

INTERPRETER



A JOURNAL OF LATTER-DAY SAINT
FAITH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Volume 58 · 2023 · Pages 243 - 306

Centered on Christ: The Book of Enos Possibly Structured Chiastically

Stephen Kent Ehat

Offprint Series

© 2023 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 is a weekly publication of the Interpreter Foundation, a non-profit organization located at InterpreterFoundation.org. You can find other articles published in our journal at Journal.InterpreterFoundation.org.

CENTERED ON CHRIST: THE BOOK OF ENOS POSSIBLY STRUCTURED CHIASTICALLY

Stephen Kent Ehat

Abstract: *The book of Enos is considered to be a short, one-chapter treatise on prayer, yet it is more. Close examination of its text reveals it to be a text structurally centered on Christ and the divine covenant. Enos seeks and obtains from Him a covenant to preserve the records of the Nephites for the salvation of the Lamanites. Enos prays not only for his own remission of sins but also for the salvation both of his own people, the Nephites, and also of the Lamanites. He yearns in faith that the Lord will preserve the records of his people for the benefit of the Lamanites. This article outlines a possible overall chiastic structure of vv. 3–27 as well as a centrally situated smaller chiasm of vv. 15–16a, which focus on Christ and His covenant with Enos. The voice of the Lord speaks to the mind of Enos seven times, and the proposed chiastic structure of the text is meaningfully related to those seven divine communications. We have the Book of Mormon in our day because of the faithful prayers and faithful labors of prophets like Enos and because of the promises they received from Christ, whose covenant to preserve the records is made the focal point at the center of the Enos text.*

Enos, like his uncle Nephi, manifestly desired to highlight in his writings his yearning that the written word of the Lord bless God's children. Nephi earlier had written that he knew that the Lord God would consecrate his own prayers for the gain of his people and that the words which he had written in weakness would be made strong unto them, persuading them to do good (2 Nephi 33:4).

We usually pay due attention to Enos's description of his struggle in prayer, by which he sought and obtained a remission of his sins (Enos 1:3–8). When we think of the book of Enos, our first impression generally is that it is a treatise on prayer. And in that we are correct. The book is a book about prayer, yes, but prayer that seeks more than Enos's

own personal redemption. He first writes that he intends to tell of the “wrestle” he had “before God” *before* he received a remission of his sins (v. 2). But by v. 8 he has received forgiveness. So why vv. 9–27? We should note that the Lord’s statements to him — “Enos, thy sins are forgiven thee; ... thou shalt be blessed; ... go to, thy faith hath made thee whole” (vv. 5, 8) — constitute the first of *seven* divine communications from the Lord into his mind. The first communication is a twofold response (in vv. 5 and 8, which answer Enos’s prayer and supplication for his own personal redemption (vv. 3–8). The second responds to his struggle in prayer for the redemption of the Nephites (vv. 9–10). And the third answers his prayer — and responds to his and his own people’s toils — for redemption of the Lamanites and the preservation of the Nephite record for their benefit (vv. 11–14). The central communication from the Lord states the Lord’s covenant with Enos that the Nephite records will be preserved for the benefit of the Lamanites (vv. 15–16a). The book is structured on three prayers uttered by Enos: for his own redemption, for the redemption of the Nephites, and for redemption of the Lamanites. Quoted seven times in the book, the Lord answers Enos’s prayers (vv. 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 18, 27) and covenants to preserve the Nephite records (v. 16).

After introductory verses 1 and 2, Enos apparently structured vv. 3–27 of his text on the three accounts of the Lord’s voice to his mind: (1) the Lord’s answer to his own struggle in prayer for his own personal redemption (vv. 3–8 and 25–27, respectively, at the beginning and end of the book); (2) the Lord’s answer to his struggle in prayer on behalf of the Nephites (vv. 9–10 and 21–24, found in text just following the beginning and just before the end of the book); (3) the Lord’s promised fulfillment of Enos’s hope for the redemption of the Lamanites by the preservation of the Nephites’ writings (vv. 11–14 and vv. 16b–20, in text found immediately before and after the center of the book); and (4) Enos’s prayer, which secures the Lord’s answering promise that the Nephite record would be preserved (vv. 15–16a, at the center of the book). This seems to represent classic concentric structuring, commonly referred to as *chiasmus*, a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas in a text, with a meaningful climactic turning point in the middle, after which the reversed repetition begins. *Chiasmus* is a term that refers generally both to a *chiasm* (with *two* matching words, phrases, or ideas at the central turning point of a text) and to a *concentric structure* (with *one* word, phrase, or idea at that central turning point). Either of the two structures can be termed *chiasmus*, though the distinction is often made. The book of Enos may be *concentric* in structure, with *one* central element at the

center of the chapter, an element itself also that forms a central chiasm in the text, a central chiasm focused on Christ.

This present study hypothesizes that Enos composed his text with a chiastic plan in mind. It is considered here that Enos expresses his message by means of a thematic *concentric* structure, seeking thereby to draw attention to the following central point: knowing that the Lord God was able to preserve his own people's records for the benefit of the Lamanites, Enos cries unto the Lord God continually, for the Lord has said unto him, "Whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith, believing that ye shall receive in the name of Christ, ye shall receive it. And [Enos] had faith, and [he] did cry unto God that he would preserve the records" (vv. 15–16a). In this short book Enos prays for his own personal redemption; he prays for the redemption of his own people, the Nephites; he prays for the redemption of the Lamanites; and he prays that the Nephite writings be preserved for the benefit of the Lamanites. And God covenants with him that the records will be preserved, in answer to both his own prayer and the prayers of his forefathers.

As John Welch has emphasized, "a burden of persuasion rests on anyone asserting that a passage is chiastic."¹ "Anyone who claims that a passage is chiastic should be able to prove it."² This paper represents an attempt to shoulder that burden in the writings of Enos on the small plates of Nephi. The proposed overall structure of the book of Enos will be identified by reference to the *concepts* and *ideas* reflected in the complete text of the book. Second, the paired sections so identified will be analyzed, both to note correspondences *between* sections and to describe repetitions and possible occasional rhetorical structures perceived *within* sections. Third, the elements that serve to give unity and progression to the paired sections will be analyzed. And fourth, some gleanings will be expressed, based on the proposed presence of chiasmus in the text.

The Overall Structure of the Book of Enos

No published attempt to illustrate a chiastic structure that covers the *entire* book of Enos seems yet to have appeared. The only attempts to

1. John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in Alma 36" (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1989), 43. See also John W. Welch, "Criteria for Identifying and Evaluating the Presence of Chiasmus," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 42 (1995): 3, "a burden of persuasion rests on any person describing a passage as chiastic."

2. John W. Welch, "A Masterpiece: Alma 36," in *Rediscovering the Book of Mormon*, ed. John L. Sorenson and Melvin J. Thorne (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, UT: FARMS, 1991), 131.

discern one or more chiasmic passages *within* the book appear to be by Donald W. Parry in *The Book of Mormon Text Reformatted According to Parallelistic Patterns*³ and by the late H. Clay Gorton in *A New Witness for Christ: Chiasmic Structures in the Book of Mormon*.⁴ The proposals advanced by Parry and Gorton at least suggest that the principle of chiasmus apparently was known to Enos. In 1981, referring to the books of Jarom and Omni, Welch observed that they “were composed during a dark age in Nephite history which was marked by political stagnation and little or no literary activity”; and the books of Jacob, Enos, Jarom and Omni, he added, “manifest virtually no chiasmus.”⁵

Chiasmus and antimetabole generally

Though they are interrelated, *chiasmus* and *antimetabole* are defined differently and manifest themselves differently. Defined broadly and inclusively, chiasmus is the repetition of *ideas* in inverted order or the repetition of *grammatical structures* in inverted order.⁶ Strictly speaking, *antimetabole* is the repetition of *words* in inverted order.⁷

Chiasmus and antimetabole are interrelated, and both chiasmus and antimetabole commonly form part of rhetorical patterns within texts of various lengths. But the distinction between chiasmus, strictly defined (based on a reversal in the sequence of repeated *ideas*), and antimetabole,

3. Donald W. Parry, *The Book of Mormon Text Reformatted According to Parallelistic Patterns* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1992), 132-134 (Enos 1: 8-12 and 13-16).

4. H. Clay Gorton, *A New Witness for Christ: Chiasmic Structures in the Book of Mormon* (Bountiful, UT: Horizon Publishers, 1997), 178-79 (Enos 1:4-12, 13-16, and 19-22).

5. John W. Welch, “Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon,” in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981), 202. The reference to “*virtually* no chiasmus” suggests at least *some* chiasmus is manifest; however, Welch did not take occasion to identify what passages are or may be chiasmic.

6. Ethelbert William Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London, 1898), “When *Subjects* are introverted, it is called *Chiasmus*,” 356; (first emphasis added); “When only the *subject matter* is thus related (‘repeated, not in the same order again, but backward’) it is called chiasmus,” 299, (emphasis added).

7. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 301, “This figure repeats the *word* or *words* in a reverse order” (emphasis added). In brief clauses, antimetabole consists of “the repetition of *words* in successive clauses, in reverse grammatical order.” Ahmed Taleb Abdeldayem Khalil, “Antimetabole: Forms and Rhetorical Functions in Sahidic Coptic Texts,” *Journal of the General Union of Arab Archaeologists* 6, no. 2 (2021): 125, (emphasis added), <https://digitalcommons.aaru.edu.jo/jguaa/vol6/iss2/7>.

strictly defined (based on a reversal in the sequence of repeated *words* and *phrases*) is an important distinction in analyzing lengthier texts. Some analysts propose chiasmic patterns for very large texts by reviewing repeated words and phrases reversed in the sequence of their repetition over the entire lengthy text, without reviewing repeated ideas that are reversed in their repetition over that text. Because the distinction is important to the analysis, I will discuss it. But because a full explanation of it is detailed and would be beyond the aim of this paper and a distraction if presented at this point, it is set forth in an appendix to this paper.

Chiasms are said to be of two types: on the one hand, simple, basic, short, grammatical, or so-called *micro chiasms*, and, on the other hand, complex, lengthier, structural, large-scale, or so-called *macro chiasms*. At its simplest, chiasmus is represented as a reversed repetition of only four elements, A-B-B-A, with each element composed of a word or short phrase, as in each of the following three chiasms in the text of Isaiah 5:20, each showing the reversed repetition of words (referred to as *antimetabole*), the “X” representing the Greek letter *chi*, from which the word *chiasmus* derives (reading each line from left to right):

Woe unto them that call

evil		good, and
good		evil;

that put

darkness		for light, and
light		for darkness;

that put

bitter		for sweet, and
sweet		for bitter!

—Isaiah 5:20

Each of the above three micro chiasms is an A-B-B-A chiasm and each strictly speaking is antimetabole, showing a reversal in the sequence of repeated *words*, such as evil-good-good-evil.

In one study, Kenneth E. Bailey limits the term *chiasmus* to the simple four-element A-B-B-A form, while stating that in his study the term *chiasmus* “will be preserved for precise reference to any occurrence of a true chiasmus of four terms in an A B-B’ A’ structure,” adding, “obviously, when there are more than four terms the crossed form of the

figure disappears.”⁸ Structures beyond what Bailey terms a four-element “true chiasmus” are to be termed “inverted parallelism,” a designation Bailey attributes to John Jebb.⁹ The point is that Bailey and some other authors sometimes use the term *chiasmus* only in a restricted sense, limiting the term to four-element structures, and they refer to longer structures as *inverted* or *introverted parallelism*.

Most others use the term *chiasmus* more broadly to include both the four-element form and all other inverted parallelism forms, including what John Breck refers to as the three-element “chiastically structured tricolon” (A-B-A’),¹⁰ or what Neil R. Laroux refers to as the “strict ABBA chiasmus,”¹¹ or what Bill Camden refers to as the four-element A B B’ A’ form,¹² and the longer, introverted forms (such as A-B-C-B-A; or such as A-B-C-D-E-F-E-D-C-B-A; and so forth).

8. Kenneth E. Bailey, “Recovering the Poetic Structure of I Cor. I 17 – ii 2: A Study in Text and Commentary,” *Novum Testamentum* 17, no. 4 (1975): 266n9. The quoted statement should not be understood to suggest that chiasmus can only be as ancient a device as the Greek word later used to describe it (for without the “X” — the *chi* — of the Greek word *chiasmus*, the device would not exist under such an understanding of Bailey’s statement); but the quoted statement also thus should not be understood to suggest that the term chiasmus must be limited to structures with only four elements.

9. Ibid. The term used by Jebb is actually “introverted parallelism.” John Jebb, *Sacred Literature* (London: T. Cadell, Strand, 1828), 53. Although this is a minor point, Jebb does not use the term “inverted parallelism.”

10. John Breck, “Biblical Chiasmus: Exploring Structure for Meaning,” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 17, no. 2 (1987): 71. Regarding *repetition* in a tricolon, see further below.

11. Neil R. Laroux, “Repetition, Progression, and Persuasion in Scripture,” *Neotestamentica* 29, no. 1 (1995): 19. Laroux explains, “There may or may not be identity between elements on opposite sides of the reversal (strict ABBA chiasmus is fairly rare, ABB’A’ seems much more common, so the ‘parallel’ nature of members contains flexibility — they can be identical, synonymous, contrasting, antithetical, etc.); ... exactly what constitutes an ‘element’ is not a given (a single word? a phrase?), and the matter of ‘punctuation’ — that is, establishing the boundaries of each element, which will affect how many elements there are (which is not nearly as important as is how each element matches its parallel companion) — is by no means always straightforward.” Ibid.

12. Bill Camden, “Two Instances of Chiasmus Rephrased, From *Baebol long Bislama* of Vanuatu, South Pacific,” *The Bible Translator* 46, no. 2 (1995): 240. Camden distinguishes between the form A–B, B’–A’ and the form A, B–B’, A’, while observing that the latter is “the Hebrew chiastic structure” that it is “normally of the form A, B–B’, A’, and many English readers do not grasp the point involved until a person with knowledge of Hebrew points out the significance,” though Camden himself stops short of pointing out the significance.

The chiasm below is a lengthier A-B-C-D-E-D-C-B-A macro chiasm (a concentric structure, with one central element, E), formed by a reversal in the sequence of repeated *ideas* that span the 22 verses of the text of Luke 15:11–32, the parable of the two sons, as examined by John W. Welch.¹³ Because the ideas that form each of the elements of the A-B-C-D-E-D-C-B-A macro chiasm are themselves conveyed by words, the reversed repetition of the ideas is characterized also by the repetition of some words used in conveying those ideas. The ideas are represented by labels, headings, or descriptions, authored by Welch, accurately founded on the underlying text itself. Each statement of an idea is given an alphabetic label, and each statement of an idea in the first half of the text is indented from the left margin the same distance as its corresponding statement in the second half of the text. Thus the idea conveyed in element A is shown to correspond to the idea conveyed in element A', the idea in B to that in B', the idea in C to the idea in C', and the idea in D to that in D'. In examining the parable of the two sons, Welch identifies both a reversal in the sequence of the repeated ideas and also the repetition of some of the words and phrases, including quotations of and citations to the Greek language of the original, as seen in his elements C, D, D', and C':

- A One son takes his inheritance; conversation between Father and son (11–12)
- B One son goes out; his conduct [squandering] (13–16)
- C The well-being of the Father's servants recalled; "I perish" (*apollumai*) (17)
- D I will say "I have sinned" (18–19)
- E At the point of *crisis*, the Father runs to meet his son and is compassionate (20)
- D' The son says "I have sinned" (21)
- C' The Father instructs the servants to make well; the lost (*apolos*) is found (22–24)
- B' One son refuses to go in; his conduct [not forgiving] (25–30)
- A' One son is promised his inheritance: conversation between Father and son (31–32)

—Luke 15:11–32

Although the definitions of *chiasmus* generally pertain to elements within two *sentences* (in rhetoric, *chiasm* is an inversion of order

13. John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in the New Testament," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981), 239, bracketed phrases in B and B' here added, based on Welch's explanatory commentary at 239.

in the symmetrical parts of two *sentences*, forming an antithesis or constituting a parallel”¹⁴), the term generally is applied to the balanced inversion of words, sentences, pericopes, passages, and lengthier spans of text.¹⁵ Indeed, *prose* scriptural texts like Genesis and Samuel, for example, are said to be composed of “a system of systems” that consist of twelve “levels of signification,” the levels being sounds, syllables, words, phrases, clauses, sentences, sequences/speeches, scene-parts, scenes, acts, sections/cycles, and books or compositions; and *poetic* scriptural texts like Isaiah and Job, for another example, are said to be composed of eleven such “levels,” consisting of sounds, syllables, words, phrases, half-verses/cola, verses, strophes, stanzas, poems, sections/groups of songs, and collections or books.¹⁶

And while the term *antimetabole* may be used to refer to the feature as it appears in Greek texts but not the feature as it appears in Hebrew texts, the feature of the reversal in the sequence of repeated words in short texts is in fact manifest in all literatures, occurring even down to the reversed repetition of sounds.¹⁷ Generally, however, *antimetabole* often is considered a subgroup of *chiasmus*; and the term *chiasmus* often is used to refer to both forms of reversed repetition, both of ideas (*chiasmus*) and of words (*antimetabole*).

