoes the name Ephraim.

When Isaiah returns to the subject of Jesse's "roots" near the end of Isaiah 11, he uses language that evokes the double-etymology of the name Joseph in direct connection with the name Ephraim:

And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord **shall** set his hand **again** [*yôšîp*] the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign

for the nations, and shall **assemble** [*wě'āsap*] **the outcasts of Israel**, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of **Ephraim** shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: **Ephraim shall not envy Judah**, and **Judah shall not vex Ephraim**. (Isaiah 11:10–13; 2 Nephi 21:10–13)

This prophecy, quoted and alluded to repeatedly in the Book of Mormon (e.g., 2 Nephi 6:14; 21:11–12; 25:17; 29:1; Jacob 6:2; 3 Nephi 5:23–26) employs both key verbs that the Genesis text uses to etiologize the name Joseph. It is significant that both verbs are juxtaposed with the name Ephraim in this prophecy of the gathering and restoration of the whole family of Israel. The verb form *yôsîp* clearly evokes the name Joseph, as does the verb *wě'āsap*, which further evokes images of “gathering in” (e.g., of fruit) at the harvest.⁴⁰ The presence of the name Ephraim suggests intentional onomastic allusions to Joseph.

The “root of Jesse” in this prophecy is a figure clearly related to the “stem of Jesse,” “the rod out of the stem of Jesse,” and the “branch” that would *yipreh* or “grow” out of his “roots” — that verb echoing the name Ephraim. Significantly, Joseph Smith offered the following interpretation of Isaiah 11:1–5, 10, broadly identifying the “stem,” “rod,” and fruitful “branch”:

WHO is the Stem of Jesse spoken of in the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th verses of the 11th chapter of Isaiah? Verily thus saith the Lord: It is Christ. What is the rod spoken of in the first verse of the 11th chapter of Isaiah, that should **come of** [cf. “grow out of” — *yipreh*] the Stem of Jesse? Behold, thus saith the Lord: It is **a servant in the hands of Christ, who is partly a descendant of Jesse as well as of Ephraim, or of the house of Joseph, on whom there is laid much power**. What is the root of Jesse spoken of in the 10th verse of the 11th chapter? Behold, thus saith the Lord, it is **a descendant of Jesse, as well as of Joseph**, unto whom rightly belongs the priesthood, and the keys of the kingdom, for an ensign, and for the gathering of my people in the last days. (D&C 113:1–6)

40. See, e.g., Exodus 23:10 “And six years thou shalt sow thy land, **and shalt gather** [*wě'āsaptā*] in the fruits thereof”; Leviticus 25:3 “Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard, and **gather in** [*wě'āsaptā*] the fruit thereof”; Leviticus 25:20: “And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh year? behold, we shall not sow, nor **gather** [*ne'ēsōp*] in our increase.”

Joseph offers his interpretations of these figures with divine authority, using the prophetic "messenger" formula "thus saith the Lord."⁴¹ He identifies "the stem of Jesse" as Christ. However, he identifies the "rod out of the stem of Jesse" as someone distinct from Christ (or the Messiah) — i.e., an Ephraimite ("of Ephraim") or "of the house of Joseph" who is also a descendant of Jesse — and thus, presumably, also partly of Judahite descent.

"A Righteous Branch from the Fruit of the Loins of Joseph"

When Jacob addressed the people of Nephi at their temple in the land of Nephi "under the reign of the second king,"⁴² in order to condemn Nephite materialism and the incipient practice of polygamy, Jacob began his address by using the FL collocation from the plates of brass: "Wherefore thus saith the Lord: I have led this people forth out of the land of Jerusalem by the power of mine arm, that I might raise up unto me a **righteous branch** [cf. *ṣemaḥ ṣaddîq*]⁴³ **from the fruit** [Hebrew *pēri*; Egyptian *pr.t*] **of the loins of Joseph**" (Jacob 2:25).

Jacob's language alludes, first, to Joseph's words as preserved in JST Genesis 50:24–25:

I [Joseph] have obtained a promise of the Lord, that out of the fruit [Hebrew *pēri*; Egyptian *pr.t*] of my loins, the Lord God will raise up a righteous branch out of my loins; and unto thee, whom my father Jacob hath named Israel, a prophet; (not the Messiah who is called Shilo;) and this prophet shall deliver my people out of Egypt in the days of thy bondage. And it shall come to pass that **they shall** be scattered **again** [cf. *yōsipûl/ yōsipû*]; and a branch shall be broken off, and shall be carried into a far country; nevertheless they shall be remembered in the covenants of the Lord, when the Messiah cometh.

Secondly, Jacob's language alludes to Lehi's use of the same text in his final admonition to his son, Joseph: "Wherefore Joseph [*yōsēp*] truly saw our day. And he obtained a promise of the Lord that out of the **fruit** [Hebrew *pēri*; Egyptian *pr.t*] of his loins the Lord God would raise up a

41. Donald W. Parry, "Thus Saith the Lord": Prophetic Language in Samuel's Speech," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 1/1 (1992): 181–83, citing David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 88–100.

42. Jacob 1:15.

43. Jeremiah 23:5; cf. "branch of righteousness [*ṣemaḥ ṣēdāqâ*]" (Jeremiah 33:15–16).

righteous branch unto the house of Israel, not the Messiah, but a branch which was to be broken off” (2 Nephi 3:5). Jacob had alluded to this prophecy on another occasion when addressing the Nephites: “And now **I** Jacob speak unto you **again** [cf. *’ôšîp*], my beloved brethren, concerning **this righteous branch** of which I have spoken” (2 Nephi 10:1). Jacob’s repeated allusions to a “righteous branch” from Joseph and “fruit” echo the Genesis wordplay on Joseph and Ephraim, also establish a lexical, thematic, and onomastic context for Jacob’s lengthy quotation of Zenos’s allegory of the olive tree, which makes extensive use of “fruit” terminology and the *yāsap/yôšîp* (+ verbal component) idiom.