And it is always possible that an analyst’s subjective judgment intervenes when the analyst’s own words are used to describe the

14. *Dictionnaire de Linguistique*, 2nd ed. (2002), 83, s.v. “chiasme.” “En rhétorique, on appelle *chiasme* une inversion de l’ordre dans les parties symétriques de deux *phrases*, formant anti-thèse ou constituant un parallèle” (second emphasis added).

15. J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel: A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analyses*, vol. 2, *The Crossing Fates (I Sam. 13–31 & II Sam. 1)* (Assen/Maastricht, NL: Van Gorcum, 1986), 4. Examples of sounds being integral to chiasms are John S. Kselman, “Semantic-Sonant Chiasmus in Biblical Poetry,” *Biblica* 58 (1977): 219–23; Wilfred G. E. Watson, “Further Examples of Semantic-Sonant Chiasmus,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (1984): 31–33; and Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*, Dissertation Series, no. 18 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature and Scholars Press, 1975), 68–69 (assonance).

16. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry*, 4.

17. Wilfred G. E. Watson, “Chiastic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry,” in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 156; Jean-Baptiste Édart, “De la nécessité d’un sauveur rhétorique et théologie de rm 7, 7–25,” *Revue Biblique* 105 (1998): 379, “L’antimétabole se retrouve aussi au niveau sonore” — Antimetabole is also found at the level of sound.

ideas constituting the chiasmic elements of a text. Thus the technical distinction between *antimetabole* (reversed repetition of words) and *chiasmus* (reversed repetition of ideas) can be used in evaluating repetitions in texts. Some simple examples of antimetabole are these: “When the going gets tough, the tough get going.” This statement represents the reversed repetition of words but not of ideas, for only one idea is conveyed (or technically, only two interrelated ideas). Another example of antimetabole: “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.” This manifests two different ideas, but not a reversed repetition of two ideas; rather, it is only the *words* that are repeated and reversed. Again, therefore, technically, this is only *antimetabole*, albeit considered to be a subset of *chiasmus* (where generally examples of *antimetabole* are also called *chiasmus*). Indeed, the example of chiasmus from Isaiah cited earlier is part of this sub-group of chiasmus known as antimetabole, with three chiasms in that text: “Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” (Isaiah 5:20).

Sometimes those who analyze texts cite only to the reversed repetition of *words* to propose that a passage is chiasmic. These proposed chiasms are said to manifest *linguistic, verbal, language, grammatical, semantic, morphological, syntactical, lexical, or phonological* parallelism. For example, the following concentric structure is evident in the text of Jeremiah 2:27–28, showing a reversal in the sequence of repeated words and short phrases:

- A But in the *time of their trouble* they will say,
- B *Arise*, and *save* us
- C But where are thy gods that thou hast made ... ?
- B' let them *arise*, if they can *save* thee
- A' in the *time of thy trouble*.

Note that the Jeremiah 2:27–28 chiasm (strictly speaking, a *concentric structure*, because it has one middle element rather than two) partakes mostly of antimetabole (the reversed repetition of words or short phrases).

Alternatively, analysts sometimes cite a reversal in the sequence of repeated *ideas*. These proposed chiasms are said to manifest *conceptual, structural, thematic, content, or aesthetic* parallelism. One such

conceptual chiasm, for example, is that identified for the 40 verses of Galatians 3:1–4:11.¹⁸

- a rebuking questions (3.1–5)
- b bestowal of the Spirit (3.1, 5)
- c faith-sonship (3.6–9)
- d faith-law (3.10–14)
- e promise-law (3.15–18)
- e law-promise (3.19–22)
- d law-faith (3.23–25)
- c sonship-faith (3.26–29)
- b bestowal of the Spirit (4.1–7)
- a rebuking question (4.8–11)

Scholars often analyze proposed chiasmic patterns of texts in light of *both words and ideas*. Welch’s analysis of the parable of the two sons, discussed earlier, is an example of that sort of analysis over a text of 22 verses. Other similarly lengthy spans of text may be analyzed in light of both ideas and words, such as with the 22 verses forming the account of Joseph and Potiphar’s wife in Genesis 39:2–23, as proposed by John Breck to be a conceptual chiasm,¹⁹ quoted and diagrammed below. Breck points to repeated “keywords” and “key phrases” within each of the identified elements of the proposed chiasm, elements identified by reference to the text itself. Analysts will often quote from the text in its original language, if it is available.²⁰ As shown below, Breck uses

18. G. Walter Hansen, “Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series 29* (1989): 78, 109. Hansen shows how words and phrases within each of the elements correspond with words and phrases in their counterpart elements in the chiasm. Such proposals of conceptual chiasmus are legion in the literature. See Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 379 — Epistle to Philemon, A-B-C-D-E-F-G-H-I-I-H-G-F-E-D-C-B-A “introverted correspondence” over 25 verses, all conceptual elements; and Norbert Lohfink, *Höre Israel: Auslegung von Texten aus dem Buch Deuteronomium* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1965), which identifies a conceptual chiasm for the 20 verses of Deuteronomy 8:1–20: A The land which the LORD promised on oath to your fathers (8:1); B Forty years in the wilderness (8:2-4); C you must realize that the LORD (8:5); D “keep the commandments of the LORD your God, by walking in his ways and by fearing him” (8:6); C’ you must bless the LORD, your God (8:10); B’ Exodus (8:11–16); A’ The covenant which he swore to your fathers (8:17-20).

19. Based on John Breck, *The Shape of Biblical Language: Chiasmus in the Scriptures and Beyond* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1994), 49–52.

20. This type of analysis is performed also by Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986), while showing keywords and

labels and paraphrases to characterize the textual units of the proposed chiasm. By the use of italic font, Breck also identifies the “keywords” and “key phrases” within each of the textual units. Those words and phrases are, of course, most relevant because the main ideas of each element are based in large part upon those words and phrases:

A The Lord causes Joseph to prosper in his master’s house — *The Lord was with Joseph*, and he became a *successful* man; and he was in the house of his master the Egyptian, and his master saw that *the Lord was with him*, and that *the Lord caused all that he did to prosper* in his hands. (2–3)

B Joseph is given all responsibility because he has found favor in Potiphar’s sight — So *Joseph found favor in his sight*, and attended him, and he *made him overseer* of his house, and put him *in charge of all* that he had. From the time that he had made him overseer in his house and over all that he had the Lord blessed the Egyptian’s house for Joseph’s sake; the blessing of the Lord was upon all that he had, in house, and field. So he left *all that he had* in Joseph’s charge; and having him *he had no concern for anything* but the food which he ate. Now Joseph was handsome and good-looking (4–6)

C Joseph’s righteous refusal — And after a time his *master’s wife* cast her eyes upon Joseph and said, “Lie with me.” But he refused and said to his master’s wife, “Lo having me my master has no concern about anything in the house (*beth*), and he has put everything that he has in my hand; he is not greater *in this house* than I am; nor has he kept back anything from me except yourself, because you are his wife; *how then can I do this great wickedness*, and sin against God? And although she spoke to Joseph day after day, he would not listen to her, to lie with her or to be with her. (7–10)

D The innocent Joseph flees the seductress — But one day, when he went into the house *to do his work* and none of *the men of the house* was there in the house, she

key phrases in each of the chiastic or parallelistic elements within each of the four cycles of the book of Genesis — the Primeval History (1:1–11:26, A-B-C-D-E-A' B' C' E' D', pp. 7–25); the Abraham Cycle (11:27–22:24, A-B-C-D-E-E' D' C' B' A', pp. 27–52); the Jacob Cycle (25:19–35:22, A-B-C-D-E-F-F' E' D' C' B' A', pp. 53–69); and the Joseph Story (37:1–50:26, A-B-C-D-E-F F' E' D' C' B' A', pp. 79–97). Rendburg catalogues and discusses all the “keywords” or “catchwords” by reference to the original Hebrew. An excellent example of his analysis is set forth in the appendix to this present paper.

caught him by his garment, saying, “*Lie with me.*” *But he left his garment in her hand, and fled and got out of the house.* (11–12)

D' The woman impugns his innocence with her lie — And when she saw that he had *left his garment in her hand, and had fled out of the house*, she called to *the men of her household* and said to them, “See, he has brought among us a Hebrew to insult us; he came in to me to *lie with me*; and I cried out with a loud voice; and when he heard that I lifted up my voice and cried, *he left his garment with me, and fled and got out of the house.* (13–15)

C' The woman's self-serving lie leads to Joseph's imprisonment — Then she laid up his garment by her until *his master* came home, and she told him the same story, saying, “The Hebrew servant, whom you have *brought among us, came in to me to insult me; but as soon as I lifted up my voice and cried, he left his garment with me, and fled out of the house.* When his master heard the words which his wife spoke to him, “*This is the way your servant treated me,*” his anger was kindled. And Joseph's master took him and put him into the *prison (beth-sohar)*, the place where the king's prisoners were confined, and he was there in *prison.* (16–20)

B' Joseph is given all responsibility because the Lord was with him and showed him his steadfast love — But the Lord was with Joseph and shewed him steadfast love, and *gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison.* And the keeper of the prison *committed to Joseph's care all the prisoners who were in the prison; and whatever* was done there, he was the doer of it; the keeper of the prison *paid no heed to anything* that was in Joseph's care; (21–23a)

A' Because the Lord was with him, Joseph prospers even in prison — because *the Lord was with him, and whatever he did, the Lord made it prosper.* (23b)

In assessing the possible presence of what Breck proposes as a conceptual chiasm, I do not suggest that such a large structure is an example of *antimetabole* (the reversed repetition of words and phrases). To be sure, the text does manifest repeated words and phrases, but not a *reversal* in the sequence of the repeated words themselves. If the text is chiasmatic, it is so because of repeated *themes* and *ideas*, reversed in the sequence of their repetition; it is not chiasmatic because of any reversal in

the sequence of the repeated *words* and *phrases* themselves. And whether, for example, the labels for C and C' correlate to each other is open for analysis, as also whether the appearance of the word *garment* not only in D and D' but also in C' but *not* in C works against the proposed chiasm. But generally, and this is the point here: such a text should not be analyzed as if it were antimetabole. If a proposed chiasm exists at all, it is built on *ideas* and must be analyzed as such. I address the details of this distinction in the appendix.

One final preliminary note about the fine distinction between *antimetabole* and *chiasmus*: the distinction is most often ignored when the terms are used to describe chiasms, with little harm done to the discussion; and references to instances of *antimetabole* generally use the word *chiasmus* when discussing such instances. For example, without using the word *antimetabole*, Nils Lund includes a description of *antimetabole* as part of his definition of the term *chiasm*:

According to its Greek origin the term [*chiasm*] designates a literary figure, or principle, which consists of “a placing crosswise” of *words* in a sentence. The term is used in rhetoric to designate an inversion of the order of *words* or *phrases* which are repeated or subsequently referred to in the sentence.²¹

Similarly, referring to the short poems in Jeremiah, Jack R. Lundbom observes that “in Hebrew poetry *chiasmus* is a syntactic structure at base which inverts normal *word order*.”²² Lundbom thus describes a feature that strictly speaking typifies *antimetabole*, even though he is using the word *chiasmus* — appropriately so, because he and most all others today use *chiasmus* to refer also to *antimetabole*. In using the terms *chiasmus* and *antimetabole* in their strict senses, however (the former referring to the introverted repetition of ideas or grammatical structures and the latter referring to the introverted repetition of words or phrases), one can say that *antimetabole* is manifest *generally* in the simple, basic, short, introverted repetitions and *chiasmus* is manifest both in the simple, short introverted repetitions and in the complex, lengthier, large-scale, complex, structural, or macro forms.

And on this account it is noteworthy to observe that keywords and key phrases that help to define what the ideas are for corresponding

21. Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiastic Structures* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 31 (emphasis added).

22. Lundbom, *Jeremiah*, 62 (emphasis added).

elements of an *overall* chiasm in a longer text may or may not themselves be significant to other parallelistic patterns which may appear *within* those elements. Conversely, some keywords and key phrases that help define some of the proposed chiasmic patterns which may appear *within* any given element of an overall chiasm may possibly not serve as keywords and phrases in the makeup of the larger structure over the lengthy text.

Proposed Overall Structure of the Book of Enos

The following depicts the *full text* of vv. 3–27 of the book of Enos, proposing a seven-part concentric A-B-C-D-C'-B'-A' *conceptual* chiasm (see the left column in the table below for the alphabetic characters). If the proposed pattern manifests conceptual chiasmus, at least it can be said it is not antimetabole. It is a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas or concepts, not repeated words, that forms the proposed concentric structure. Caution is warranted here, of course, as noted by one charitable anonymous reviewer of this present paper: “there is a real risk when assessing conceptual chiasms and other organizing structures for the proposed structure to be as much a ‘projection’ of the discoverer’s proclivities as the actual sources.” The proposal below, based on the very text of the book itself, should be read in light of what the text itself says. Each element of the proposed conceptual chiasm is founded on the text that describes the efforts or “struggling” of Enos in prayer as he seeks salvation for himself (element A), for the Nephites (element B), and for the Lamanites (element C); the text centers (element D) on his securing the promise of the Lord that He will preserve the records of the Nephites for the benefit of the Lamanites. The first three elements of the proposed conceptual chiasm (A, B, and C) are said here to be based on the three communications by the Lord to the mind of Enos (vv. 5 and 8; v. 10; and v. 12), and the last three conceptual elements of the chiasm (elements C', B', and A') correspond, in reverse sequence, with the earlier three. But as the reviewer notes, “The problem with proposing an ancient A B C D C' B' A' structure is (1) the human propensity to see patterns in everything (including Harry Potter and Star Wars) and (2) the fact that Enos is not available to confirm or deny.” With those cautionary thoughts in mind, the text of Enos himself is presented with only topical guideposts attendant in the left column:

<p>A: Enos's Personal Redemption</p>	<p>3 Behold, I went to hunt beasts in the forests; and the words which I had often heard my father speak concerning eternal life, and the joy of the saints, sunk deep into my heart. 4 And my soul hungered; and I kneeled down before my Maker, and I cried unto him in mighty prayer and supplication for mine own soul; and all the day long did I cry unto him; yea, and when the night came I did still raise my voice high that it reached the heavens. 5 And there came a voice unto me, saying: Enos, thy sins are forgiven thee, and thou shalt be blessed. 6 And I, Enos, knew that God could not lie; wherefore, my guilt was swept away. 7 And I said: Lord, how is it done? 8 And he said unto me: Because of thy faith in Christ, whom thou hast never before heard nor seen. And many years pass away before he shall manifest himself in the flesh; wherefore, go to, thy faith hath made thee whole.</p>
<p>B: Redemption of the Nephites</p>	<p>9 Now, it came to pass that when I had heard these words I began to feel a desire for the welfare of my brethren, the Nephites; wherefore, I did pour out my whole soul unto God for them. 10 And while I was thus struggling in the spirit, behold, the voice of the Lord came into my mind again, saying: I will visit thy brethren according to their diligence in keeping my commandments. I have given unto them this land, and it is a holy land; and I curse it not save it be for the cause of iniquity; wherefore, I will visit thy brethren according as I have said; and their transgressions will I bring down with sorrow upon their own heads.</p>
<p>C: Redemption of the Lamanites</p>	<p>11 And after I, Enos, had heard these words, my faith began to be unshaken in the Lord; and I prayed unto him with many long strugglings for my brethren, the Lamanites. 12 And it came to pass that after I had prayed and labored with all diligence, the Lord said unto me: I will grant unto thee according to thy desires, because of thy faith. 13 And now behold, this was the desire which I desired of him — that if it should so be, that my people, the Nephites, should fall into transgression, and by any means be destroyed, and the Lamanites should not be destroyed, that the Lord God would preserve a record of my people, the Nephites; even if it so be by the power of his holy arm, that it might be brought forth at some future day unto the Lamanites, that, perhaps, they might be brought unto salvation — 14 For at the present our strugglings were vain in restoring them to the true faith. And they swore in their wrath that, if it were possible, they would destroy our records and us, and also all the traditions of our fathers.</p>