“That I May Preserve the Fruit Thereof unto Myself”

Jacob’s use of a term translated “fruit” — almost certainly Hebrew *pěri* or its Egyptian cognate *pr.t* — constitutes an important Leitwort in Zenos’s allegory of the olive trees (Jacob 5), occurring some 67 times,⁴⁴ and a verb rendered “grow”/“grew” occurring eight times.⁴⁵ In the broad, overarching context of the scattering and gathering (cf. Hebrew *’āsap* and Joseph) of Israel and couched in terms of horticulture and harvest, it is difficult not to hear echoes of the name Ephraim and Joseph throughout the allegory. Add to the foregoing Zenos’s apparent abundant use of the Hebrew *yāsap/yôšîp* + verbal idiom in describing iterative divine action on behalf of the vineyard that recalls the name Joseph (*yôšēp*):

- “**that we may** labor **again** in the vineyard” (Jacob 5:29)
- “And **we will** nourish **again** the trees of the vineyard” (5:58)
- “**I have** grafted in the natural branches **again** into their mother tree” (5:60)
- “**that all may** be nourished **once again** for the last time” (5:63)
- “the branches of the natural tree **will I** graft in **again** into the natural tree” (5:67)
- “thus **will I** bring them together **again**” (5:68)

This divine, iterative (*yôšîp*-) action brings about the intended “fruitfulness” of the vineyard, recalling both the meaning of the name Joseph (“may he add”; “may he do again”) and the name Ephraim (“doubly fruitful”):

44. Jacob 5:8 (1 x), 13 (2 x), 17–20 (11 x), 22–33 (15 x), 33–42 (10 x), 45–46 (4 x), 52 (1 x), 54 (2 x), 60–61 (6 x), 64–65 (2 x), 68 (1 x), 71 (1 x), 71–77 (11 x) = 67 times.

45. Jacob 5:3, 37, 48, 64–66 (4 x), 73.

- "that I may preserve **again** good fruit" (Jacob 5:33)
- "that ... the trees of my vineyard **may** bring forth **again** good fruit" (5:60)
- "that I may have joy **again** in the fruit of my vineyard" (5:60)
- "that I may bring forth **again** the natural fruit" (5:61)
- "there **began** to be the natural fruit **again** in the vineyard" (5:73)
- "the trees **had** brought **again** the natural fruit" (5:74)
- "and **it hath** brought unto me **again** the natural fruit" (5:75)⁴⁶

The allegory closes with the pairing of the same terms in connection with a final, post-millennial, eschatological gathering, "when the time cometh that evil **fruit shall again** come into my vineyard, then will I cause the good and the bad to be **gathered**; and the good will I preserve unto myself ..." (Jacob 5:77). The Hebraistic and Egyptianistic metonymy of "fruit" as posterity constitutes a critical hermeneutical key to understanding Zenos's allegory. If we fail to recognize this symbol, we will miss what the allegory is attempting to teach us about divine fruitfulness and God's love for his posterity. Statements of intent and purpose from the Lord of the Vineyard, such as "I may preserve the fruit thereof unto myself" (Jacob 5:8; cf. v. 11); "that I may preserve unto myself the natural branches of the tree, and also that I may lay up fruit thereof against the season unto myself" (Jacob 5:13); "that I may preserve [the fruit] unto mine own self" (Jacob 5:20, 23); "that I may preserve again good fruit thereof unto mine own self" (Jacob 5:33; cf. 36–37, 46, 53–54, 60, 74–75) must be understood with this symbolism in mind. The will of the Lord of the Vineyard is, in essence, to "seal" his fruit or posterity "his" (see Mosiah 5:15)⁴⁷ — i.e., "preserve" or "seal" it to himself.⁴⁸

Finally, we should point out that Jacob interprets Zenos's entire allegory of olive tree and the fruitfulness of the Lord's vineyard in terms of Isaiah 11:11: "And the day that **he shall set** his hand **again** [*yôšip*] the second time to recover his people [Isaiah 11:11], is the day, yea, even the last

46. Matthew L. Bowen, "I Have Done According to My Will": Reading Jacob 5 as a Temple Text," in *The Temple: Ancient and Restored*, Stephen D. Ricks and Donald W. Parry, eds. (Salt Lake City: Eborn Books; Orem, UT: The Interpreter Foundation, 2016), 235–72.

47. On the idiom, "seal you his," see John Gee, "Book of Mormon Word Usage: 'Seal You His,'" *Insights* 22/1 (2002): 4.

48. Bowen, "I Have Done According to My Will," 251–52.

time, that the servants of the Lord shall go forth in his power, to nourish and prune his vineyard; and after that the end soon cometh” (Jacob 6:2). As has been noted elsewhere, Isaiah’s use of the *yôsîp* idiom, especially as understood in a Nephite context, strongly hints at the name Joseph.⁴⁹ Iterative (divine) action — Hebrew *yôsîp* — on behalf of the vineyard in the allegory achieves its intended fruitfulness.⁵⁰ Jacob “For behold, after that ye have been nourished by the good word of God all the day long, will ye bring forth evil **fruit**, that ye must be hewn down and cast into the fire?” (Jacob 6:7). Partaking of the “divine nature” (2 Peter 1:4) or the “heavenly gift” (Hebrews 6:4; 4 Nephi 1:3; 12:8) requires our “bringing” or producing “**again** the natural **fruit**” (Jacob 5:74) and “bring[ing] forth good fruit” (Jacob 5:27, 54).

Conclusion

Whether he was named Ephraim (“doubly fruitful” or “twice fruitful”) or originally another derivational form of *pêrî* (fruit), it is clear that the promises made by Jacob to Joseph passed on to his second son. While Joseph is the embodiment of Jacob’s blessing, Ephraim represents its fulfillment.

From a Latter-day Saint perspective, we understand that those promises and blessings are iterative and thus continue to find fulfillment in the descendants of Joseph. One modern-day revelation offers the following prophecy regarding “the children of Ephraim” using the language of Jacob’s blessing upon Joseph in Genesis 49:

[T]hey [who are in the north countries] shall bring forth their rich treasures unto **the children of Ephraim, my servants**. And *the boundaries of the everlasting hills shall tremble at their presence*. And **there shall they fall down and be crowned** with glory, even in Zion, by the hands of the servants of the Lord, even **the children of Ephraim**. And they shall be filled with songs of everlasting joy. Behold, this is the blessing of the everlasting God upon the tribes of Israel, and **the richer blessing upon the head of Ephraim and his fellows** (D&C 133:30–34, emphasis added).

49. Matthew L. Bowen, “He Shall Add: Wordplay on the Name Joseph and an Early Instance of Gezera Shava in the Book of Mormon,” *Insights*, 30/2 (2010): 2–4; idem, “Wordplay on Joseph and Benjamin,” 255–73.

50. Bowen, “I Have Done According to My Will,” 247–48.

This prophecy of the coming of gathered Israel to the children of Ephraim, where they “fall down”⁵¹ and are “crowned with glory” offers an imagistic look at what to “c[o]me forth and f[a]ll down and part[ake] of the fruit of the tree” (1 Nephi 8:30; cf. also 3 Nephi 11) can look like within the context of the latter-day gathering of Israel. It also stands as a latter-day fulfillment of Joseph’s dream in which he saw his father’s family “bow down” to him (Genesis 37:7–10; JST Genesis 48:10–11). Moreover, it shows how the “children of Ephraim” as “servants of the Lord” stand as types of Jesus Christ himself, the “firstborn” and “firstfruit” of God the Father.⁵² “The richer blessing” or double portion (cf. *pī šēnayim*) that rests “upon the head of Ephraim and his fellows” makes it incumbent that latter-day Ephraimites always nourish the “word” and “look forward with faith to the fruit” of the “tree of life” or the “tree springing up unto everlasting life” within them (Alma 32:41; 33:23). Then they will, as Jesus stated, “br[ing] forth **fruit**, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold” (Matthew 8:13, 23).

As we have endeavored to show, the Hebrew Bible consistently associates the name Ephraim with fruitfulness. The book of Genesis in particular makes the name and naming of Joseph’s son Ephraim the culmination of a “fruitfulness” theme that begins with the creation account⁵³ and inexorably moves toward the miracle of God’s making Abraham and Sarah fruitful out of barrenness.⁵⁴ The Lord reiterates these promises with Abraham’s posterity. He fulfills his promise to make Jacob-Israel fruitful,⁵⁵ as his son Joseph becomes doubly fruitful in Ephraim.⁵⁶

All of the foregoing helps us to appreciate the promises made to the patriarchs as a backdrop to divine fruitfulness, at which the names Joseph and Ephraim, the prophecies of Isaiah, and Zenos’s allegory all hint:

Abraham received promises concerning his seed, and of the **fruit** of his loins — from whose loins ye are, namely, my servant **Joseph** — which were to **continue** so long as they

51. Cf., e.g., Psalm 72:11: “Yea, all kings shall **fall down** [*wēyīštahāwū*, i.e., fall down in worship] before him: all nations shall serve him.” See Noah Webster, *An American Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: S. Converse, 1828), s.v. “Fall,” <http://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/Fall>. Fall down = “to prostrate oneself in worship.”

52. See, e.g., Romans 8:29; Colossians 1:15 (cf. 1:18); Hebrews 1:6 (cf. Hebrews 11:12; D&C 76:54, 94; 77:11; 78:21; 88:5); Revelation 3:14; D&C 93:21.

53. Genesis 1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7.

54. Genesis 17:20.

55. Genesis 28:3; 35:11; 48:4.

56. Genesis 41:52; 48:4–22.

were in the world; and as touching Abraham and his seed, out of the world **they should continue**; both in the world and out of the world should they continue as innumerable as the stars; or, if ye were to count the sand upon the seashore ye could not number them. This promise is yours also, because ye are of Abraham, and the promise was made unto Abraham; and by **this law is the continuation of the works of my Father, wherein he glorifieth himself.** (D&C 132:30–31)

We live in the time of the fulfillment of Isaiah’s prophecy that “the desert shall rejoice and **blossom** [*wētiprah*] as the rose” (Isaiah 35:1) — even the time that “the Lamanites shall blossom as the rose” (D&C 49:24). However, the Lord’s warning to the Latter-day Saints of Kirtland, Ohio in 1831 remains in effect for Latter-day Saints today: “For, verily I say that the rebellious are not of the blood of Ephraim, wherefore they shall be plucked out” (D&C 64:36).

In the final analysis, we believe that the complex nexus of onomastic connections and associations with Ephraim throughout ancient scripture are ultimately better understood as reflecting the work of ancient authors who knew and used Hebrew and Egyptian, rather than that of a 19th-century frontier English speaker.

Matthew L. Bowen *was raised in Orem, Utah, and graduated from Brigham Young University. He holds a PhD in Biblical Studies from the Catholic University of America in Washington, DC, and is currently an Assistant Professor in Religious Education at Brigham Young University-Hawaii. He and his wife (the former Suzanne Blattberg) are the parents of three children: Zachariah, Nathan, and Adele.*

Loren Spendlove *(MBA, California State University, Fullerton, and PhD, University of Wyoming) has worked in many fields over the last 30 years, including academics and corporate financial management. A student of languages, his research interests center on linguistics and etymology.*

PRESSING FORWARD WITH THE BOOK OF ABRAHAM

Stephen O. Smoot

Abstract: The Book of Abraham continues to attract scholarly attention. New findings in the fields of Egyptology, Near Eastern archaeology, and Mormon history have highlighted the complexity surrounding the origins of the Book of Abraham and its relationship to the Egyptian papyri that came into the possession of Joseph Smith in 1835. A new introductory volume on the Book of Abraham by John Gee, An Introduction to the Book of Abraham, is an excellent resource that may help laypersons and scholars alike navigate this rapidly developing area of study.

Review of John Gee. *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham*. Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book. 2017. 184 pp. + index. \$19.99 (print) and \$11.99 (e-book).

Hugh Nibley once quipped that the controversy surrounding the Book of Abraham was “a great fuss . . . being made about a scrap of papyrus.”¹ Were it not for the fact that it is tied up in religious polemics involving Joseph Smith, founder and first prophet of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, outside of a handful of Egyptologists who specialize in Greco-Roman funerary texts, there would probably be little concern for the text identified among the surviving Joseph Smith Papyri as the Book of Breathing — what the ancient Egyptians called the *š’t n snsn ỉr.n ʿIst n snỉ.s Wsỉr*, or the “document of breathing

1. Hugh Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri: An Egyptian Endowment*, 2nd ed., The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley: Volume 16 (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and FARMS, 2005), xxv.

made by Isis for her brother Osiris.”² But because the text is tied to a book of scripture purporting to be “a translation of ... the writings of Abraham, while he was in Egypt,”³ there has been an unusual amount of interest (to say nothing of a boisterous fracas) among laypersons for this unassuming “scrap of papyrus.”