<p>D: Christ-Centered Covenant</p>	<p>15 Wherefore, I knowing that the Lord God was able to preserve our records, I cried unto him continually, for he had said unto me: Whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith, believing that ye shall receive in the name of Christ, ye shall receive it. 16a And I had faith, and I did cry unto God that he would preserve the records</p>
<p>C': Restoration of the Lamanites</p>	<p>16b and he covenanted with me that he would bring them forth unto the Lamanites in his own due time. 17 And I, Enos, knew it would be according to the covenant which he had made; wherefore my soul did rest. 18 And the Lord said unto me: Thy fathers have also required of me this thing; and it shall be done unto them according to their faith; for their faith was like unto thine. 19 And now it came to pass that I, Enos, went about among the people of Nephi, prophesying of things to come, and testifying of the things which I had heard and seen. 20 And I bear record that the people of Nephi did seek diligently to restore the Lamanites unto the true faith in God. But our labors were vain; their hatred was fixed, and they were led by their evil nature that they became wild, and ferocious, and a blood-thirsty people, full of idolatry and filthiness; feeding upon beasts of prey; dwelling in tents, and wandering about in the wilderness with a short skin girdle about their loins and their heads shaven; and their skill was in the bow, and in the cimeter, and the ax. And many of them did eat nothing save it was raw meat; and they were continually seeking to destroy us.</p>
<p>B': Redemption of the Nephites</p>	<p>21 And it came to pass that the people of Nephi did till the land, and raise all manner of grain, and of fruit, and flocks of herds, and flocks of all manner of cattle of every kind, and goats, and wild goats, and also many horses. 22 And there were exceedingly many prophets among us. And the people were a stiffnecked people, hard to understand. 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. I say there was nothing short of these things, and exceedingly great plainness of speech, would keep them from going down speedily to destruction. And after this manner do I write concerning them. 24 And I saw wars between the Nephites and Lamanites in the course of my days.</p>

A': Enos's Personal Redemption	<p>25 And it came to pass that I began to be old, and an hundred and seventy and nine years had passed away from the time that our father Lehi left Jerusalem.</p> <p>26 And I saw that I must soon go down to my grave, having been wrought upon by the power of God that I must preach and prophesy unto this people, and declare the word according to the truth which is in Christ. And I have declared it in all my days, and have rejoiced in it above that of the world.</p> <p>27 And I soon go to the place of my rest, which is with my Redeemer; for I know that in him I shall rest. And I rejoice in the day when my mortal shall put on immortality, and shall stand before him; then shall I see his face with pleasure, and he will say unto me: Come unto me, ye blessed, there is a place prepared for you in the mansions of my Father. Amen.</p>
---	--

The following provides an abbreviated conceptual summary of the above proposed full-text, conceptual chiasm:

- A Enos speaks of his personal redemption from sin; the first time the voice of the Lord comes into the mind of Enos (vv. 3–8)
- B Enos speaks of the blessings and the cursing of the Nephites and his own prayerful struggle for the Nephites; the second time the voice of the Lord comes into the mind of Enos (vv. 9–10)
- C Enos speaks of the redemption of the Lamanites by the preserved word of the Nephites; the third time the Lord speaks to Enos (vv. 11–14)
 - D The words of the Nephites are to be brought to the Lamanites; fulfilling the promise of the third time the voice of the Lord speaks to Enos (vv. 15–16a)
- C' Enos speaks of the Nephites' attempt to redeem the Lamanites (vv. 16b–20)
- B' Enos speaks of the blessed and precarious condition of the Nephites and their contentions with the Lamanites (vv. 21–24)
- A' Enos speaks of his personal redemption (vv. 25–27)

Verses 1 and 2 serve as a *colophon* for the text, which I will discuss later.

Regarding intentionality, at this stage in the discussion of the Enos text as a potential thematic chiasm, the proposal perhaps may rightly be viewed as at least important and promising. Say what one will about the overall hypothetical structure, at least the proposed tightly constructed central chiasm (vv. 15–16a) seems clearly to show what may be construed to be a purposeful reversal in the sequence of repeated *words* and *phrases*, centering on “the name of Christ.” If perhaps that can

properly be viewed as at least implying recognition by Enos, as author, of chiasmus as a rhetorical tool, then maybe the overall structure of the text might also have been influenced by his possible acquaintance with if not use of that device. Says the anonymous reviewer concerning vv. 15–16a, “this chiasm is nearly flawless ... strong enough to make a compelling statistical argument that Enos was at least familiar with the technique.”

The Paired Sections Analyzed

Sections A and A' both concern Enos's own personal redemption from sin and the prospects for his own salvation. Whereas in A Enos *kneels down before his Maker* (v. 4), in A' he *stands before him* (v. 27). In A he tells of the *words* which he had often heard his father speak (v. 3), and in A' he tells of the *word* he himself was inspired to declare (v. 26). In A he refers to his own *father* (v. 3); in A' he mentions *father* Lehi (v. 25). In A Enos states that “many *years pass away*” before Christ should manifest himself in the flesh (v. 8) and in A' he states that “an hundred and seventy and nine *years had passed away*” since Lehi left Jerusalem (v. 25). While in A Enos speaks of *eternal life* and the *joy* of the saints (v. 3), stating that *all the day* long he did *cry* unto the Lord (v. 4), correspondingly, in A' he tells that he did *rejoice* in the *day* when his mortal should put on *immortality* (v. 27), having declared the word in *all his days*, having *rejoiced* in the word above that of the world (v. 26). In A he mentions that his voice reached *the heavens* (v. 4) and in A' he is assured there is a place prepared for him in the *mansions* of the Father (v. 27). In A he continues: “there came a voice *unto me, saying ... thou shalt be blessed*” (v. 5); in A' he mentions that his Redeemer will “*say unto me ... ye blessed*” (v. 27). In A Enos declares that he knows *God could not lie* (v. 6), and in A' he speaks of “the *truth* which is in *Christ*” (v. 26). In A the Lord tells Enos he had never before heard nor *seen* Christ (v. 8) and in A' Enos confirms that he indeed shall *see* Christ's face with pleasure (v. 27). In other words, A and A' seem intimately related to one another and A' fully answers what A anticipates. Both A (vv. 3–8) and A' (vv. 25–27) concern Enos's efforts to seek and obtain his own personal redemption, both in this life (vv. 3–8) and in the immortal realm (vv. 25–27).

Sections B and B' concern the potential for destruction faced by the Nephites because of iniquity and Enos's concern for their redemption. In B Enos mentions twice having “heard *these words*” (vv. 9 and 11), in B' he mentions twice “*these things*” (v. 23).²³ In B Enos quotes the Lord

23. The word *words* and the word *things* are likely equivalent. See Robert F. Smith, “Textual Criticism of the Book of Mormon,” *Reexploring the Book of*

concerning this *land*, given unto the *Nephites*, a holy *land* not to be cursed save for “*iniquity*” (vv. 9–10); in B' he states that the *people of Nephi* did till the *land* (v. 21) but otherwise had to be reminded of the *judgments of God* (v. 23). The Lord's repeated use of the word *land* in v. 10 speaks of the land of promise, contrasted with Enos's single, unique use of the term in v. 21, indicative merely of the ground.²⁴ B and B' thus correspond to one another; both are concerned with the redemption of the *Nephites* and the destruction and sorrow that awaits them if they transgress.

Sections C and C' concern Enos's hope for the redemption of the *Lamanites* through preservation of the record of the *Nephites*. In C Enos speaks, and in C' the Lord speaks, of Enos's *faith* (vv. 11 and 18). In C Enos speaks of the good traditions of the *fathers* (v. 14) and in C' he speaks of the faith of the *fathers* (v. 18). In C Enos tells his concern “if it should so be” that the *Nephites* should fall into transgression and be “*destroyed*” (v.13) and tells that the *Lamanites* had sworn in their *wrath* that they would *destroy* the *Nephite* “*records and us*” (v. 14); in C' Enos correspondingly states that the *Lamanites*' *hatred* was fixed, and while prophesying “of things to come” and of things which he “had heard and seen” (v. 19), Enos tells of the *Lamanites*' efforts in “continually seeking to *destroy*” the *Nephites* (v. 20). In C the Lord states “*I will grant unto thee according to thy desires, because of thy faith*” (v. 12), while in C' the Lord states “*it shall be done unto them [the fathers] according to their faith*” (v. 18). In C Enos speaks of his *prayer* “*with many long strugglings*” for the *Lamanites*, adding that he “*prayed and labored*” with all *diligence* (vv. 11, 12), while remarking that at the present our *strugglings were vain* in *restoring them to the true faith* (v. 14). Similarly, in C' he mentions that he and his people did seek *diligently* to *restore* the *Lamanites* unto the *true faith* in God, adding that their *labors were vain* (v. 20). The correspondences between C and C' are evident in the text. Both C and C' concern Enos's hope that the *Lamanites* will be restored to the “*true faith*” and be redeemed. C and C' manifestly are a corresponding pair

Mormon: The FARMS Update (Provo, UT: FARMS, Sept. 1984), 78–79, “There is an interesting confusion between *things* and *words* at 2 Nephi 6:8 and 33:4. While the Printer's Manuscript reads *things* at both locations, all editions (except the 1830 at 2 Nephi 33:4) have changed this to read *words*. Either variant is a good reading, and the Hebrew word *debarim* is accurately translated as either ‘things’ or ‘words.’” See, e.g., Genesis 44:7: “Wherefore saith my lord these words [*debarim*]? God forbid that thy servants should do according to this thing [*dabar*].”

24. Roger R. Keller, *Book of Mormon Authors: Their Words and Messages* (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1996), 103, 129–30, 135.

and both anticipate the possibility that the *Lamanites should not be destroyed* (v. 13a), that the *Lamanites might be brought unto salvation* (v. 13c). Whereas in C, Enos states the Nephite records will be *brought forth at some future day* unto the Lamanites (v. 13), in C' he states that the Lord covenanted with him that he would *bring them forth unto the Lamanites in his own due time* (v. 16b).

Section D, the central element of the overall concentric pattern of vv. 3–27, is itself a most appropriate Christ-centered concentric structure composed of the text of vv. 15–16a. Enos first expresses his knowledge that “the Lord God was able to preserve our records” (v. 15). This knowledge had been imparted to him when, after his faith had begun “to be unshaken in the Lord” (v. 11), the Lord God had said to Enos he would “grant unto [him] according to [his] desire” (v. 12), which desire was that “the Lord God would preserve a record” of the Nephites (v. 13). Then, because the Lord God had said unto him that “whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith, believing that ye shall receive in the name of Christ, ye shall receive it” (v. 15), Enos adds that he “cried unto” the Lord God “continually” and that he “had faith” and “did cry unto God that he would preserve the records” (vv. 15–16a). The Lord God had promised to enter into the covenant with Enos to preserve the records of the Nephites for the benefit of the Lamanites, as Enos had desired (vv. 12–13); and in the centerpiece of the overall chiastic passage Enos cries unto the Lord God that He fulfil that promise (v. 16a).

Elements that Give Unity and Progression to the Paired Sections

Several elements provide a sense of unity and progression. These are discussed in the following sections.

Prayer, Struggling, and Labor

Enos uses the terms “prayer,” “struggling,” and “labor” as complements of one another; “prayer” is equated with “struggling” and “struggling” is equated with “prayer and labor.” Having stated in v. 9 that in prayer he did pour out his whole soul unto God, in v. 10 he equates that prayer with “*struggling in the spirit*” and in v. 11b he tells how he *prayed* unto the Lord “with many long *strugglings*.” Also, in v. 12a he equates those strugglings with having “*prayed and labored*.” Thus, while in v. 14 Enos states that his and his people’s “*strugglings were vain*,” in the chiastic counterpart in v. 20 he states that his and his people’s “*labors were vain*.” Each use of these related terms occurs at or near the beginning of the respective

elements of the chiasmic structure; and the relationship among them serves to highlight the shift from one main emphasis in the first half of the book (vv. 2–17) — that of Enos’s *prayer and his strugglings in prayer* to restore the Lamanites to the true faith — to a related main emphasis in the second half of the book (vv. 18–27) — that of the Nephites’ *labors* to restore the Lamanites to the true faith. The latter half of the book lacks mention of the words “prayed,” “prayer,” “struggling,” and “strugglings” (the word “pray” is never used); use of the word “labored” in the first half (in v. 12) clearly connotes prayer, whereas use of the word “labors” in the last half of the book (in v. 20) manifestly relates to prophesying and testifying to the Lamanites (see vv. 19–20).

From Faith and Struggling to Knowledge and Rest

Subtly, Enos effectuates a transformation in his text from faith and struggling to knowledge and rest. In the first three sections (vv. 2–8, 9–11a, and 11b–14) Enos tells of his “wrestle” (v. 2), in which he “cried” (v. 4) and was “struggling” (v. 10) with “many long strugglings” (v. 11; see also v. 14), having “prayed and labored” (v. 12), all with “faith in Christ” (vv. 8, 11, 12, and 15). However, after the transitional middle section (vv. 15–16a), Enos writes — in the last three sections (vv. 16b and 20b; vv. 19–20a and 21–24; and vv. 25–27) — of what he “knew” (v. 17), of what he could “testify” to (v. 19) and of what he could “bear record” (v. 20), telling both that he did “know” (v. 27) that in Christ eternally he “shall rest” (v. 27) and that because of the covenant of Christ his soul already “did rest” (v. 17).

Beginnings

Certain weaving factors also exist. The transition from elements A to B is characterized by the same factors that signal the transition from elements B to C. At the former transition Enos speaks of the fact that when he “had heard these words” he “began” to feel a desire for the welfare of the Nephites (v. 9); similarly, at the latter transition, he speaks of the fact that when he “had heard these words” his faith “began” to be unshaken (v. 11). That latter transition (from elements B to C), concerning Enos’s unshaken faith, later becomes (following the central sections of the book) the subject of the transition back to element C', where the faith of the fathers is said to be “like unto” Enos’s faith (v. 18).

Internal Patterns at Subordinate Levels of Analysis

Some meaningful internal patterning seems plausible. For example, within B, the phrase “*had heard these words*” (vv. 9 and 11) appears at the beginning and ending of the element. The phrase “*I will visit thy brethren*” (v. 10) appears twice, each of the appearances found closer to the center of the element. And surrounding the center are the contrasting ideas of, on the one hand, “*keeping my commandments*” and, on the other hand, the “*iniquity*” and “*transgressions*” of the Nephites (all in v. 10). This latter contrast of ideas seems to provide an appropriate framework for what may be a significant contrast stated in the middle of the element, concerning the “*land*” — contrasting a “*holy*” land on the one hand and a “*curse[d]*” land on the other (v. 10) — all of these correspondences suggesting that an internal structure possibly may exist within element B of the proposed chiasm of the text. The correspondences proposed here may be diagrammed as follows:

Now, it came to pass

- 1 that when I *had heard these words* I began to feel a desire for the welfare of my brethren, the Nephites; wherefore, I did pour out my whole soul unto God for them. (v. 9)
- 2 And while I was thus struggling in the spirit, behold, the *voice* of the Lord came into my mind again, *saying*:
 - 3 *I will visit thy brethren*
 - 4 according to their diligence in *keeping my commandments*.
 - 5 I have given unto them this land, and it is a holy land, and I curse it not
 - 4a' save it be for the cause of *iniquity*;
 - 3' wherefore, *I will visit thy brethren*
- 2' according as I have *said*;
 - 4b' and their *transgressions* will I bring down with sorrow upon their own heads. (v. 10)
- 1' And after I, Enos, *had heard these words*, ...

Similar to the apparent use of reversed repetitions and contrasts within element B earlier in the text (vv. 9–10, above), the Enos text seems possibly to reflect additional repetitions and correspondences within the proposed element B' later in the text (vv. 21–24, below), which may be diagrammed as follows:

And it came to pass that

- 1 the *people of Nephi* did till the land, and raise all manner of grain, and of fruit, and flocks of herds, and flocks of all manner

of cattle of every kind, and goats, and wild goats, and also many horses. (v. 21)

2 And there were *exceedingly* many *prophets* among us. And the people were a stiffnecked people, *hard to understand*. (v. 22) And there was *nothing* save it was *exceeding harshness*, *preaching* and *prophesying* of wars, and *contentions*, and *destructions*,

3 and *continually reminding* them of *death*, and the *duration of eternity*, and the *judgments and the power of God*,

3' and all these things — *stirring them up continually* to keep them in the fear of *the Lord*.

2' I say there was *nothing* short of these things, and *exceedingly great plainness of speech*, would keep them from going down speedily to *destruction*.

1' And after this manner do I write concerning them. (v. 23) And I saw wars between the *Nephites* and Lamanites in the course of my days. (v. 24)

The proposed chiasmic subpattern immediately above for element B' (vv. 21–24) shows possible contrasting correspondence between elements 1 and 1', where the seeming prosperity of the people of Nephi (v. 21) contrasts with the wars they endure (v. 24). The phrase “hard to understand” (in element 2 at v. 22) is understood to mean “hard of understanding,”²⁵ perhaps giving meaningful correspondence to the statement of the need for “exceedingly great plainness of speech” used to warn the Nephites (v. 23).

Regarding such internal patterns, it should be noted that Noel B. Reynolds recently analyzed the proposed chiasm of Alma 36,²⁶ doing so in light of what has been published by Roland Meynet.²⁷ Reynolds notes that rhetorical patterns within elements of large-scale or macro

25. See Royal Skousen, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon*, 2nd ed., Part Two: 2 Nephi 12–Mosiah 13 (Provo, UT: FARMS, 2017), 1135, “the apparent meaning of ‘hard to understand’ is that it was hard for this stiffnecked people to understand the prophets.”

26. Noel B. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” in *Give Ear to My Words: Text and Context of Alma 36–42*, ed. Kerry M. Hull, Nicholas J. Frederick, and Hank R. Smith (Provo, UT: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2019), 451–72; updated in Noel B. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” *Interpreter: A Journal of Latter-day Saint Faith and Scholarship* 34 (2020): 279–312, <https://journal.interpreterfoundation.org/rethinking-alma-36/>.

27. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” 282n8, citing to Roland Meynet, *Treatise on Biblical Rhetoric*, trans. Leo Arnold (Boston: Brill, 2012), 51ff.

chiasms often are manifest on subordinate rhetorical levels,²⁸ and he says that Meynet gives “the most detailed explanation of rhetorical levels.”²⁹ Meynet published his two extensive works concerning “levels analysis” in 1998³⁰ and 2012.³¹ In short, in his 1998 *Rhetorical Analysis* text and in his 2012 *Treatise*, Meynet reviews the history of the study of the “arrangement” or “organization” of texts on various “levels.”³² Meynet says these prior “studies of a rhetorical nature” all recognize the existence of “micro and macro structures,” noting that “what is most urgently lacking here is a systematic presentation of biblical rhetoric,”

28. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” 282.

29. *Ibid.*, 282n8.

30. Roland Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis: An Introduction to Biblical Rhetoric* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998). Meynet is a Jesuit, Docteur-ès-Lettres, and Professor of Biblical Exegesis at the Faculty of Theology of the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, who also has taught for twenty years at St. Joseph University in Beirut and the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Jerusalem.

31. Meynet, *Treatise on Biblical Rhetoric*.

32. *Ibid.*, 27–47; Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 44–166, citing and discussing the prior works of Robert Lowth, *De sacra poesi Hebraeorum* (Oxford: 1753) and *Isaiah: A New Translation* (London: J. Dodsley & T. Cadelle, 1778); Johann Christian Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae* (Dresden and Leipzig: apud Hekelii, 1733); Johann-Albrecht Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (Tübingen: Io. Henri Philippi Schranii, 1742); John Jebb, *Sacred Literature* (London: Cadell & Davis, 1820); Thomas Boys, *Tactica Sacra* (London: T. Hamilton, 1824); Friedrich Köster, “Die Strophen oder der Parallelismus der Verse der Hebraischen Poesie,” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1831); David Heinrich Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (Vienna: Hoebder, 1896); Johannes Konrad Zenner, *Die Chorgesänge im Buche der Psalmen* (Freiburg: Herder, 1896); John Forbes, *The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1854) and *Analytical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Tracing the Train of Thought by the Aid of Parallelism* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868); Ethelbert William Bullinger, *A Key to the Psalms Being a Tabular Arrangement* (London, 1890); George Buchanan Gray, *The Forms of Hebrew Poetry* (London: 1915); Charles Souvay, *Essai sur la métrique des Psaumes* (St. Louis, MO: Seminaire Kenrick, 1911); Albert Condamin, *Le livre d’Isaïe* (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1905); Nils Wilhelm Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), into which Lund “reproduced and synthesized” numerous of his anterior studies (cited in Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 142n25); Albert Vanhoye, *La Structure littéraire de l’Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963, 1976); Wilfred Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry* (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1984); Marc Girard, *Les Psaumes 1–50: Analyse structurelle et interpretation* (Montreal/Paris: Bellarmin, 1984) and *Les Psaumes redécouverts: I. Ps 1–50* (Montreal: Bellarmin, 1994); and Jan P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Knox, 1999) and *Reading Biblical Poetry* (Louisville: Knox, 2001).

to which he adds, “symmetries and relationships of all kinds are very numerous in a text,” but “the whole problem resides in knowing at which level of organization of the text they are relevant.”³³ Dissatisfied with prior analyses of “levels” of composition, Meynet wrote his *Treatise*.³⁴

An easily understood, simple, and yet elegant example of levels analysis is H. Douglas Buckwalter’s evaluation of the levels of rhetorical structure in Luke’s Travel Narrative.³⁵ As represented below, the entire ten and one-half chapters of text, from Luke 9:51 through Luke 19:27, form one overall A-B-C-D-C-B-A chiasm (a seven-element concentricism). That chiasm is depicted in the first three columns in the following table, reproducing and formatting here for easy viewing Buckwalter’s detailed analysis. The fourth column in the chart below reports Buckwalter’s view of the subordinate-level parallelistic structures which he claims exist within each of the seven elements of the overall chiasm of that extensive narrative text. Some of those subordinate level parallelistic structures are themselves chiasms, and some of them are direct parallelisms. Without commenting on the credibility of Buckwalter’s analysis, it is sufficient to say here that his proposal is easily seen as an example in which within *each* of the elements of the larger, full-text chiasm (labeled A-B-C-D-C-B-A) there is depicted a smaller feature with a rhetorical structure of some sort. The smaller rhetorical features he identifies consist of four directly parallel structures (two of them being a-b-c-d || a'-b'-c'-d' structures and two of them being a-b || a'-b' structures); one chiastic structure (an a-b-b'-a' chiasm); and two concentric structures (each an a-b-c-d-c'-b'-a' concentricism). The Buckwalter analysis is depicted immediately below:

A	Mission of Jesus, the rejected Lord, turns toward Jerusalem	A 9:51–10:37	a 9:51–56 b 9:57–62 c 10:1–12 d 10:13–16 c' 10:17–20 b' 10:21–24 a' 10:25–37
---	---	--------------	--

33. Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 166.

34. Meynet, *Treatise on Biblical Rhetoric*, 47.

35. H. Douglas Buckwalter, “The Hike of Hikes—Luke’s Travel Narrative (Luke 9:51–19:27),” *Evangelical Journal* 33, no. 2 (2015): 68–81.

B	Persistent pursuit of God and Christ mandated by Gospel	B 10:38–11:54	a 10:38–42 b 11:1–13 c 11:14–23 d 11:24–26 a' 11:27–28 b' 11:29–32 c' 11:33–36 d' 11:37–54
C	Lessons on money, possessions, and faithful service to Master	C 12:1–59	a 12:1–12 b 12:13–34 b' 12:35–48 a' 12:49–59
D	Repentance of sin and submission to Jesus	D 13:1–14:35	a 13:1–9 b 13:10–17 c 13:18–21 d 13:22–30 a' 13:31–35 b' 14:1–6 c' 14:7–24 d' 14:25–35
C'	Lessons on money, possessions, and faithful service to Master	C' 15:1–16:31	a 15:1–32 b 16:1–13 a' 16:14–18 b' 16:19–31
B'	Persistent pursuit of God and Christ mandated by Gospel	B' 17:1–18:8	a 17:1–10 b 17:11–19 a' 17:20–37 b' 18:1–8
A'	Mission of Jesus, rejected client king, nears Jerusalem	A' 18:9–19:27	a 18:9–14 b 18:15–17 c 18:18–30 d 18:31–34 c' 18:35–43 b' 19:1–10 a' 19:11–27

Reynolds likewise depicts numerous similar structures at the subordinate levels of his analysis of Alma 36, accounting as he does for rhetorical features he perceives in *all* of the text of Alma 36. Reynolds disclaims being the first to introduce levels analysis to a study of the chiasm of Alma 36;³⁶ regarding levels analysis in “Hebrew writing” generally, Reynolds notes that his own levels analysis and his own proposals regarding Alma 36 build upon and expand prior discussions or depictions of this sort of analysis. Numerous other analysts, including

36. Reynolds, “Rethinking, Alma 36,” 280–82, 311. The Book of Mormon apparently was written in “the language of the Egyptians,” with “the learning of the Jews” responsible for the rhetorical structures. See Robert F. Smith, *Egyptianisms in the Book of Mormon and Other Studies* (Provo, UT: Deep Forest Green Books, 2020), 1–13.

Lowell G. Tensmeyer, John W. Welch, Angela Crowell, Donald R. Parry, David Demke and Scott Leigh Vanatter, D. Lynn Johnson, and Jeff Lindsay, join Reynolds in having conducted some levels analysis of Alma 36.³⁷

Relevant to this present discussion are the following three observations, evident from the earlier suggestion of possible rhetorical patterns within element B (vv. 9–10) and element B' (vv. 21–24) in the A-B-C-D-C-B-A chiasm of Enos 1:3–27, evident from Buckwalter's levels analysis of Luke's Travel Narrative shown immediately above, and evident from some but not all of the numerous prior studies of Alma 36. The three observations are these:

37. Lowell G. Tensmeyer, "Structure, Beauty and Meaning in Alma's Testimony; Alma Chapter Thirty-Six," unpublished, 1983, John Welch Chiasmus Collection, BYU Special Collections, MSS 3776, Box 12, Folder 19; Angela M. Crowell, "Hebrew Poetry in the Book of Mormon, Part 1," *Zarahemla Record* No. 32, 33 (Independence, MO: Zarahemla Research Foundation, 1986): 6; Lowell G. Tensmeyer "A Short Introduction to the Testament of Alma," unpublished, 1986, John Welch Chiasmus Collection, BYU Special Collections, MSS 3776, Box 3, Folders 68 and 69; John W. Welch, "Alma 36" (August 1988), John Welch Chiasmus Collection, BYU Special Collections, MSS 3776, Box 3, Folder 74 (Folder title: "Chiasmus in Alma"); John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in Alma 36," FARMS Working Paper WEL-89a, Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Provo, UT, 1989); John W. Welch, "A Masterpiece: Alma 36," in *Rediscovering the Book of Mormon*, ed. John L. Sorenson and Melvin J. Thorne (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book; Provo, UT: FARMS, 1991), 119–24; Donald W. Parry, *The Book of Mormon Text Reformatted According to Parallelistic Patterns* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1992), 278–81; D. Lynn Johnson, "Untitled Manuscript" ["Alma to his Sons"] (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1999), 246–49, John Welch Chiasmus Collection, BYU Special Collections, MSS 3776, Box 1, Folder 24 and Box 3, Folder 34; David R. Demke and Scott L. Vanatter, "Alma 36: Nothing So Exquisite and Sweet," Davidic Chiasmus, 2010, BYU Special Collections, MSS 3775, Box 3, Folder 62 (unpublished) archived online at the Wayback Machine, <https://web.archive.org/web/20101023120817/http://www.davidicchiasmus.com/blog/book-of-mormon/alma-36/>, first posted May 16, 2000, as archived online at the Wayback Machine, <https://web.archive.org/web/20000516202552/http://www.geocities.com/CapitolHill/3500/bomal36.html>; Donald W. Parry, *Poetic Parallelisms in the Book of Mormon: The Complete Text Reformatted* (Provo, UT: Neal A. Maxwell Institute, 2007); Jeff Lindsay, "Arise from the Dust: Insights from Dust-Related Themes in the Book of Mormon (Part 3: Dusting Off a Famous Chiasmus, Alma 36)," *Interpreter: A Journal of Mormon Scripture* 22 (2016): 295–318, <https://journal.interpreterfoundation.org/arise-from-the-dust-insights-from-dust-related-themes-in-the-book-of-mormon-part-3-dusting-off-a-famous-chiasmus-alma-36/>.

1. Rhetorical structures at subordinate levels (such as shown in the fourth column above in the Buckwalter analysis) necessarily are parallelistic structures, covering a shorter amount of text, and as proposed in the case of Enos, such structures are characterized more by antimetabole (based on words and phrases) than by chiasmus strictly defined (based on ideas); in the Buckwalter analysis the ideas are expressed in the second column of the above table;
2. The overall macro chiasm in Buckwalter is manifest in the first three columns; and in the book of Enos the proposed overall macro chiasm of vv. 3–27 consists of the A-B-C-D-C-B-A structure regarding the three prayers and three answers to prayer; and
3. The overall chiasm in each case is not formed by a reversal in the sequence of the repetition of keywords and key phrases in the text (antimetabole) but instead by a reversal in the sequence of the repetition of ideas (chiasmus proper).

The result of the combination of those three observations is this: if an analyst attempts to discern and depict an overall chiasmic structure for a lengthy text (such as Alma 36 or Enos 1:3–27) by reference only to words and phrases, such an effort may result in a meaningful and even a beautiful set of correspondences. But it may be incomplete and may leave gaps in the analysis, such that portions of the text under consideration are omitted from the analysis. This is explained well by Reynolds in the context of his discussion of Alma 36³⁸ and is touched upon in more detail in the appendix to this present article in the context of the book of Enos. In short, large texts may be analyzed with attention to the repetitions of words and phrases,³⁹ but when a large text manifests an overall chiasmic pattern, it generally reflects a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas such that any keywords or key phrases in the text may or may not contribute to that overall structure.

Overall Correspondences

In addition to the possible correspondences *within* element B and *within* element B', correspondences exist also *between* the themes of elements B (vv. 9–10) and B' (vv. 21–24), respectively displaying the relationships between, on the one hand, iniquity (v. 10), transgressions (v. 10) and

38. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” 280–84.

39. *Ibid.*, 282 speaks of “repeated words, phrases, or topics.”

stiffneckedness (v. 22), and, on the other, the resulting sorrowful visitations of the Lord upon the heads of the transgressors (v. 10), with their resulting destructions (v. 23). The many internal repetitions within element B (possibly forming a chiasmic subsystem) correspond with the apparent internal repetitions within element B'. Central to element B is the holy, blessed nature of the land when the people are not iniquitous (v. 10). Similarly, serving as a transitional idea leading into element B', Enos reports evidence that the land indeed was blessed (v. 21). Whereas within element B, the Nephites' land is stated to be blessed because of their diligent obedience (v. 10), also within that same v. 10 of element B that same land is cursed because of their iniquity. Similarly, in B' the progression of ideas advances from a blessed land (v. 21) to one filled with destructions (v. 23). Whatever the patterns *within* B alone and B' alone, the repetitions do exist *within* each of the elements; and, more importantly, because of the repetitions between B and B', those two elements appear to be intimately related.

Christ-Centered Structure

That Enos apparently used chiasmus as a structural framework for his entire text may be evidenced by the fact that a promise from the Lord — set forth in the central passage of the book (vv. 15–16a) — is preceded by the prayer that leads up to receipt of the promise and followed by the efforts of the promisee to share the blessings of that promise with those who would benefit from it. Another stylistic indication that Enos may have consciously used chiasmus is likewise found in the characteristic presence of a reference to Christ in the central phrase of the book. Christ-centered and Jehovah-centered texts are abundant among scriptural texts analyzed as chiasmic within the Judeo-Christian tradition. For one example, Wilfred G. E. Watson says of Psalm 136:10–15 that his elements A and A' in vv. 12–13 of the chiasm he proposes for the text of vv. 10–15 “form the centre: Yahweh exerting his power over the elements.”⁴⁰ Writers of sacred texts in the Judeo-Christian tradition often place a reference to the Lord at or near the middle or focal point of a chiasmic pattern. The following represents only a very small sampling of lengthier texts that place a reference to the Lord at the center, the turning point, or the chiasmic center of a text:

40. Wilfred G. E. Watson, “Chiasmic Patterns in Biblical Hebrew Poetry,” in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), 156–58.

Genesis 6:9–9:19⁴¹

Transitional introduction (6:9–10)

1. Violence in God's creation (6:11–12)
2. First divine address: resolution to destroy (6:13–22)
3. Second divine address: command to enter the ark (7:1–10)
4. Beginning of the flood (7:11–16)
5. The rising flood waters (7:17–24)
GOD'S REMEMBRANCE OF NOAH
6. The receding flood waters (8:1–5)
7. The drying of the earth (8:6–14)
8. Third divine address: command to leave the ark (8:15–19)
9. God's resolution to preserve order (8:20–22)
10. Fourth divine address: covenant blessing and peace (9:1–17)

Transitional conclusion (9:18–19)

Psalm 58⁴²

- A Leaders do not judge righteously (v. 1)
- B The wicked have violent hands (v. 2)
- C Description of the wicked: like a snake (vv. 3–5)
 - D "Break their teeth, O God" (v. 6a)
 - D "Break their teeth, O LORD" (v. 6b)
- C Curses on the wicked: like a snail (vv. 7–9)
- B The righteous wash their feet in the blood of the wicked (v. 10)
- A God will judge (v. 11)

Psalm 71⁴³

- A Prayer for deliverance (vv. 1–4)
- B "From my youth you are my God" (vv. 5–7)
- C "My mouth shall be filled" (v. 8)
 - D Prayer against enemies of "my soul" (vv. 9–11)
 - E "O God, be near" (v. 12a)
 - E "O God, help" (v. 12b)
 - D Prayer against adversaries of "my soul" (vv. 13–14)
- C "My mouth shall tell" (vv. 15–16)

41. Bernhard W. Anderson, "From Analysis to Synthesis: The Interpretation of Genesis 1–11," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97, no. 1 (1978): 38.

42. Robert L. Alden, "Chiastic Psalms (II): A Study in the Mechanics of Semitic Poetry in Psalms 51–100," 19 *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* (1996): 192, citing M. Dahood, *The Anchor Bible: Psalms II* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1968), 57.