Anyone — layperson and scholar alike — wishing to better understand the Book of Abraham and the associated Joseph Smith Papyri faces a daunting problem. As Nibley astutely observed:

Consider for a moment the scope and complexity of the materials with which the student must cope if he would undertake a serious study of the Book of Abraham’s authenticity. At the very least he must be thoroughly familiar with (1) the texts of the “Joseph Smith Papyri” identified as belonging to the Book of the Dead, (2) the content and nature of mysterious “Sen-sen” fragment, (3) the so-called “Egyptian Alphabet and Grammar” attributed to Joseph Smith, (4) statements by and about Joseph Smith concerning the nature of the Book of Abraham and its origin, (5) the original document of Facsimile 1 with its accompanying hieroglyphic inscriptions, (6) the text of the Book of Abraham itself in its various editions, (7) the three facsimiles as reproduced in various editions of the Pearl of Great Price, (8) Joseph Smith’s explanation of the facsimiles, (9) the large and growing literature of ancient traditions and legends about Abraham in Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, Greek, Slavonic, etc., and (10) the

2. Or possibly the “letter of fellowship made by Isis for her brother Osiris.” See the discussion in John Gee, “A New Look at the ‘*nh p3* by Formula,” in *Actes du IXe congrès international des études démotiques, Paris, 31 août–3 septembre 2005*, ed. Ghislaine Widmer and Didier Devauchelle (Paris: Institut Français D’Archéologie Orientale, 2009), 136–38; Nibley, *The Message of the Joseph Smith Papyri*, 95–130; François-René Herbin, *Catalogue of the Books of the Dead and Other Religious Texts in the British Museum, Volume IV: Books of Breathing and Related Texts* (London: British Museum Press, 2008), 1–3; Foy David Scalf III, “Passports to Eternity: Formulaic Demotic Funerary Texts and the Final Phase of Egyptian Funerary Literature in Roman Egypt,” (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 2014), 12–28.

3. “Book of Abraham,” *Times and Seasons* 3, no. 9 (March 1, 1841): 704, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/book-of-abraham-and-facsimiles-1-march-16-may-1842/1>.

studies and opinions of modern scholars on all aspects of the Book of Abraham.⁴

Spending the effort and time needed to get a handle on each of these complex, interlocking issues may very reasonably seem like a bridge too far. Thankfully, Latter-day Saints can benefit from dedicated scholars like John Gee, an Egyptologist who has studied the Book of Abraham and the Joseph Smith Papyri extensively, leaving voluminous writings on the subject in his academic wake.⁵ Gee's latest offering, *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham*, is the culmination of decades of previous scholarship.⁶ It is a book that fills a gaping void, as there have heretofore been no introductory works on the Book of Abraham that are accessible to a general audience while still grounded in rigorous scholarship.

"The goal with the *Introduction to the Book of Abraham*," Gee explains, "is to make reliable information about the Book of Abraham accessible to the general reader" (ix). The book accomplishes this goal. This is something to celebrate, since many past treatments on the Book of Abraham and the Joseph Smith Papyri are often too technical (and thus riddled with academic jargon only comprehensible to scholars), too general or amateurish (and thus riddled with inaccuracies), too hyper-focused on a single aspect or issue of the controversy, or too scattered across various publications, some more accessible (and

4. Hugh Nibley, *Abraham in Egypt*, 2nd ed., The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley: Volume 14 (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and FARMS, 2000), 154–55.

5. Most of Gee's Book of Abraham research can be accessed on the Neal A. Maxwell Institute's website at <https://publications.mi.byu.edu/people/john-gee/>. See also John Gee and Stephen D. Ricks, "Historical Plausibility: The Historicity of the Book of Abraham as a Case Study," in *Historicity and the Latter-day Saint Scriptures*, ed. Paul Y. Hoskisson (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2001), 63–98; John Gee, "Joseph Smith and Ancient Egypt," in *Approaching Antiquity: Joseph Smith and the Ancient World*, ed. Lincoln H. Blumell, Matthew J. Grey, and Andrew H. Hedges (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book, 2015), 427–48; "Shulem, One of the King's Principal Waiters," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 19 (2016): 383–95; "Book of Abraham, facsimiles of," in *Pearl of Great Price Reference Companion*, ed. Dennis L. Largey (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2017), 54–60; "Book of Abraham, selected non-English words in," in *Pearl of Great Price Reference Companion*, 63; "Book of Breathings," in *Pearl of Great Price Reference Companion*, 69–70.

6. John Gee, *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham* (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Deseret Book and the Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2017).

affordable) to a popular audience than others. *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham* largely remedies this problem. Gee upholds his scholarship but does not drown his prose in academese and focuses on the important issues without becoming pedantic. This is complemented by the book's affordability and accompanying charts, images, and sidebars that helpfully enhance readability.

The organization of *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham* flows logically and keeps the reader's attention. Gee begins with an overview of the background of the Joseph Smith Papyri (1–12), their acquisition by Joseph Smith and their chain of custody from his death to their return to the Church in 1967 (13–42), the content of the Abrahamic narrative Joseph translated (43–48), the relationship between the Book of Abraham and the Joseph Smith Papyri (83–86), and evidence for the historicity of the text (87–142). Gee provides overviews of what we know about the ancient owners of the papyri (57–72) and the contents therein (73–82). He additionally discusses the facsimiles of the Book of Abraham (143–156) and the role of the Book of Abraham as scripture in the Church today (163–74). The book concludes with an FAQ that summarizes the main points and findings of his research (175–184). I do not think it's an exaggeration to say that John Gee is perhaps one of the few people alive who could do all of this basically by himself. That he can cover each of the issues identified by Nibley as necessary to know to discuss the Book of Abraham intelligently is a monument to his scholarly acumen.