43. Alden, "Chiastic Psalms (II), 197.

B “From my youth I am yours” (vv. 17–18)

A Praise for deliverance (vv. 19–21)

Similarly, says Meynet, for example, of 1 John 3:4–6, “the segments at the beginning [v. 4] and end [v. 6] concern man, while the central segment [v. 5] speaks of Christ; it can therefore be said that the piece is concentric in construction.”⁴⁴ It is *Christ-centered*.

Unquestionably the proposed Christ-centered purpose of the Enos text fits well within this tradition. The central turning point (in vv. 15–16a) conveys a crossing effect. Prior to this point in the text, Enos has told his readers of his strugglings in prayer for his people the Nephites and for the Lamanites (vv. 9–12). He has told of hearing the voice of the Lord promising to grant unto him according to his desires (v. 12). And he has stated what his desires are (vv. 13–14). And because the Lord had told him so (v. 12), he states (at the center) that he knew that the Lord God was able to preserve the records of his people, for he had desired it.

The short central passage, with its tightly related elements, manifests a clear turning point from the prayer and struggle of the first half of the book to the actions and labors of the second half. Beginning in v. 19, Enos recounts that he “went about among the people of Nephi” (v. 19) and that his people sought diligently to restore the Lamanites (v. 20). The turning point is emphasized by the juxtaposition of the two phrases “ask in faith” (suggesting prayer and supplication) and “I had faith” (suggesting active exertions). It is also reflected in the comparison between “believing that ye shall receive” and the phrase “ye shall receive” (v. 15). The central element forms a powerful turning point. Whether it should be termed a “chiastic” passage or more appropriately a “concentric” one — the distinction is sometimes made⁴⁵ — it nonetheless speaks volumes concerning why it is we have the Book of Mormon today. And both the language of the text of the book of Enos and its rhetorical structure center on the covenant Christ makes with Enos that He will preserve the writings of the Nephites for the benefit of the Lamanites, truly a Christ-centered composition.

44. Meynet, *Treatise on Biblical Rhetoric*, 100; see also 133–34 (differentiating “mirror” and “concentric” compositions).

45. George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987), 125–29; George Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary-Dramatic Structure of John’s Gospel*, 2nd ed. enlarged (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), 319–27; see also 83–147 (survey of other authors).

External and Internal Boundaries

Unquestionably, the book of Enos is a complete literary unit. It is bounded by Jacob’s command to Enos to take the Small Plates of Nephi (Jacob 7:27) and Enos’s similar command to Jarom (Jarom 1:1, 14–15). It begins with an unmistakable colophon that introduces (and is written by) its author (vv. 1 and 2) and ends with a characteristic final “amen” (v. 27). Indeed, even the internal boundaries structuring the book are clearly delineated by the wording of the text itself. Five of the six pericopes surrounding the central chiasm of the text, reflected in the general outline set forth earlier in this paper, begin with the signaling phrase “and it came to pass” (see vv. 9, 12, 19, 21, and 25), a phrase that appears nowhere else in the book. Each of those phrases serves also as the beginning phrase of the first three and the last three of the seven paragraphs of text of the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon, as perceptively paragraphed by the typesetter of that edition, John Gilbert, corresponding with elements I, II, III, III’, II’, and I’ of the following general outline (see the third column where the I, II, III, III’, II’, and I’ elements are enumerated):

Gilbert’s Paragraphing in 1830 Edition	Versification in 1981 Edition	Chiastic Label for Section and First Phrase of Section
1	Vv. 1–8 (includes vv. 1–2 colophon)	I “Behold, it came to pass” (verse 3)
2	Vv. 9–11	II “Now, it came to pass”
3	Vv. 12–14	III “And it came to pass”
4	Vv. 15–18	IV “Wherefore”
5	Vv. 19–20	III’ “And now it came to pass”
6	Vv. 21–24	II’ “And it came to pass”
7	Vv. 25–27	I’ “And it came to pass”

Regarding the paragraphing by Gilbert for the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon (as depicted in the table set forth earlier), it might be noted here that Sections IV and III’ in that table (representing respectively the text of vv. 15–18 and 19–20) hint that it might be possible that the text of verses 16b to 18 form an element D’ to correspond with element D, in an overall A-B-C-D-D’-C’-B’-A’ chiastic structure, as follows:

<p style="text-align: center;">C: Redemption of the Lamanites</p>	<p>12 And it came to pass that after I had prayed and labored with all diligence, the Lord said unto me: I will grant unto thee according to thy desires, because of thy faith.</p> <p>13 And now behold, this was the desire which I desired of him — that if it should so be, that my people, the Nephites, should fall into transgression, and by any means be destroyed, and the Lamanites should not be destroyed, that the Lord God would preserve a record of my people, the Nephites; even if it so be by the power of his holy arm, that it might be brought forth at some future day unto the Lamanites, that, perhaps, they might be brought unto salvation —</p> <p>14 For at the present our strugglings were vain in restoring them to the true faith. And they swore in their wrath that, if it were possible, they would destroy our records and us, and also all the traditions of our fathers.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">D: Christ-Centered Covenant</p>	<p>15 Wherefore, I knowing that the Lord God was able to preserve our records,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">I cried unto him continually, for he had said unto me: Whatsoever thing ye shall ask in faith, believing that ye shall receive in the name of Christ, ye shall receive it.</p> <p>16a And I had faith, and I did cry unto God that he would preserve the records;</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">D: Christ-Centered Covenant</p>	<p>16b and he covenanted with me that he would bring them forth unto the Lamanites in his own due time.</p> <p>17 And I, Enos, knew it would be according to the covenant which he had made; wherefore my soul did rest.</p> <p>18 And the Lord said unto me: Thy fathers have also required of me this thing; and it shall be done unto them according to their faith; for their faith was like unto thine.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">C: Restoration of the Lamanites</p>	<p>19 And now it came to pass that I, Enos, went about among the people of Nephi, prophesying of things to come, and testifying of the things which I had heard and seen.</p> <p>20 And I bear record that the people of Nephi did seek diligently to restore the Lamanites unto the true faith in God. But our labors were vain; their hatred was fixed, and they were led by their evil nature that they became wild, and ferocious, and a blood-thirsty people, full of idolatry and filthiness; feeding upon beasts of prey; dwelling in tents, and wandering about in the wilderness with a short skin girdle about their loins and their heads shaven; and their skill was in the bow, and in the cimeter, and the ax. And many of them did eat nothing save it was raw meat; and they were continually seeking to destroy us.</p>

Whether any features of the text in the hypothetical element D' (vv. 16b to 18) would account for rhetorical structures over the text of those two and one-half verses is not readily apparent.

A Well-Balanced Proposed Chiasm

The book of Enos presents remarkable balance between the two halves of the text that surround the central chiasm of vv. 15–16a. According to the text produced by Royal Skousen,⁴⁶ the English-language word counts of the first and last flanks of the chiasm might be similar to the Egyptian or Hebrew word counts in the otherwise unavailable original, and those English-language word counts of the text surrounding the chiasmic passage at the center compare as follows:

Description	vv. 1–14	vv. 16b–27
Total English words:	558	554
Percentage of total English words:	50.2%	49.8%

A Strong Sense of Completion and Return

The center of the book begs for resolution and return, and indeed because the second half of the text mirrors the first half, the book ends as it begins. The need for the preservation of the Nephite records is manifest in the mention of actual wars and destructions among the Nephites (v. 24). That answers the prediction of destruction set forth in v. 10. The early promise that Enos would be blessed (v. 5) is wholly fulfilled in v. 27, where the Lord refers to him as “ye blessed.” Even the only two time indicators (vv. 8, “many years pass away,” and 25, “seventy and nine years had passed away”) are in the early and late parts of the book. The early references to joy and eternal life (v. 3) are repeated by references to Enos’s rejoicing and immortality in vv. 26–27. Whereas in v. 4 Enos kneels down before his Maker, in v. 27 he stands before Him. And the only three uses of the name of Christ in the entire book are at the very chiasmic center point (v. 15), within the first element at the beginning (v. 8), and within the last element at the end (v. 26). This is consistent with the observation made by Nils Lund, who noted that “Identical ideas are often distributed in such a fashion that they occur in the extremes and at the centre of their respective system, and nowhere else in the system.”⁴⁷

46. Royal Skousen, ed., *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text*, 2nd ed. (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2022), 180–83.

47. Nils Wilhem Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament: A Study in the Form and Function of Chiasmic Structures* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), 41.

Other Important Features of the Proposed Enos Chiasm

There are two other important features to note about the proposed chiasm: an intrinsic economy of style and the use of rare and unique vocabulary.

Enos knew that his people's record would be preserved. If not at the time of his own writing then surely shortly thereafter, the plates upon which he wrote had already approached the point at which few words could be written on them, they being "small," according to the statements of his son, Jarom (Jarom 1:2, 14). Enos wrote only about 150 percent more text than his son Jarom. Perhaps aware of the economy of style, the beauty of form, and the depth of meaning available through creating — and the powerful spiritual experience that would be treasured and appreciated by those who would discover and study — a Christ-centered chiastic text, Enos may well have purposefully used this technique in order to open up a fuller appreciation of his life and his message, notwithstanding (and perhaps in part because of) the apparent paucity of writing materials in his time.

Words and phrases sometimes are unique to a chiastic passage and may rarely or never otherwise appear anywhere in the scriptures. Such rare and unique terms occasionally are identified as elements that support the structure of a chiastic pattern. For example, Yehuda T. Radday has identified a chiastic pattern for the entire book of Genesis, while relying in part on the reversed repetition of certain unique words and phrases that either appear only in their respective chiastic elements within Genesis, or appear nowhere else in the Bible, or appear only rarely elsewhere in the Bible. A depiction of Radday's proposed pattern is set forth below:

THE BOOK OF GENESIS⁴⁸

I — Typological Prologue (1:1–11:32)

Eleven chapters (roughly one-quarter of the book)

A Poetry (ch. 1)

- 1 "his daughter-in-law" (Tamar) (11:31; the only two "daughters-in-law" mentioned in Genesis are in chs. 11 and 38)

II — Progressively Individualized Main Part (12:1–36:43)

Twenty-five chapters (roughly one-half of the book)

48. Yehuda T. Radday, "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative," in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981), 96–112.

B “Descent” into Egypt (12:10–20)

- 2 “the land could not support both of them dwelling together” (13:6; in Genesis unique to chs. 13 and 36 and found nowhere else in the Bible)
- 3 “the Canaanite and the Pherizite” (13:7; mentioned as a pair nowhere in the Bible except in Genesis 13 and 34)
- 4 “which cannot be numbered for multitude” (16:10)

C Solemn change of name: “no longer shall your name be ... but ...” (17:5) — Abram-Abraham

D Circumcision (17:23)

- 5 “the firstborn daughter” (19:31; once in Samuel and in Genesis only in chs. 19 and 29)
- 6 “last night” (19:34; once each in Kings and Job, and in Genesis only in chs. 19 and 31)
- 7 “seize by force” (21:25; in Genesis only in chs. 21 and 31)
- 8 “be a witness” (21:30; in Genesis only in chs. 21 and 31)

B’ “Ascent” from Egypt (ch. 22)

- 9 “the Lord ... grant me success” (24:12; unique to Genesis 24 and 26)
- 9’ “the Lord ... grant me success” (26; unique to Genesis 24 and 26)
- 5’ “the firstborn daughter” (29:26; once in Samuel and in Genesis only in chs. 19 and 29)
- 6’ “last night” (31:29; once each in Kings and Job, and in Genesis only in chs. 19 and 31)
- 7’ “seize by force” (31:31; in Genesis only in chs. 21 and 31)
- 8’ “be a witness” (31:52; in Genesis only in chs. 21 and 31)
- 4’ “which cannot be numbered for multitude” (32:12)
- 3’ “the Canaanite and the Pherizite” (34:30; mentioned as a pair nowhere in the Bible except in Genesis 13 and 34)

D’ Circumcision (23:14 ff.)

C’ Solemn change of name: “no longer shall your name be ... but ...” (35:10) — Jacob-Israel

- 2’ “the land could not support both of them dwelling together” (36:7 in Genesis unique to chs. 13 and 36 and found nowhere else in the Bible)

B’ “Descent” into Egypt (37:36)

III — Highly Individualized Portrait in Epilogue

Fourteen chapters (roughly one-quarter of the book)

1' "his daughter-in-law" (Sarah) (38:24; the only two "daughters-in-law" mentioned in Genesis are in chs. 11 and 38)

A' Poetry (ch. 49:1-27)

For another example, Welch points out that the phrase "*left hand of God*" appears only twice in the Book of Mormon (Mosiah 5:10 and 5:12), a repeated key phrase that forms two corresponding elements of the first chiasmic Book of Mormon passage identified as such by Welch, Mosiah 5:10-12 [A-B-C-D-E-F-F-E-D-C-B-A].⁴⁹

While not at all part of as extensive a formulation as Radday's Genesis proposal, nor reliant on a *unique* phrase like Welch's, a possible instance of what might be termed a chiasmic use of a *rare term* is Enos's two uses of the rare phrase "true faith" in vv. 14 and 20 (elements C and C'). The rarity of the phrase itself and the relationships of the two words to one another are discussed by Tvedtnes.⁵⁰ The two uses of the term in the book of Enos occur in corresponding chiasmic elements C and C', concerning the Nephites' strugglings to restore the Lamanites to the "true faith" (v. 14) and their efforts to restore the Lamanites unto the "true faith" in God (v. 20). The only other appearances of the phrase "true faith" in all scripture appear in Alma 44:4 and 3 Nephi 6:14, and those two uses both concern themselves also with the relationships among Nephites, Lamanites, and "true faith." One cannot read Alma's words to the Lamanite leader Zerahemnah in Alma 44:3-4 (with its reference to the relationships between transgression and destruction and between faith and societal preservation) without harkening back to Enos's concern with the redemption of his own people and of the Lamanites and of the preservation of his own people's records and the role that righteousness and wickedness play. And one cannot read what Mormon says in 3 Nephi 6:14 about the faithful Lamanites who in the thirtieth year from the coming of Christ were converted to the "true faith" and who were willing "with all diligence to keep the commandments of the Lord" without recalling Enos's references to "true faith," "diligence," and the need for "keeping the commandments."

49. John W. Welch, "Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon," Provo, UT, FARMS, 1994, 7-8 (transcript of video lecture, FARMS Books of Mormon Lecture Series).

50. John A. Tvedtnes, "Faith and Truth," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 3, no. 2 (1994): 114.

The Tradition of Prophets Who Desire Preservation of the Word of the Lord

Enos (1:3–27) and Nephi (2 Nephi 33:4) were not alone in desiring (Enos 1:12) or requiring (Enos 1:18) that the Lord God “preserve” the word of the Lord for the salvation of mankind. Noting the reason for preserving the records, Nephi explained that he “had obtained the records which the Lord had commanded us, and searched them and found that they were desirable; yea, even of great worth unto us, insomuch that we could *preserve the commandments of the Lord unto our children*” (1 Nephi 5:21). The Lord commanded other prophets to preserve His word. He commanded the prophet Moses to put into the ark of the covenant “the testimony” (Exodus 25:16), the “book of the law” (Deuteronomy 31:24), “the tables of the covenant” (Hebrews 9:4). The Lord told the prophet Isaiah, “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever” (Isaiah 30:8). The word of the Lord to the prophet Ezekiel was for him to take the two sticks of Judah and Joseph, written on two separate continents, and join them “one to another into one,” clearly something possible only if both are recorded, protected, and *preserved* (Ezekiel 37:15–17).

Moroni did “seal up these records” (Moroni 10:2) “and for this very purpose are these plates *preserved*, which contain these records — that the promises of the Lord might be fulfilled, which he made to his people; and that the Lamanites might come to the knowledge of their fathers, and that they might know the promises of the Lord, and that they may believe the gospel and rely upon the merits of Jesus Christ, and be glorified through faith in his name, and that through their repentance they might be saved” (Doctrine and Covenants 3:19–20).

Regarding his desire that the records of his fathers be preserved, records that testify of Christ, Mormon states that

these things are written unto the remnant of the house of Jacob ... and they are to be hid up unto the Lord that they may come forth in his own due time. And this is the commandment which I have received; and behold, they shall come forth according to the commandment of the Lord, when he shall see fit, in his wisdom. And behold, they shall go unto the unbelieving; ... and for this intent shall they go — that they may be persuaded that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God; that the Father may bring about, through his most Beloved, his great and eternal purpose, in restoring ...

all the house of Israel, to the land of their inheritance, which the Lord their God hath given them, unto the fulfilling of his covenant; and also that the seed of this people may more fully believe his gospel, which shall go forth unto them from the Gentiles. ...

And also the Lord will remember the prayers of the righteous, which have been put up unto him for them. (Mormon 5:12–15, 21)

Indeed, when the Nephites gathered to the land of Cumorah to prepare for their “last struggle” (Mormon 6:6), Mormon’s concern turned toward protection and preservation of the sacred records:

And it came to pass that when we had gathered in all our people in one to the land of Cumorah, behold I, Mormon, began to be old; and knowing it to be the last struggle of my people, and having been commanded of the Lord that I should not suffer the records which had been handed down by our fathers, which were sacred, to fall into the hands of the Lamanites, (for the Lamanites would destroy them) therefore I made this record out of the plates of Nephi, and hid up in the hill Cumorah all the records which had been entrusted to me by the hand of the Lord, save it were these few plates which I gave unto my son Moroni. (Mormon 6:6)

Concerning that which he had written, Mormon wrote that to him those things were “pleasing,” and he took the small plates with their “small account of the prophets” and combined them with “the remainder” of his record written on the plates of Mormon (Words of Mormon 1:3, 4, 6), while explaining that the large and small plates of Nephi

were handed down ... from generation to generation until they have fallen into my hands. And I, Mormon, pray to God that they may be *preserved* from this time henceforth. And I know that they will be preserved; for there are great things written upon them, out of which my people and their brethren shall be judged at the great and last day, according to the word of God which is written. (Words of Mormon 1:11)

King Mosiah “kept” the “plates of brass” and “all the records” and “conferred them upon Alma, who was the son of Alma, ... and commanded him that he should *keep and preserve* them, and also keep a record of the people, handing them down from one generation to

another, even as they had been handed down from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem” (Mosiah 28:20, emphasis added).

And Alma urged his son Helaman to

Keep all these things sacred which I have kept, even as I have kept them; for it is for a wise purpose that they are kept. And these plates of brass, which contain these engravings, which have the records of the holy scriptures upon them, which have the genealogy of our forefathers, even from the beginning — behold, it has been prophesied by our fathers, that they should be kept and handed down from one generation to another, and be kept and preserved by the hand of the Lord until they should go forth unto every nation, kindred, tongue, and people, that they shall know of the mysteries contained thereon. (Alma 37:2–4)

Alma tells Helaman to “keep” the twenty-four plates (Alma 37:21). Shiblon confers the “sacred things” and “engravings” upon Helaman, the son of Helaman (Alma 63:11–13). Nephi, the son of Helaman, gives charge unto his son Nephi, “concerning the plates of brass, and all the records which had been kept, and all those things which had been kept sacred from the departure of Lehi out of Jerusalem (3 Nephi 1:2). Nephi is the “just man who did keep the record” and whom Christ called upon during His visit to the Nephites, asking him to “bring forth the record which ye have kept” (3 Nephi 8:1; 23:7). Those who “kept” the records in the sense of writing upon them also “kept” them in the sense of having “preserved” them.

King Benjamin reminded his three sons Mosiah, Helorum, and Helaman

That were it not for these plates [of brass], which contain these records and these commandments, we must have suffered in ignorance, even at this present time, not knowing the mysteries of God. For it were not possible that our father, Lehi, could have remembered all these things, to have taught them to his children, *except it were for the help of these plates*; for he having been taught in the language of the Egyptians therefore he could read these engravings, and teach them to his children, that thereby they could teach them to their children, and so fulfilling the commandments of God, even down to this present time.

I say unto you, my sons, were it not for these things, which have been *kept and preserved by the hand of God*, that we might read and understand of his mysteries, and have his commandments always before our eyes, that even our fathers would have dwindled in unbelief. (Mosiah 1:3–5)

And, as Mormon notes,

King Mosiah” thereafter “took the plates of brass, and all the things which he had kept, and conferred them upon Alma, who was the son of Alma; yea, all the records, and also the interpreters, and conferred them upon him, and commanded him that he should keep and preserve them, and also keep a record of the people, handing them down from one generation to another, even as they had been handed down from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem. (Mosiah 28:20)

In short, the message of the book of Enos fits well into this almost universal concern of the prophets of God that the word of the Lord be preserved for the benefit of His children.

Mosiah 5:10–12 Compared to Enos 1:15–16a

A beautiful chiasm exists in the text of Mosiah 5:10–12, discovered by Welch in 1976, which has been depicted variously over the years and held out as one of the ten best chiasms in the Book of Mormon,⁵¹ best depicted by Welch as follows (with one small modification here), a chiasm with which the centerpiece pattern in the book of Enos compares favorably. The depiction below seems to be what Welch would likely agree best reflects his discovery. For ease of analysis, prime symbols after capital letters in the second flank of the chiasm are added here, and one minor modification is made by moving the “and also” phrase from the end of B' to the beginning of A'. Otherwise, Welch’s proposal is left intact:

- A And now it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall not take upon him the **name of Christ**
- B must be **called** by some other name;
- C therefore, he findeth himself on the **left hand of God**.

51. Compare John W. Welch, “The Discovery of Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon: Forty Years Later,” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 16, no. 2 (2007): 79–80, with the image at “What Can We Learn from 10 of the Best Chiasms in the Book of Mormon? Part 1,” KnoWhy #349, Book of Mormon Central (website), August 7, 2017, <https://knowhy.bookofmormoncentral.org/knowhy/what-can-we-learn-from-10-of-the-best-chiasms-in-the-book-of-mormon-part-1/>.

- D And I would that ye should **remember** also, that this is
 the name that I said I should give unto you
 E that never should be **blotted out**,
 F except it be through **transgression**;
 F' therefore, take heed that ye do not **transgress**,
 E' that the name be not **blotted out** of your hearts.
 D' I say unto you, I would that ye should **remember** to
 retain the name written always in your hearts,
 C' that ye are not found on the **left hand of God**,
 B' but that ye hear and know the voice by which ye shall be
called,
 A' and also, the **name** by which he shall call you.

In all, the number of English words of the text in which the Mosiah 5:10–12 chiasm appears is 139 English words. By contrast, the number of English words of the text in which the Enos 1:15–16a central concentric structure appears is 61 words. Welch's structure relies on six words and phrases that appear in the first half of the chiasm and are repeated in reverse sequence in the second half of the chiasm (a total of 12 words and phrases overall, which comprise a total of 22 words, accounting for 15.8% of the English-language text in which the chiasm is situated).

The proposed structure for the centerpiece of the book of Enos follows:

- F Wherefore, I knowing that the *Lord God* was able to *preserve our records*,
 G I *cried unto him* continually, for he had said unto me:
 H Whatsoever thing ye shall ask in *faith*, believing
 I that *ye shall receive*
 J in the name of *Christ*,
 I' *ye shall receive* it. (15)
 H' And I had *faith*, (16a)
 G' and I did *cry unto God* (16b)
 F' that *he would preserve the records*;

That proposed structure relies on reference to five words and phrases in the first flank, one word in the middle element, and five words and phrases in the second flank (a total of eleven words and phrases overall, consisting of a total of 24 words within those English words and phrases, accounting for 39% of the English-language text within which the concentric structure is situated).

While the English-language text of Mosiah 5:10–12 accounts for more than two times the amount of text than can be accounted for in

Enos 1:15–16a (139 words compared to 61 words); and while the chiasm found by Welch as calculated in the English-language text of Mosiah 5:10–12 relies on more words and phrases than the concentric structure proposed for the English-language text of Enos 1:15–16a (12 words and phrases and 22 words overall in Welch’s chiasm compared to 11 words and phrases and 24 words overall in the proposed concentric structure in the Enos text), it would appear, at least from this sort of statistical comparison, that the ratio of the number of keywords and key phrases to the overall number of words of text for the proposed concentric structure of Enos 1:15–16a compares favorably with the ratio of keywords and key phrases to the overall number of words of text for the proposed chiasm of Mosiah 5:10–12. In short, it might be said that the proposed concentric structure at the center of the book of Enos is tightly composed within its context, similar to that of the chiasm of Mosiah 5:10–12.

Conclusion

Some concluding gleanings may be proposed, the first perhaps mundane and obscure and the second clearly important. First, though not crucial to the beautiful lessons portrayed in this book, it can legitimately be asked what is meant by the opening colophon to the book (vv. 1–2). Both John A. Tvedtnes⁵² and Thomas W. Mackay⁵³ have previously described the introductory colophon of the book of Enos as composed of both vv. 1 and 2. The statement in v. 2 seems to invite the reader not only to anticipate the recounting of a prayer but to expect devotion of the entire book to an account of that one prayer, for there Enos tells his readers that he will tell of “the wrestle which [he] had before God” (Enos 1:2).

Yet with even a cursory reading of the entire book, the modern reader concludes that the account of Enos’s prayer extends only from v. 3 through v. 18 (the first half of the book, A, B, and C plus the middle section, D). Taken as a whole, the balance of the text of the book, beginning with v. 19, which begins with the phrase “and it came to pass,” represents Enos’s description of *activities* seemingly beyond the “wrestle which [he] had before God, before [he] received a remission of [his] sins” (Enos 1:2). Those activities include Enos’s having gone about among the

52. John A. Tvedtnes, “Colophons in the Book of Mormon,” in *Reexploring the Book of Mormon, The FARMS Updates*, ed. John W. Welch (Salt Lake City, UT: Deseret Book; Provo, UT: FARMS, 1992), 13.

53. Thomas W. Mackay, “Mormon as Editor: A Study in Colophons, Headers, and Source Indicators,” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 2, no. 2 (1993): 96, “contextual colophon”.

people of Nephi, prophesying of things to come, testifying of the things which he had heard and seen (v. 19), and bearing record (v. 20). This does not, at least at first blush, seem to be a description of a “wrestle before God” for remission of sins, as v. 2 would lead the reader to expect. Indeed, no reference to prayer exists beyond v. 18 of the book.

In v. 2 Enos tells his reader that he will recount the wrestle which he had before God “*before*” he received a remission of his sins. Yet, it is as early as v. 5 that he recounts that the voice of the Lord has already come to him saying, “Enos, thy sins are forgiven thee,” and as early as v. 6 that his guilt is already spoken of as having been “swept away.” Clearly, Enos desired to give us something more than a mere chronological account of activities that in time preceded his remission of sins. Consistent with Tvedtnes’ and Mackay’s identifications of vv. 1 *and* 2 together as the one colophon for the entire book, I suggest that when the book is viewed in light of that apparent fact, the reader must deal with the significance of it. If v. 2 is part of the colophon and if the colophon is intended to introduce *all* of Enos’s book, why is the topic promised in v. 2 seemingly exhausted by v. 6 and v. 8?

The activities set forth in vv. 19–27 seem to be prompted by the areas of concern described in the *prayer* (and God’s answers to that prayer), as recounted in vv. 3–18. And those *activities* set forth in vv. 19–27 seem to be set forth roughly in an order that is the reverse of the order in which they are recounted in the *prayer*:

- I personal redemption (vv. 3–8)
- II concern for the Nephites (vv. 9–11)
- III concern for the Lamanites (vv. 11–14)
- IV the covenant concerning the record (vv. 15–18)
- III’ concern for the Lamanites (v. 20)
- II’ concern for the Nephites (vv. 21–24)
- I’ personal redemption (vv. 25–27)

Enos’s prayer surely did not end with the Lord’s first communication (vv. 5–8) that announced his redemption from sin, but it continued on through the remaining three communications (through v. 18). Enos recounts the essence of his entire life, the main activities of his life (vv. 19–27), in the light of that one prayer and in light of the Lord’s answers to that one prayer (vv. 3–18).

Perhaps all of the activities of his life’s work, all of the labors prompted by the three answers given by the Lord to his prayer, all of the struggles, all of the testifying, and all of the preaching and prophesying did indeed precede his ultimate remission of sins, as predicted in v. 2 and

reported, perhaps only in part, in v. 6. Maybe the truly effectual, eternal “remission of sins” which he predicts in v. 2 is not only the forgiveness of sins and the sweeping away of guilt recounted in vv. 5 and 6, but also the “rest” he anticipates in v. 27 after all his strugglings of a lifetime, after all his rejoicing with having declared the word all his days, and after all his envisioned blessings in the mansions of his Father after having been wrought upon by the power of God that he must preach and prophesy unto the people. Perhaps this reflects one of the lessons taught us by Ezekiel (see 3:17–21 and 33:7–9), concerning the delivery, too, of the soul of the watchman.

From these observations, it would appear that the colophon is rightly identified as comprising both vv. 1 and 2, strengthening the notion that, if the colophon accurately describes the whole book, then Enos perhaps has, in a deeply meaningful way, told his readers — by means of his *entire* text — of the wrestle which he had before God “before he received a remission of [his] sins”; he then enhances that description with an account of his whole life’s experience, *not told merely as a chronological progression of events* (notwithstanding his uses of the phrase “it came to pass”) but as a description of all the activities of his life prompted by the Lord’s answers to his prayerful yearnings. Apparently, the progression of Enos’s narrative moves not only chronologically toward but also deeper into his quest for an ultimate and an eternal personal redemption. It seems that the focal point of his own personal immortal redemption hinges on the central role Christ played in satisfying his main stated desire: redemption of the Lamanites through ultimate preservation of the record of the Nephites. His charity for others was the means by which he merited God’s ultimate charity toward him.

It should be noted that within the bounds of his book, Enos *quotes* the Lord a total of *seven* times (vv. 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 18, and 27). The first two quotations (vv. 5 and 8) seem to be grouped into one communication (concerning Enos’s personal redemption), forming a part of vv. 1–8, a span of verses introduced by the phrase “behold, it came to pass” (v. 1). That first quotation (v. 5) balances against the last quotation (v. 27), an anticipated statement which he attributes to the Lord in the future, which correspondingly constitutes a part of Enos’s repeated account concerning his own salvation (vv. 25–27). The final span of verses (vv. 25–27) is also introduced by the phrase “and it came to pass” (v. 25). The next quotation (v. 10), part of the section concerning the Lord’s promised visitation upon Enos’s Nephite brethren balances against a span of verses (vv. 21–24) in which the unfaithful Nephites are indeed visited of the

Lord, a span of verses introduced by “and it came to pass” (v. 21) and lacking a quotation of the Lord, perhaps to highlight the Nephite people’s stiffneckedness. The next quotation (v. 12) forms part of a span of verses (vv. 12–14) introduced by “and it came to pass” (v. 12), which likewise seems to balance against a span of verses (vv. 19–20), which lacks a quotation of the Lord, perhaps likewise to emphasize the result of the Lamanites’ wrath and hatred. And as to the two central quotations (vv. 15 and 18), set forth in a span of verses introduced by “wherefore” (v. 15), the first contains the central phrase of the book (v. 15) and the second serves to conclude the prayer, being set forth at the major division of the book (v. 18), between Enos’s prayer and his life’s labors.

More important, perhaps, is a lesson about the value of the Nephite record and its role in redemption. The lesson concerning Christ’s power to redeem those who obey His teachings as contained in the Nephite record is a lesson not unique to Enos. Nephi knew that the record of the Jews could save a nation from perishing in unbelief. Enos, too, knows that the Nephite record can play such a redemptive role for the Lamanites. True, Enos’s prayer and his efforts are first directed, in each respective half of the book, to the salvation of his own people, the Nephites. (Compare Enos 1:9–10 with 1:11–12 and compare also 1:19–20a with 1:20b.) But element C’ (v. 20) includes the phrase “destroy us” (an indication of the destruction of the Nephites), in stark contrast to the use of the phrase “not be destroyed” in element C (v. 13) (an indication of the survival of the Lamanites). And Enos’s prayerful request at the center of the book centers on preservation of the Nephite record, a request expressed both in anticipation of the possible destruction of the Nephites and in hopes of the eventual survival of the Lamanites. Taking a cue from the centrality of the experience he recounts in vv. 15–16a, it can probably safely be said that Enos’s charitable concern for the spiritual survival of the Lamanites, through preservation of the Nephite record, did indeed rival his concern for the spiritual (and physical) survival of his own people, the Nephites.

Enos sought and obtained his own personal redemption from sin, and from that he developed a desire that both the Nephites and the Lamanites obtain their own redemption. The central role of the Lord Jesus Christ in responding to the strugglings and the labors of this prophet, and those of his people, is reflected in Christ’s own divine desire that God’s children be redeemed. That is characterized by the Lord’s four communications to Enos: (1) “thou shalt be blessed” (vv. 2–8); (2) “I will visit thy brethren” (vv. 9–11); (3) “I will grant unto thee according to thy desires” — which are that the Nephite record be preserved for

the salvation of the Lamanites (vv. 12–14); and (4) “ye shall receive it” — in answer to Enos’s desires (vv. 15–18). Charity is the pure love of Christ (Moroni 7:47), being that same love for God’s children that Christ Himself possesses (*see* Ether 12:33–34a). Keeping in mind that the central phrase of the book of Enos is the phrase “in the name of Christ,” we can perhaps better appreciate that indeed Enos had first-hand experience with the doctrine that “whatsoever thing ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, which is good” — and desiring the redemption of God’s children, Enos’s brethren, is indeed a paramount good — “*in faith believing that ye shall receive, behold, it shall be done unto you*” (Moroni 7:26). Enos shows us clearly that we have the Book of Mormon today in great part because of the unwavering faith in the Lord Jesus Christ manifest by the ancients, including among them Enos. As Lehi had said to his son Joseph, quoting that ancient Joseph, who had been carried captive into Egypt, so can it be said of Enos himself and of all the other prophets like him who are responsible for the preservation of the word of God for our day: “Because of their faith their words shall proceed forth out of my mouth unto their brethren who are the fruit of thy loins; and the weakness of their words will I make strong in their faith, unto the remembering of the covenant which I made unto thy fathers” (2 Nephi 3:21).