Some aspects of Gee's work on the Book of Abraham may appear iconoclastic from a conservative Latter-day Saint perspective. For instance, Gee argues that "the Book of Abraham ... presents a geocentric astronomy, like almost all ancient astronomies, including ancient Egyptian astronomy," as opposed to a modern scientific cosmology (116). If we follow Gee's proposition that the Book of Abraham reflects a cosmology that would have been comprehensible to the ancient Egyptians (cf. Abraham 3:15), then we should not concern ourselves with proving that the Book of Abraham is reconcilable with modern science, since such attempts miss the point of the text.⁷ This may seem jarring at first for Latter-day Saints who have inherited fundamentalist assumptions about scriptural concordism — belief that Scripture, when

7. See for instance Michael D. Rhodes and J. Ward Moody, "Astronomy and the Creation in the Book of Abraham," in *Astronomy, Papyrus, and Covenant*, ed. John Gee and Brian M. Hauglid (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2005), 17–36.

properly interpreted, will always agree or concord with modern science⁸ — but when properly understood, Gee’s argument actually strengthens belief that the Book of Abraham is ancient.⁹ After all, if the Book of Abraham was written sometime during the second millennium BC, would it not make more sense for it to reflect a pre-scientific worldview and understanding of the cosmos?¹⁰

On the other hand, some of Gee’s arguments are sure to rankle those who want to read the Book of Abraham as pseudepigrapha. Besides arguing for the Book of Abraham’s historicity (87–105), Gee challenges recent attempts by source critics to reduce the book down to a mere pastiche of Joseph Smith’s imaginative speculations and reworking of the Genesis creation account (136–138).¹¹ Gee does not dispute that the author of Genesis “had some access to written or oral sources,” but he rather questions “whether or not source criticism can correctly identify those sources” (137). He insists that “[i]f one accepts the historicity of the Book of Abraham, then one cannot accept the validity of source criticism. Likewise, if one accepts the validity of source criticism, then one cannot accept the historicity of the Book of Abraham. The two are incompatible” (138). While I am personally not sure the two are entirely incompatible (I am open to various theories for a possible transmission or redaction of the Book of Abraham that may allow for an intertextual relationship with Genesis), Gee’s bigger point is one worth considering:

8. In fact, Gee even questions the foundational premise of concordism. “Should our understanding of scripture necessarily match our understanding of science? Whether our understanding of the stories of God’s dealings with men, which are designed to help us come to an understanding of things that God thinks we ought to know and act on, should necessarily match human theories that for the moment have not yet been proven false is a matter that is at least open to debate. It is not obvious that the two things should have to match on any given point at any given juncture in time. When they do, that is something to be grateful for” (139–140).

9. It likewise defuses anti-Mormon arguments that because the Book of Abraham’s cosmology is not (seemingly) reconcilable with modern science, it is therefore fraudulent.

10. I have made a similar point in Stephen O. Smoot, “Council, Chaos, and Creation in the Book of Abraham,” *Journal of the Book of Mormon and Other Restoration Scripture* 22, no. 2 (2013): 28–39.

11. Source criticism is the effort to identify and reconstruct hypothetical sources underlying the books of the Bible, including the first five books of Moses. Some have applied source critical tools to the Book of Abraham and have argued for results that complicate traditional beliefs about the text’s authorship. See David Bokovoy, *Authoring the Old Testament: Genesis–Deuteronomy* (Salt Lake City, UT: Greg Kofford Books, 2014), 191–214.

when it comes to the Book of Abraham, do we grant the text any evidentiary precedence against other theories? And if so, how much?

While much of what Gee offers might not be especially new or ground-breaking for most who have followed the discussion and scholarship on the Book of Abraham, he nevertheless brings fresh insights to the text that will be appreciated by both seasoned and novice readers. He identifies, for example, the presence of an Egyptian pun at Abraham 3:17–18 that nicely develops the Lord’s revelation to Abraham (117).¹² Concerning the Abrahamic covenant in Abraham 2:6–11, Gee points out that the form of the covenant “has several features that appear in other covenants and treaties of the ancient world” (108). Accordingly, “the covenant in the Book of Abraham follows the pattern of treaties and covenants in his day and not the pattern of later times. The covenant pattern is thus an indication that the text dates to Abraham’s day” (111).¹³

Gee also explores how Abraham calling Sarah his “sister” rather than his “wife” (Abraham 2:22–25; cf. Genesis 12:10–13) would have been ambiguous to the ancient Egyptians rather than intrinsically dishonest (102).¹⁴ On the contested issue of Abraham’s homeland, Gee mentions

12. Paronomasia, of course, is characteristic of both Hebrew and Egyptian literature. For their part the Egyptians were “very fond of puns,” as evidenced, for instance, by Spell 85 from the Book of Dead: “I came into being ... in this my name of Khepri” (*ḥpr.n.ī ... m rn.ī pwy n Ḥpri*). Thomas George Allen, trans., *The Book of the Dead or Going Forth By Day*, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization 37 (Chicago: Oriental Institute, 1974), 4. Paronomasia, however, was not restricted to religious texts. Egyptian narratives abound with puns and wordplay. One thinks immediately of Sinuhe (*s3 nḥt*, “son of the sycamore”) being greeted as *s3 mḥyt* (“son of the north wind”) upon returning from his escapades in Syria or of the shipwrecked sailor extolling his companions for their ability to see (*m33*) like lions (*m3w*). James P. Allen, *Middle Egyptian Literature: Eight Literary Works of the Middle Kingdom* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 16, 145. See further Antonio Loprieno, “Pun and Word Play in Ancient Egyptian,” in *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*, ed. Scott B. Noegel (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2000), 3–20.

13. Here Gee is drawing from the seminal work on ancient Near Eastern treaties and covenants undertaken by Kenneth A. Kitchen and Paul J. N. Lawrence, *Treaty, Law and Covenant in the Ancient Near East* (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2012).

14. By the Eighteenth Dynasty the word for “sister” (*snt*) is attested along with the conventional *ḥmt* and *ḥbswt* as a word for “wife.” Terry G. Wilfong, “Marriage and Divorce,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Egypt*, ed. Donald B. Redford (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 2:342; cf. Jaroslav Černý, “Consanguineous Marriages in Pharaonic Egypt,” *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 40 (1954): 23–29. This should come as no surprise, as “brother-sister

an article published by a non-Mormon Turkish archaeologist excavating Oylum Höyük, which posits a possible connection between the site and the Book of Abraham (104).¹⁵ Finally, Gee’s mainstream Egyptological work on the family history and occupation of Hor — the ancient owner of the Book of Breathings recovered in the Joseph Smith Papyri — is summarized in the book and is sure to raise laypersons’ appreciation for how the Book of Abraham could plausibly fit an Egyptian *Sitz im Leben* in Ptolemaic Thebes (57–72).¹⁶

While most of Gee’s arguments are persuasive, some of his positions appear debatable. His discussion of the timeline of the translation of the Book of Abraham is one such debatable point. Gee believes the extant text of the Book of Abraham was translated by the end of 1835. “Joseph revised the translation preparatory to its publication in 1842, but other than that, no evidence has survived that he worked on the translation of the existing Book of Abraham after 1835” (15). In this Gee appears to be following a translation timeline for the Book of Abraham laid out

marriage had extensive mythological precedent for the Egyptians” in the forms of the divine sibling-spouse pairs Shu/Tefnut and Osiris/Isis/Nephthys. Wilfong, “Marriage and Divorce,” 2:343. And besides all of this, Genesis 20:12 identifies Abraham and Sarah as half-siblings. See the commentary offered by Yael Shemesh, “Lies by Prophets and Other Lies in the Hebrew Bible,” *Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Society* 29 (2002): 88–89. It is also interesting to note that the so-called Genesis Apocryphon (cols. XIX–XX) features Abraham being told in a dream to instigate the deception. For a translation see Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader: Volume 1*, 2nd rev. ed. (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2013), 533–36.