The text in one sense seems to reflect the classic Book of Mormon pride cycle (Helaman 12:1–6): The Lord blesses and prospers his people; they become proud and sinful because of their ease; the Lord chastens the people; and they humble themselves, repent, and are blessed. Enos expresses concern more than once not only that his own people might be destroyed if they fall into transgression but also concern that the Lamanites, too, might similarly be destroyed for the same reason. (See vv. 13, 14.) The two peoples are both on the cycle: the Nephites *seemingly* are at the stage of enjoying blessings, seeking “diligently to restore the Lamanites unto the true faith in God” (vv. 19–20a) and able to “till the land,” enjoy “all manner of grain, and fruit, and flocks of herds” and the like (v. 21), but for some reason they are not successful (v. 20a). The Nephites, so seemingly blessed, have among them prophets (v. 22) whom they do not heed (v. 23), which may be the reason they are not successful in their efforts to redeem the Lamanites (v. 20a). Perhaps the Nephites are in the *pride* stage of the cycle, between prosperity and wickedness. The Lamanites, on the other hand, are seemingly already at the *wickedness* stage and are entering into the *punishment* stage (v. 20b, fixed on “hatred” and being a “wild,” “ferocious,” and “blood-thirsty” people).

“And I saw wars between the Nephites and the⁵⁴ Lamanites in the course of my days,” says Enos (v. 24). Perhaps vv. 20 to 24 are structured simply on the themes mentioned here rather than on words and phrases.

The book of Enos is concerned with yearning for potential happiness and joy and for the eternal and temporal welfare and redemption of Enos himself, of his people the Nephites, and of their brethren, the Lamanites. But notwithstanding his prayers and efforts and labors on behalf of the Nephites and his and his people’s struggles on behalf of the Lamanites, Enos alone is left assured of those eternal blessings of joy, confidence before God, and redemption of his soul. He desired eternal life and the joy of the saints (v. 3) and eventually for his prayers and efforts was at least himself assured of eternal rest, eternal blessings, and eternal life (v. 27).

Stephen Kent Ehat has a J.D. degree (1981) and as a California attorney he researches and writes appellate briefs for California attorneys in state and federal matters. He has been a student of chiasmus since 1973. He and his wife Jeanine moved to Utah in 2001 and live in Lindon, Utah. They are the parents of five sons and have twenty-one grandchildren.

Appendix

Observing the distinction between chiasmus proper (a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas) and antimetabole (a reversal in the sequence of repeated words and phrases) is important in the analysis of large-scale chiasms, those chiasms that constitute the rhetorical structure of lengthier texts, such as Alma 36 and the book of Enos, vv. 3–27. Clearly, ideas are conveyed by words and phrases, and so chiasmus proper and antimetabole are related to one another. And yet as Meynet observes, “symmetries and relationships of all kinds are very numerous in a text” and “the whole problem resides in knowing at which level of organization of the text they are relevant.”⁵⁵ Keywords and key phrases that help to define what the ideas are for corresponding elements of an *overall* chiasm in a longer text may or may not themselves be significant to other parallelistic patterns that may appear *within* those elements. Conversely, some keywords and key phrases that help define some of the proposed

54. The Printer’s Manuscript of the Book of Mormon includes the word “the” here in the text.

55. Meynet, *Rhetorical Analysis*, 166.

chiastic patterns that may appear *within* any given element of an overall chiasm may possibly not serve as keywords and phrases in the makeup of the larger structure over the lengthy text.

Sometimes a lengthier text, such as Alma 36, may reflect a great amount of reversal in the sequence of repeated words and phrases, as can be seen in Welch's most recent analysis,⁵⁶ depicted below. And yet analysis by that methodology leaves gaps in the text that are not accounted for in the pattern. The appearance of these gaps in the text was noted by Reynolds in his levels analysis of Alma 36⁵⁷ and early on was acknowledged by Welch in his own levels analyses of that chapter.⁵⁸ What is reproduced below is Welch's most recent analysis, with alphabetic letters added to the left of each element to facilitate seeing the correspondences, with the italic font here replicated from the original 1999 Welch portrayal, which emphasizes the words and phrases that correspond between the first and second flanks (halves) of the pattern; and with left-margin notations added here to show the "gaps," which represent the places where verses of the text are not accounted for in the proposed word-and-phrase-based chiastic pattern (the gaps consisting of the text of vv. 11–13, 21, and 25):

- A My son give ear to my *words* (v. 1)
- B *Keep the commandments* and ye shall *prosper in the land* (v. 1)
- C *Do as I have done* (v. 2)
- D *Remember the captivity* of our fathers (v. 2)
- E They were in *bondage* (v. 2)
- F He surely did *deliver* them (v. 2)
- G *Trust* in God (v. 3)
- H Supported in *trials, troubles, and afflictions* (v. 3)
- I Lifted up at the *last day* (v. 3)
- J *I know* this not of myself but *of God* (v. 4)
- K *Born of God* (v. 5)

56. John W. Welch and J. Greg Welch, *Charting the Book of Mormon; Visual Aids for Personal Study and Teaching* (Provo, UT: FARMS, 1999), chart 132.

57. Reynolds, "Rethinking Alma 36," 280–81.

58. See Welch, "A Masterpiece: Alma 36," 116–18. Welch refers to the "main girders" in the "structure or framework" of Alma 36. He then provides a chapter summary in chiastic form that omits reference to the text of Alma 36:11–13, 21, and 25. These omitted verses constitute the gaps which Welch discusses beginning on page 118: "at a more detailed level, we are able to detect panels of text filling in the gaps."

L I sought to destroy the church
(vv. 6–9)

M My *limbs* were paralyzed
(v. 10)

[gap: vv. 11–13]

N Fear of being in the
presence of God (vv.
14–15)

O *Pains* of a damned
soul (v. 16)

P *Harrowed up by*
the memory of
sins (v. 17)

Q I remembered
Jesus Christ, a
son of God (v.
17)

Q' I cried, *Jesus*
Christ, son of
God (v. 18)

P' *Harrowed by the*
memory of sins
no more (v. 19)

O' Joy as exceeding as
was the *pain* (v. 20)

[gap: v. 21]

N' Long to be in the
presence of God (v. 22)

M' My *limbs* received strength
again (v. 23)

L' I labored to bring souls to
repentance (v. 24)

[gap: v. 25]

K' *Born of God* (v. 26)

J' Therefore *my knowledge* is of *God* (v.
26)

H' Supported under *trials, troubles, and*
afflictions (v. 26)

G' *Trust* in him (v. 27)

F' He will *deliver* me (v. 27)

I' And *raise me up at the last day* (v. 28)

- E' As God brought our fathers out of *bondage* and captivity (vv. 28–29)
- D' Retain a *remembrance of their captivity* (v. 29)
- C' Know *as I* do know (v. 30)
- B' *Keep the commandments* and ye shall *prosper in the land* (v. 30)
- A' This according to his *word* (v. 30)

The existence of such “gaps” in the analysis is occasioned by the fact that the entire lengthy text is analyzed in light of antimetaboly as the structuring principle that gives the text its chiasmic pattern. Of course, Alma did not compose the above word-and-phrase-based chiasmic pattern; rather, he composed a text composed of all of the text of the chapter. And Welch, and more recently and completely, Reynolds used “levels analysis” to depict the overall chiasm of the chapter at one level and smaller parallelistic structures at subordinate levels. And doing so accounted for all of the text, including the text where gaps otherwise appear in the proposed word-and-phrase-based chiasmic pattern. Reynolds essentially presents the following overall “concentric organization of Alma 36”:⁵⁹

- A “my word”
 - B “that inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God ye shall prosper in the land”
 - C remember “the captivity” of our fathers
 - D “trust in God” and be “supported in trials, troubles,” and afflictions (faith in Jesus Christ and enduring to the end)
 - E knowledge “of God”
 - F “destroy the church of God”
 - G “fell to the earth”
 - H “that I might not be brought to stand in the presence of my God”
 - I Jesus Christ atoned for the sins of the world
 - H* “my soul did long to be there”
 - G* “stood upon my feet”
 - F* “brings souls unto repentance”
 - E* “born of God”
 - D* “trust in God” and be “supported in trials, troubles,” and afflictions (faith in Jesus Christ and enduring to the end)

59. Reynolds, “Rethinking Alma 36,” 289–308.

- C* remember “the captivity” of our fathers
 B* “that inasmuch as ye shall keep the commandments of God ye shall prosper in the land”
 A* “his word”

Applying “levels analysis,” Reynolds accounts for patterns in the text at the point where the proposed word-and-phrase-based chiasmic pattern otherwise results in gaps in the pattern. Note, for example, where the following gap appears at v. 21 in Welch’s 1999 proposed word-and-phrase-based chiasmic pattern:

- O’ Joy as exceeding as
 was the *pain* (v. 20)
- [gap: v. 21]
- N’ Long to be in the
presence of God (v. 22)

The levels analysis by Reynolds, referencing the full text of vv. 20–22, results in what Reynolds perceives to be an a-b-c-b-a concentric structure:⁶⁰

- a And O what joy and *what marvelous light* I did behold!
 b Yea, *my soul was filled with joy* as exceeding as was⁶¹ *my pains*.
 c Yea, I say unto you, my son, that there can be *nothing so exquisite and so bitter as was my pains*.
 b* Yea, and again I say unto you, my son, that on the other hand there *can be nothing so exquisite and sweet as was my joy*.
 a* Yea, and methought I saw, even as our father Lehi saw, *God sitting upon his throne*,
 i surrounded with numberless concourses of angels
 ii in the attitude of singing and praising their God.

If antimetabole plays a part in the Alma 36 chiasm, it is at the subordinate levels, signaling a structure for the shorter amounts of text. The overall chiasm of the full text of the chapter, however, may better be characterized by a reversal in the sequence not of words and phrases alone but of repeated ideas (chiasmus proper), such as the ideas expressed in the following proposal, which accounts for Welch’s elements A–K,

60. Ibid., 306, formatting is here altered to use the more customary left-indentations of the alphabetic characters attached to the elements.

61. Reynolds uses the wording of Skousen’s *Yale* text.

L–M, N–O, P–P', O'–M', L'–K', and J'–A', a view of the overall chiasm of Alma 36 as a seven-element conceptual concentric structure:⁶²

- 1 Alma's word to his son regarding obedience, prosperity, remembering the captivity of the fathers, support in trials, and knowledge from God — Alma's word to his son is not only that in keeping the commandments of God he will prosper in the land, and that as he himself has done, his son also should remember the captivity and bondage of their fathers, from which captivity and bondage God did deliver them, but also that anyone who puts their trust in God will be supported in their trials, troubles, and afflictions and be lifted up at the last day, all of which Alma knows by revelation from God (vv. 1–5, elements A–K)
- 2 Alma and the sons of Mosiah, who seek to destroy of the church of God, are confronted by the angel of God — Only because he has been spiritually born of God does Alma know these things, for with the sons of Mosiah he had sought to destroy the church of God and with them had been confronted by an angel of God, who commanded them to seek no more to destroy the church of God (vv. 6–9, elements L–M)
- 3 Alma suffers anguish of soul — Alma falls to the earth, loses the use of his limbs, is racked with eternal torment, fears coming into the presence of God, and is racked with the pains of a damned soul (vv. 10–16, elements N–O)
- 4 Alma's conversion to Jesus Christ — While Alma is harrowed up by his many sins he remembered his father's prophecy about Jesus Christ, a Son of God, and crying within his heart, "O Jesus, thou Son of God," Alma pleaded for mercy and was harrowed up by the memory of his sins no more (vv. 17–19, elements P–P')
- 3' Alma experiences joy in his soul — His soul having been filled with joy as exceeding as had been his pains, Alma stands upon his feet, receives back the use of his limbs, longs to be in the presence of God, and manifests unto the people that he had been born of God (vv. 20–23, elements O'–M')

62. See Stephen Kent Ehat, "The Roles of Words, Phrases, and Ideas in Macro-Chiasms," in *Chiasmus: The State of the Art*, ed. John W. Welch and Donald W. Parry (Provo, UT: BYU Studies and Book of Mormon Central, 2020), 336–37.

- 2' Alma builds up the church of God — Alma labors that he might bring souls to repentance that they too might be born of God, and he experiences great joy in the fruit of his labors when many of them are born of God (vv. 24–26a, elements L'–K')
- 1' God's word regarding obedience, prosperity, remembering the captivity of the fathers, support in trials, and knowledge from God — According to God's word, Alma emphasizes not only that he knows by revelation from God that he has been supported by God in his trials, troubles, and afflictions, and that God has delivered him as he did deliver their fathers from captivity, which captivity he has retained in remembrance, but also that God still will deliver him, and that in keeping the commandments of God his son will prosper in the land (vv. 26b–30, elements J'–A')

The question can be posed whether the main elements of an overall chiasm proposed for a lengthy text will always manifest not only repeated words and phrases between them but also rhetorical patterning within them based on those repeated words and phrases. The answer seems to be a simple one, simple because the writers of these ancient texts were free to compose and structure their texts as they desired; and apparently some did craft their texts with various “levels” of rhetorical structure and some did not. Reynolds and Meynet seem to provide ample evidence of the former. And Gary A. Rendsburg, for example, seems to provide ample evidence of the latter. Rendsburg has shown that chiasmus in the Book of Genesis is manifested in a way in which lexical items are shared between matching units of the chiastic pattern without there being any further subordinate level of rhetorical patterning evident in the text. According to Rendsburg,

Large-scale chiasmus may be seen in the three main cycles of the Ancestral Narratives in the book of Genesis: (1) The Abraham Cycle (Gen 11:27–22:24); (2) The Jacob Cycle (Gen 25:19–35:22); and (3) The Joseph Story (Gen 37–50). ... In each of these three main sections of the book of Genesis, a series of episodes unfolds, the narrative reaches a focal point or pivot point, and then the parallel episodes unfold in reverse order. Moreover, for each of the matching units, one finds a series of lexical items which serve to solidify the connections inherent in the shared themes.⁶³

63. Gary A. Rendsburg, “Chiasmus in the Book of Genesis,” *BYU Studies* 59, no. 5 (2020): 17.

His analysis of the two cycles and the one story are set forth in the 1986 and 2014 editions of his book *The Redaction of Genesis*, as well as in somewhat abbreviated form in the 2020 *State of the Art* article. One example of his analysis suffices here to support his point. He outlines the Abraham Cycle (Genesis 11:27–22:24) as follows:⁶⁴

- A Genealogy of Terah (11:27–32)
- B Start of Abram’s Spiritual Odyssey (12:1–9)
 - C Sarai in foreign palace; ordeal ends in peace and success; Abram and Lot part (12:1–13:18)
 - D Abram comes to the rescue of Sodom and Lot (14:1–24)
 - E Covenant with Abram; Annunciation of Ishmael (15:1–16:16)

Focal Point: 17:1–5: Abram > Abraham | Elohim introduced | covenant
 - E’ Covenant with Abraham; Annunciation of Isaac (17:1–18:15)
 - D’ Abraham comes to the rescue of Sodom and Lot (18:16–19:38)
 - C’ Sarah in foreign palace; ordeal ends in peace and success; Abraham and Ishmael part (20:1–21:34)
 - B’ Climax of Abraham’s Spiritual Odyssey (22:1–19)
- A’ Genealogy of Nahor (22:20–24)

In support of his analysis, Rendburg points both to conceptual and thematic correspondences between the matching units and to lexical correspondences. From among the scores of such correspondences to which he draws attention, reference can be made here to two examples, which suffice to show his methodology in highlighting corresponding words and phrases (in this case in his elements B and B’) and in drawing attention to unique or rare occurrences of words or phrases (much like is done in this present paper in drawing attention to the rare phrase “true faith”):

- 2. 12:1 גֵּרְךָ־לְךָ֑ *lek laka* “go forth”
- 22:2 גֵּרְךָ־לְךָ֑ *lek laka* “go forth”

NOTE: These are the only two places in the entire Bible where this key phrase occurs.

* * * *

64. Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Redaction of Genesis* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986), 28–29; and *The Redaction of Genesis*, 2nd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2014).