15. See further Stephen O. Smoot “‘In the Land of the Chaldeans’: The Search for Abraham’s Homeland Revisited,” *BYU Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (2017): 7–37.

16. John Gee, “History of a Theban Priesthood,” in «*Et maintenant ce ne sont plus que des villages ...* » *Thèbes et sa région aux époques hellénistique, romaine et byzantine*, ed. Alain Delattre and Paul Heilporn (Bruxelles: Associations Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 2008), 59–71; “Execration Rituals in Various Temples,” in *8. Ägyptologische Tempeltagung: Interconnections between Temples*, ed. Monika Dolińska and Horst Beinlich (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 67–80; “The Cult of Chespsichis,” in *Egypt in Transition: Social and Religious Development of Egypt in the First Millennium BCE*, ed. Ladislav Bareš, Filip Coppens, and Květa Smolárisková (Prague: Czech Institute of Egyptology, 2010), 129–145. See also Stephen O. Smoot and Quinten Barney, “The Book of the Dead as a Temple Text and the Implications for the Book of Abraham,” in *The Temple: Ancient and Restored*, ed. Stephen D. Ricks and Donald W. Parry, The Temple on Mount Zion 3 (Salt Lake City and Orem, UT: The Interpreter Foundation and Eborn Books, 2016), 183–209.

by Kerry Muhlestein and Megan Hansen.¹⁷ I am not confident that this timeline for the translation of the Book of Abraham is as certain as these authors, including Gee, would have us suppose. The key piece of evidence that contradicts this timeline is the appearance of transliterated Hebrew words in Abraham 3 that are clearly drawn from Joshua Seixas' Hebrew classes offered in Kirtland, Ohio, beginning in 1836.¹⁸ Their appearance in the Book of Abraham as well as the text's recognition that *'elōhīm* (God) is technically a plural noun in Hebrew (cf. Abraham 4:1–12, 14, 16–18, 20–22, 24–29, 31; 5:2–5, 7–9, 11–16, 20), it could be argued, would seem to indicate that Abraham 3 onward was translated after Joseph Smith studied Hebrew in 1836.

Muhlestein and Hansen believe this can be reconciled by understanding the transliterated Hebrew words in Abraham 3 as interpretative glosses added by Joseph Smith in his preparations for the publication of the Book of Abraham in 1842 after he initially translated the text in 1835.¹⁹ While this is possible, it remains speculative. It seems we simply do not know enough at the moment to stake out any definitive answers. Further work, such as that being undertaken by Brian Hauglid and Robin Jensen with the Joseph Smith Papers Project may bring additional light to this issue down the road.²⁰ While Gee's position is arguable, I believe readers should at least be aware that this remains a contested point.

Whatever I found questionable in *An Introduction to the Book of Abraham*, however, did not dramatically detract from the overall quality of the book. With something as perplexing and often vexatious as the Book of Abraham, there is inevitably going to be disagreement on many points. But whether you agree or disagree with all his conclusions, there is no denying that Gee possesses a qualified scholarly voice in this discussion that is worth listening to. *An Introduction to the Book*

17. Kerry Muhlestein and Megan Hansen, “‘The Work of Translating’: The Book of Abraham’s Translation Chronology,” in *Let Us Reason Together: Essays in Honor of the Life’s Work of Robert L. Millet*, ed. J. Spencer Fluhman and Brent L. Top (Salt Lake City and Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, and Deseret Book, 2016), 139–62.

18. Matthew J. Grey, “The Word of the Lord in the Original’: Joseph Smith’s Study of Hebrew in Kirtland,” in *Approaching Antiquity*, 249–302.

19. Muhlestein and Hansen, “‘The Work of Translating,’” 149–153.

20. Brian M. Hauglid, “The Book of Abraham and Translating the Sacred,” *BYU Religious Education Review*, Winter 2017, 12–15; Robin Scott Jensen, “The Joseph Smith Papers and the Book of Abraham,” *BYU Religious Education Review*, Winter 2017, 16–17. Note especially the translation timeline laid out by Hauglid, “The Book of Abraham and Translating the Sacred,” 13.

of *Abraham*, alongside the Church's Gospel Topics essay,²¹ is therefore my new default recommendation as an excellent primer resource on the Book of Abraham.

Stephen O. Smoot is a graduate student in Near and Middle Eastern civilizations with a concentration in Egyptology at the University of Toronto. He previously graduated cum laude from Brigham Young University with bachelor's degrees in Ancient Near Eastern Studies and German Studies. His areas of academic interest include the Hebrew Bible, ancient Egypt, Mormon studies, and German Romanticism. He blogs at www.plonialmonimormon.com.

21. See "Translation and Historicity of the Book of Abraham," The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, <https://www.lds.org/topics/translation-and-historicity-of-the-book-of-abraham?lang=eng>.

A VALUABLE BOOK FOR THE INCREASINGLY INTERNATIONAL CHURCH

Jeff Lindsay

Abstract: *As the Church expands among the many nations, peoples, and tongues of the earth, new challenges arise that require the organization and the members of the Church to better meet the needs of the peoples in various nations and to cope with the specific challenges that may exist there. In this article I review a valuable book that can help in that expanding effort.*

Review of Reid L. Neilson and Wayne D. Crosby, eds., *Lengthening Our Stride: Globalization of the Church* (Provo and Salt Lake City, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, and Deseret Book, 2018), 400 pp. \$27.99.