12. 12:8 וַיֵּצֵא wayya'teq “and he proceeded”
 22:9 וַיִּבֶן wayya'aqod “and he bound”

NOTE: This pair of words constitutes one of the best examples of long-range alliteration in the Bible. The like-sounding lexemes cannot be present in the story coincidentally, but must have been selected quite purposefully, as one final item to enhance the interrelationship between the two episodes. I make this claim based on the rarity of both vocables. The former verb *wayya'teq* “and he proceeded” occurs only here in Gen 12:8 and (as a clear echo) in Gen 26:22.⁶⁵

While Rendsburg thus takes advantage of access to the original Hebrew language of the Genesis text (which cannot be done with the Book of Mormon text), the sort of analysis he conducts parallels the type of analysis used in this present paper concerning the chiasmic text of Enos 1:3–27. There may be some subordinate-level rhetorical structures in some of the elements of the overall chiasm, based on words and phrases. But the text does not otherwise seem to manifest much, if any, subordinate levels of parallelistic patterning beyond that identified for elements B and B'. But as with Rendsburg's analysis of the chiasmic patterns in Genesis, the overall chiasms are formed by a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas (chiasmus strictly defined) and not by a reversal in the sequence of repeated words (antimetabole).

A Note on Statistical Analysis

The reader might feel a need for application of some sort of statistical analysis or test to resolve doubts about intentionality (that is, whether Enos himself intentionally created a text with an A-B-C-D-C'-B'-A' conceptual sequence based on ideas expressed over a span of 25 verses, surrounding a tight a-b-c-d-e-d'-c'-b'-a' concentric structure based on antimetabole). On this account it should be noted that some scholars have indeed devised and applied some statistical tests or methods to understand some of the characteristics of proposed chiasms. The tests generally seek to answer questions about style and rhetorical structure, as well as questions about probability and intentionality.

For example, concerning style and rhetorical structure, Andrew H. Bartelt analyzes various units of text, such as Isaiah 5:8–25, Isaiah 9:7–10:4, and numerous others, in light of syllable counts, stress counts, and word counts; and in one specific example, he looks at the macrostructure

65. Rendsburg, “Chiasmus in the Book of Genesis,” 19–20.

of Isaiah 5:1–10:4 in light of such counts (without counting stresses in prose text), all in an effort to reveal the balanced nature of the chiasms in those texts.⁶⁶ Similarly, Loren F. Bliese analyzes the structure of Nahum in light of metrical or rhythmical chiasmus, which he notes is a “counterpart” to semantic chiasmus; he analyzes the *numbers* of appearances of key words, accents, “word or sound repetitions, poetic word pairs, or metrical, or syntactic uniqueness” in the chiasms of Nehum, as well as the *numbers* of occurrences of repeated “key words” and thematic words in the three “major parts” of Nahum (1:2–2:2; 2:3–2:13; 3:1–19).⁶⁷ Indeed, chiastic balance, evidenced by *word counts*, is abundant in numerous studies.⁶⁸

On the other hand, concerning probability and intentionality, Boyd F. Edwards and W. Farrell Edwards have advanced what they call a “statistical approach” and a “mathematical approach”⁶⁹ and Yehuda T.

66. Andrew H. Bartelt, *The Book Around Immanuel: Style and Structure in Isaiah 2–12* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 117–19, 136–39.

67. Loren F. Bliese, “A Cryptic Chiastic Acrostic: Finding Meaning From Structure in the Poetry of Nahum,” *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 7, no. 3 (1995): 48–81. The quoted language is from pages 50 and 71. Bliese notes that “macrostructures are influenced by a preference for the following: ... Five units in large books (following the Pentateuch — note Psalms and the prophets Hosea and Joel). Song of Songs has seven units. In smaller books such as Nahum and Habakkuk three units are found (the short Obadiah has two units). Key words are repeated once and only once in each unit of several books ...”. Also, there are preferences for “numerical balance between parts,” such as the “number of poems, stanzas, strophes, or lines in each unit,” the “number of words in a poem,” or the “number of occurrences of key words in a book or unit.” 74–75.

68. David Noel Freedman, “The Undiscovered Symmetry of the Bible,” *Bible Review* 10, no. 1 (February 1994): 34–40; Heinrich Graetz, *The Structure of Jewish History*, ed., trans. Ismar Schorsch (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1975), 109. See, e.g., Joost Smit Sibinga, “1 Cor. 15:8/9 and Other Divisions in 1 Cor. 15:1–11,” *Novum Testamentum* 39 (1997): 54–59, detailing with word counts how I Corinthians 15: 1–11 is “clearly structured” and referring to “numerical literary technique” that “was widespread in Jewish and non-Jewish literature over a long period in antiquity.” Sibinga posits that “Paul as a literary craftsman evidently made use of a traditional composition method.”

69. Boyd F. Edwards and W. Farrell Edwards, “Does Chiasmus Appear in the Book of Mormon by Chance?,” *BYU Studies* 43, no. 2 (2004): 103–30; Boyd F. Edwards and W. Farrell Edwards, “When Are Chiasms Admissible as Evidence?” *BYU Studies* 49, no. 4 (2010): 131–54; Boyd F. Edwards and W. Farrell Edwards, “Truth or Cherry Picking: A Statistical Approach to Chiastic Intentionality,” *BYU Studies* 59, no. 5 (2020): 311–17.

Radday has offered a “statistical test.”⁷⁰ Edwards and Edwards are “word and phrase centric”; they do not apply their approach to any conceptual chiasms. Rather, they focus solely on “repeated literary elements,”⁷¹ on “all significant literary elements,”⁷² which they define as “word or word combinations.”⁷³ They do once mention “an idea” as potentially constituting a “literary element,” but in that case they explain, “then we do not account for extra appearances of individual words used in this phrase or idea but do account for extra appearances of the entire phrase or idea.”⁷⁴ They apply their approach to Alma 36 and make recourse to paraphrases and quotations.⁷⁵ The targeted language of their approach (namely, paraphrases and quotations) differs from what is targeted in this paper’s analysis of Enos, which targets what are perceived to be the seven major *ideas* conveyed by Enos; and which, it is suggested, are identified by him in his text in an A-B-C-D-C'-B'-A' sequence. The “statistical approach” by Edwards and Edwards, focused as it is on the probability of intentional reversal in the sequence of repeated *words* and *phrases*, is seemingly not compatible with an analysis of the question of the intentionality of the reversal in the sequence of six *ideas* in the proposed conceptual macrochiasm of the book of Enos.

And also concerning probability and intentionality, Radday supplied his “statistical test,” which Craig Blomberg characterizes as Radday’s “attempt to give precise statistical quantification to judgments” concerning whether a proposed chiasm results from an author’s intentional act as opposed to “subconscious or accidental processes.”⁷⁶ In reviewing Welch’s *Chiasmus in Antiquity*, Stanislav Segert labels Radday’s “statistical test,” published in Welch’s work as “perhaps the most stimulating, and at the same time most controversial, contribution” to Welch’s volume. Segert adds that “the introduction of quantitative approaches to the study of literary features is in principle welcome, as is his attempt to use statistical procedures to evaluate the probability of intentional symmetrical concentric structures against the incidental

70. Yehuda T. Radday, “Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative,” in *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981) 50–117.

71. Edwards and Edwards, “Truth or Cherry Picking?,” 312.

72. Edwards and Edwards, “By Chance?,” 108.

73. *Ibid.*, 112.

74. *Ibid.*, 113.

75. *Ibid.*, 121–23.

76. Craig Blomberg, “The Structure of 2 Corinthians 1–7,” *Criswell Theological Review* 4, no. 1 (1989): 7n14.

arrangement of elements.”⁷⁷ Says Segert, “Even if concentric symmetry could be proved without any doubt for a given passage of poetry or prose, it does not follow necessarily that the passage shows internal unity and homogeneity against a possibility of multiple authorship and editorial interventions.”

In discussing his “statistical test,” Radday refers an ABC-D-C’BA’ sequence as “a perfect chiasm” and “the paradigm sequence.”⁷⁸ And indeed, Radday focuses on conceptual chiasms almost exclusively, with numerous structures composed exclusively of concepts, with some of the other structures composed of elements identified as a mixture of concepts and of quotations and phrases. Radday’s citation to Lenglet’s view of Daniel 2:1–7:28 notes an A-B-C-D-D’-B’-C’-A’ pattern, which he contrasts to some “elementary features” of chiasmus that remain from earlier now-non-extant “elaborate chiastic construction,” while concluding that Daniel nonetheless retains “certain chiastic tendencies . . . in its structure.”⁷⁹ His depiction of the A-B-C-D-E-D’-C’-B’-A’ chiasm of 1 Samuel 10:5–10⁸⁰ is probably the closest he comes to portraying a chiasm of a *length* much like that in the chiasm identified by Welch in Mosiah 5:10–12, which, of course, according to what Radday concludes, would be given an r value of -1 (complete inversion).⁸¹

One chiasm that Radday identifies that also is also somewhat close in *length* to that of Enos 1:3–27 is his proposed chiasm for chapters 3 and 4 of the Book of Jonah (3:2–4:11, 20 verses, compared to 25 verses here analyzed in the book of Enos). There Radday identifies a 15-element A-B-C-D-E-F-G-H-G’-F’-C’-D’-E’-B’-A’ purely conceptual concentric structure, which he explains is “impaired” by the overlapping presence of “extensive directly parallel complements”⁸² And closely akin to the *number of elements* of the proposed A-B-C-D-C’-B’-A’ conceptual chiasm advanced in my paper for Enos is Radday’s A-B-C-D-E-D’-C’-B’-A’ conceptual chiasm for the 27 verses of Leviticus chapter 19, although his central element D is proposed to extend a full ten verses, from v. 9 through v. 18.⁸³

77. Stanislav Segert, review of *Chiasmus in Antiquity: Structures, Analyses, Exegesis*, ed. John W. Welch (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1981), *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (1984): 337–38.

78. Radday, “Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative,” 52.

79. *Ibid.*, 53.

80. *Ibid.*, 80.

81. *Ibid.*, 52.

82. *Ibid.*, 60–61.

83. *Ibid.*, 88.

But perhaps closest of all of Radday's conceptual chiasms is what he proposes for Exodus 2:1–22, which he identifies as a purely conceptual A-B-C-D-C'-B'-A' chiasm, perhaps a structure that could be said to be very much like that proposed for Enos, both in length of text involved and in number of chiasmic elements.⁸⁴ And it so happens that Angelico di Marco cites to Radday's proposed conceptual chiasm of Exodus 2:1–22 without disagreeing with him concerning it.⁸⁵ Indeed, in his analysis of Exodus 2, Radday expounds extensively on the chiasm of that chapter, while asserting that it treats the "salient traits" of Moses' first 40 years of life, doing so in a seven-part conceptual chiasmic text that describes "no more than a few incidents, chiasmically paired with the most decisive in the middle," "five scenes," forming what Radday indicates is "an elegant chiasm that could not escape the notice of any reader, and should give him the key for understanding the man."⁸⁶

The proposal analyzed above concerning Enos perhaps suggests what Radday would characterize as a "paradigm sequence" and may well offer somewhat of a key to better understanding Enos, both the man and the book he composed.

I suggest here that the book of Enos was composed solely and simply as an A-B-C-D-C'-B'-A' conceptual sequence based on ideas expressed over a span of 25 verses, surrounding a tightly crafted Christocentric a-b-c-d-e-d'-c'-b'-a' structure that is based on words and phrases, a central structure which one anonymous reviewer of this paper refers to as "nearly flawless."

A Note on Blomberg's Criteria for Extended Chiasmus

It should be noted that regarding what he refers to as "criteria for detecting extended chiasmus" (so-called macrochiasms or extended chiasmus over lengthier texts), Blomberg set forth nine of his own "criteria which hypotheses of extended chiasmus must meet in order to be credible," assuming that his nine criteria are "sufficiently restrictive to prevent one from imagining chiasmus where it was never intended."⁸⁷ His first criterion essentially guides analysts to prefer "more

84. Ibid., 90–96.

85. Angelico Di Marco, "Der Chiasmus in der Bibel 1: Ein Beitrag zur strukturellen Stilistik," *Linguistica Biblica* 36 (1970): 47, citing to it to note that Radday's reliance on it becomes part of Radday's analysis that leads to his conclusion that Moses composed the five books of the Torah.

86. Radday, "Chiasmus in Hebrew Biblical Narrative," 95.

87. Blomberg, "The Structure of 2 Corinthians," 4–5.

straightforward outlines” and “more conventional outlines” over “less obvious arrangements of the material” if they adequately “resolve” what the “structure of the text in question” is. In Enos, of course, one “straightforward outline” happens to be the perceptive paragraphing that is introduced in the very first printing of the Book of Mormon. The central chiasm of vv. 15 to 16a begins a middle element of a seven-element concentric structure delineated by paragraphs; concepts or ideas characterize the three elements in the first half of the text, corresponding to concepts or ideas that, in reverse sequence, characterize the three matching elements in the second half of the text.

Blomberg’s second criterion : There must be clear examples of parallelism between the two ‘halves’ of the hypothesized chiasmus. ... In other words, the chiasmus must be based on hard data in the text which most readers note irrespective of their overall synthesis.”⁸⁸ Such parallelism in the two halves of Enos is explicated above in my analysis of the “paired sections” from each half.

Blomberg’s third criterion: “Verbal (or grammatical) parallelism as well as conceptual (or structural) parallelism should characterize most if not all of the corresponding pairs of subdivisions.”⁸⁹ Such grammatical parallelism is reflected in the identified key words and key phrases in the corresponding elements; such conceptual parallelism is reflected in the overall A-B-C-D-C’-B’-A’ concentric structure proposed.

Blomberg’s fourth criterion: “The verbal parallelism should involve central or dominant imagery or terminology, not peripheral or trivial language.”⁹⁰ In Enos, the imagery and terminology concerning the major themes of the fates of the Nephites and of the Lamanites and of Enos himself are rather neatly confined to their own chiotic elements.

Blomberg’s fifth criterion: “Both verbal and conceptual parallelism should involve words and ideas not regularly found elsewhere within the proposed chiasmus.” This is essentially the equivalent of Welch’s criterion of “mavericks.”⁹¹ In Enos, the proposed chiasm is founded on a reversal in the sequence of repeated ideas (A: Enos’s Personal redemption; B: Redemption of the Nephites; C: Redemption of the Lamanites; D: Christ-

88. Ibid., 5–6.

89. Ibid., 6.

90. Ibid.

91. John W. Welch, “Criteria for Identifying and Evaluating the Presence of Chiasmus,” *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 4, no. 2 (1995): 7, “A chiasm loses potency when key elements in the system appear extraneously outside the proposed structure.”

centered covenant; C: Restoration of the Lamanites; B': Redemption of the Nephites; A': Enos's Personal redemption). The matching key words within each of the respective corresponding elements are identified above in the discussion of the "paired sections."

Blomberg's sixth criterion: "Multiple sets of correspondences between passages opposite each other in the chiasmus as well as multiple members of the chiasmus itself are desirable. A simple ABA' or ABB'A' pattern is so common to so many different forms of rhetoric that it usually yields few startlingly profound insights."⁹² Three or four members repeated in inverse sequence may be more significant. Five or more elements paired in sequence usually resist explanations which invoke subconscious or accidental processes."⁹³ The proposal of three paired elements and one central element for the structure of the book of Enos falls within Blomberg's "more significant" category.

Blomberg's seventh criterion: "The outline should divide the text at natural breaks which would be agreed upon even by those proposing very different structures to account for the whole."⁹⁴ The "natural breaks" identified for Enos are signaled by the first phrases of textual sections: "Behold, it came to pass," "Behold," "Now, it came to pass," "And it came to pass," "Wherefore," "And now it came to pass," "And it came to pass," and "And it came to pass."

Blomberg's eighth criterion: "the center of the chiasmus, which forms its climax, should be a passage worthy of that position in light of its theological or ethical significance."⁹⁵ Enos seems to satisfy this criterion. Blomberg also asserts that if the theme at the center of the chiasmus "were in some way repeated in the first and last passages of the text, as is typical in chiasmus, the proposal would become that much more plausible." Perhaps this aspect of this criterion is partially satisfied by the fact that the beginning and ending elements of the chiasm address the notion of salvation for Enos, and of course salvation is the transcendent purpose of Christ's mission and the objective of the Christ-centered covenant of the text.

92. Blomberg, "The Structure of 2 Corinthians," 6. At this point in this sentence Blomberg adds a footnote which directs reader to his note 51, on page 16, where he indicates that "P. F. Ellis (*Seven Pauline Letters* [Collegetown, MN: Liturgical, 1982] 140–41) plausibly suggests that all of 2 Corinthians was an original unity, in light of its overall ABA' pattern (chaps. 1–7, 8–9, 10–13)." Blomberg thus seemingly acknowledges the validity of some macrochiasmus of only two repeated elements.

93. *Ibid.*, 6–7.

94. *Ibid.*, 7.

95. *Ibid.*

And Blomberg's ninth criterion: "Ruptures in the outline should be avoided, if at all possible. Having to argue that one or more of the members of the reverse part of the structure have been shifted from their corresponding locations in the forward sequence substantially weakens the hypothesis; in postulating chiasmus, exceptions disprove the rule!"⁹⁶ By "ruptures" in the outline, Blomberg means chiasms that manifest a "skew" or "asymmetry" (such as A-B-C-D-B'-C'-A'). The Enos proposal does not manifest any such "rupture" in the reversal of the sequence of the repeated elements.

96. Ibid.