It was a rainy day here in Shanghai when I learned of the passing of President Monson. It was a day on which I would contemplate his legacy and the new role that Russell M. Nelson would play. I thought about President Nelson's unique ties to China and his recent visit to Shanghai, where he shared some of his thoughts on the international role of the Church. He is profoundly qualified and prepared to continue and accelerate the momentum of the Church internationally and to further develop its potential to do good and make life better for people across the globe.¹

1. On some of the unique abilities and attributes of President Nelson, see Jeff Lindsay, "Learning from Russell M. Nelson's Response to an Inspired Recommendation from President Kimball," *Mormanity*, Oct. 8, 2017, <http://mormanity.blogspot.com/2017/10/learning-from-president-nelsons.html>. See also "The Miracle of Elder Nelson in China," *Mormanity*, Oct. 26, 2015, <https://mormanity.blogspot.com/2015/10/the-miracle-of-elder-nelson-in-china.html> and "A Lesson From Russell M. Nelson's On-the-Fly Heart Surgery Innovation: Sometimes Revelation Can Be Detailed and Technical," *Mormanity*, Aug. 16, 2015, <https://mormanity.blogspot.com/2015/08/a-lesson-from-russel-m-nelsons.html>.

On rainy days I try to take a bus to work instead of riding my bike, giving me some extra time to read. On my bus ride on that particular day, I took the wrapping off a newly received book, *Lengthening Our Stride: Globalization of the Church*. It would prove to be the most inspiring bus ride I've had in a long time. What I read that morning influenced my thinking when I learned later in the day of President Monson's passing. Many times since then, I've been drawn to that book and its varied perspectives from multiple authors. It has been a valuable read, and I would recommend it to anyone seeking to understand the growing international presence of the Church, the role it can play in blessing others around the globe whether they care about our missionary message or not, and the challenges yet to be overcome in many lands in a world that desperately needs the Gospel to be preached to every people and in every tongue.

Lengthening Our Stride is divided into five parts containing 21 chapters from a host of prominent thinkers and servants with deep international experience. Part 1, "Poverty and Humanitarian Work," discusses some of the global needs addressed by the teachings, programs, and resources of the Church. Part 2, "Public Perceptions and Relations," deals with the international public relations progress the Church has made and ongoing challenges still to overcome as well as perceptions of the Church related to its humanitarian work. Part 3, "Peacemaking and Diplomacy," is a reminder of the need to continue proclaiming and promoting peace in spite of the ongoing tragedy of war between nations and among peoples, one of the most crucial things the global Church can do in spite of our small numbers. I found particular value in Part 4, "Religious Freedom and Oppression," a section treating the brutal reality that many people in the world lack religious liberty, a need often marginalized these days when it can be just as important to many as access to food and water. Finally there is Part 5, "Growth and Globalization," dealing with some of the challenges and opportunities the Church faces in the global community, including issues such as migration, tension between religion and law, and the tension between the Church and the Islamic world.

The vision of the book expressed in the editor's preface captured my imagination and turned my mind to the inspiring words of President Kimball many years ago when he expressed the need for the Church to prepare for its global mission.² Those words, spoken while

2. See Spencer W. Kimball, "The Uttermost Parts of the Earth," *Ensign*, July 1979, <https://www.lds.org/ensign/1979/07/the-uttermost-parts-of-the-earth?lang=eng>. This could well have been reprinted in *Lengthening Our Stride*.

I was on my mission in the international hotspot of Switzerland (where I taught people from 56 countries, by my count), inspired me to sign up for Mandarin Chinese classes when I got back to BYU to continue my chemical engineering education. Those few extra-major classes gave me a head start when I came to live in China decades later and helped open doors for numerous friendships and cherished experiences. If only I had been more diligent!

The decision to begin the book with consideration of the painful needs of people in many parts of the world was a wise one, in my opinion. It sets the stage for *why* the Church needs to be increasingly global. It is not about expanding numbers of members but expanding the good that the Church can do in a world with perpetual poverty and pain. Many of the programs and activities of the Church as well as the service and zeal of numerous members internationally will often make little sense unless one understands the caring that ultimately motivates the globalization of the Church and the expansion of its influence in the world.

As I began reading Part 1, I was completely captivated by Valerie Hudson's essay, "Demographic and Gender-Related Trends" (1–14), a rather tame title compared to her moving and eye-opening discussion on gendercide and the "profound devaluation of female life" in many parts of the globe. I recalled the Hmong woman we once had over for dinner, a refugee from genocide in Laos who had been able to flee to Wisconsin, where we lived at the time. In our conversation, she explained to us in all seriousness that as a woman, her opinion did not matter and that her voice and her life were just "a leaf blowing in the wind." We tried our best to persuade her otherwise, but it was not easy. In her experiences and in later tragic experiences we would share in part with her older daughter, my wife and I could see up close some of the sorrow the devaluation of female life brings.

Hudson, well known as a Mormon feminist and intellectual, has a perspective that needs to be shared and contemplated. After raising the devastating problems of gendercide, devaluation, and abuse facing women across the globe and exploring the different stages of evolving misogyny in society (sometimes celebrated as "liberation" and "progress"), Hudson offers a profound vision of how these problems can be cured: "The restored gospel of Jesus Christ is the strongest and most progressive force for women in the world today. The most profound feminist act one can commit is to share the gospel" (9). She explores the revolutionary views the restored gospel brings and points out that the Church is the place to find the kind of men who have been trained to

respect women, to be faithful to them, to actively take part in raising children, and to abhor abuse and neglect.

As the Church rises in support of women and as priesthood holders begin to conceive of themselves as part of a covenant brotherhood that has sworn to uphold, among other things, the equality, safety, and flourishing of all the daughters of God, you will see the eyes of all women turn to this Church. And as the eyes of the women turn and they begin to assess their men according to the Lord's criteria, you will see men begin to turn as well. For men are clearly no victors in any of the forms of civilizational misogyny — they suffer profoundly as well. Misogyny breeds misery for men as well as women. (13)

How great is the need to let the women and men of this planet know who they are!

There are many other outstanding chapters. Sharon Eubank's discussion of LDS Charities in "Zion's Foundations" (39–56) reminds us of the importance of our humanitarian work — not because of its potential to lead to missionary work later, as many wrongly assume, but because our brothers and sisters around the globe are in need and need our love. Many underestimate how sincere and intense is the Latter-day Saint yearning for the physical welfare of others. My years in China have shown me numerous examples of Latter-day Saints doing much to help others faced with poverty or illness with absolutely no hope of converting others or expectation that missionary work would be done. Silent, selfless service abounds in the Church and is one of the key things that members naturally do around the world on their own and with the help of Church organization as well.

Other essays I particularly enjoyed include Cole Durham's significant "Protection of Religious Liberties" (207–224), coming from one of the world's great advocates of religious liberty. He critiques the world's downplaying of religious liberty, often swept aside as something we can ignore until we've taken care of poverty and other needs. Here he quotes Paul A. Marshall: "It is a moral travesty of the highest order to maintain that because people are hungry or cold, it is legitimate to repress their beliefs as well" (209). Exactly. Durham treats some of the secular and political threats to religious liberty and discusses initiatives to preserve it. The work he has launched needs ongoing attention and support. Thank you, Brother Durham!

William Atkin’s “Let Them Worship How, Where, or What They May” (199–206), emphasizing the importance of religious liberty, is another valuable contribution, as is “Erosion of Religious Freedom: Impact on Churches” by Michael K. Young (225–242), former president and chancellor of the University of Utah.

On the other hand, one of the weaknesses of this excellent book is that some of the essays are dated. This is, perhaps, to be expected, as the essays are chosen from among those presented to the International Society³ over a number of years. For example, Michael Young’s valuable contribution is from a 2011 presentation. Much of that essay retains its currency, but a particularly important and alarming portion addresses a pending (at the time) case before the US Supreme Court that threatened the elimination of the “ministerial exemption” allowing churches to select their own clergy without complying with local employment laws and their anti-discrimination policies (232–233). Young implied that the possible outcomes of that case could include a requirement to apply all employment laws in selecting bishops, stake presidents, and all the other lay leaders we call in the Church. The concern was legitimate and remains a cause for vigilance, but fortunately the case of *Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC* was decided in favor of religious freedom with a 9–0 vote.⁴ That decision was issued Jan. 12, 2012 — now six years ago. An update of some kind would have strengthened the book.

Elder Lance B. Wickman’s essay, “The Church in the Twenty-First Century” (59–76), was from 2008. It discussed the rapidly evolving status of the church in a variety of nations, including Vietnam, China, and one disguised as “Andalasia” due to the sensitive nature of the topic at the time. In the decade since Elder Wickman’s presentation, much has changed and the book would be stronger if there were at least an addendum of some kind to update the information (though the sensitive nature of the topic in that land is still painfully current). Still, the basic issues and the nature of the challenges we face globally remain valid, and for places like Russia and China, religious liberty remains a delicate issue requiring faith, patience, and especially caution from members,

3. As explained in the book’s foreword, the International Society was formed in 1987 to bring together the experiences and expertise of LDS professionals working around the globe, whether in “academia, government, business, or law” (xii).

4. “*Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC*,” *SCOTUS Blog* (Supreme Court of the United States), January 11, 2012; <http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/hosanna-tabor-evangelical-lutheran-church-and-school-v-eec/>, accessed Feb. 24, 2018.

including visitors who may not understand local regulations. In China, for example, there has been remarkable kindness from the government shown toward the expatriate congregations of the Church, but the healthy relationship with authorities requires careful observance of the rules we have in order to maintain trust. I constantly worry that one well-meaning tourist or new resident could result in painful setbacks. (Important Safety Tip: Please don't try to pass out religious literature or do missionary work of some kind on your visit to China!)

A few others essays would also benefit from an update of some kind, perhaps on a website to support the book. For example, Warner P. Woodworth's chapter, "Private Humanitarian Initiatives and International Perceptions of the Church" (77–92), is from a 2008 presentation. There is so much more that has happened since then. Elder Anthony Perkins' "Out of Obscurity" (93–114) also helps us understand how the Church has risen in visibility in Asia and elsewhere, but much has happened since his 2012 presentation. Michael Otterson's essay, "In the Public Eye" (115–132), gives his inside perspective on public relations progress for the Church around the world from his role as managing director of the public affairs department of the Church (at the time), but that was back in 2012 when he gave the speech printed here. His discussion of the impact of LDS celebrities and politicians is now somewhat dated, though still useful. I'll also give bonus points to Otterson for mentioning LDS bloggers as having something of a role in the public perception of the Church.

The book would have been stronger with a 2017 addition covering recent developments such as the refugee crisis from the Near East and elsewhere and some recent developments on various continents. To be completely current is an impossible moving target for a book such as this, but it would have been helpful to get some updates and added perspectives from 2017.

In spite of this weakness, this is an inspiring book that will prepare us for the years ahead.

We are an international Church, and many more of us need now to lengthen our stride to step into the global community. President Russell M. Nelson will continue to be a powerful example of that. In spite of his age, I was deeply impressed when he strode into the ballroom in Shanghai where foreign LDS members meet and walked to the stage. As a very tall man, his physical stride is truly impressive. Ninety-two years old at that time, yet so vigorous. But it is his spiritual stride that will challenge even the fastest of us. May we lengthen ours

and prepare for the ongoing globalization of the Church, that we may better bless the lives of our brothers and sisters in every land, whether they care about our missionary message or not.

Jeffrey Dean Lindsay and his wife Kendra are residents of Shanghai, China. Jeff has been providing online materials defending the LDS faith for over 20 years, primarily at JeffLindsay.com. His Mormonity blog (<http://mormonity.blogspot.com>) has been in operation since 2004. He also wrote weekly for Orson Scott Card's Nauvoo Times (NauvooTimes.com) from 2012 through 2016. Jeff has a PhD in chemical engineering from BYU and is a registered US patent agent. He serves as head of intellectual property for Asia Pulp and Paper, one of the world's largest paper companies. Formerly, he was associate professor at the Institute of Paper Science (now the Renewable Bioproducts Institute) and at Georgia Tech, then went into R&D at Kimberly-Clark Corporation, eventually becoming corporate patent strategist and senior research fellow. He then spent several years at Innovationedge in Neenah, Wisconsin, helping many companies with innovation and IP strategy. Jeff has been in China for five years, where he works with various APP companies and mills in advancing their intellectual property and innovation. Since 2015, Jeff has been recognized as a leading IP strategist by Intellectual Asset Magazine in their global IAM300 listing based on peer input. He is also lead author of *Conquering Innovation Fatigue* (John Wiley & Sons, 2009). He is active in the chemical engineering community and was recently named a Fellow of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers. Jeff served a mission in the German-speaking Switzerland Zurich Mission and currently serves as counselor in the district presidency of the Shanghai International District. He and his wife Kendra are the parents of four boys and have nine grandchildren.

