



Type: Thesis

Appropriation and Adaptation of J Material in The Book of Mormon

Author(s): Colby J. Townsend

Published: Salt Lake City; University of Utah, 2016

Abstract: This study explores the influence of the King James Bible (KJV) on the Book of Mormon (BM) by examining how the BM appropriates and adapts the text of the J source of the Pentateuch—a narrative strand from Genesis to Deuteronomy—and weaves phrases, ideas, motifs, and characters into the text. I identify the full range of influence of the J source of the Pentateuch on the text of the BM in Part II, and then analyze the use of Gen. 2-4 in its own literary context, in ancient sources, and finally in the BM. Through close reading and analysis the study highlights the gaps between the meaning of Gen. 2-4 in its own literary context and the way that the BM interprets its themes and overall message. The BM employs a thoroughly 19th century American-Christian worldview in both its use of the J source and its interpretation of that important text.

This study has important implications for BM studies broadly and for historical-critical studies of the BM in particular. Moving forward, BM studies will need to grapple with the heavy influence that the KJV had on the composition of the BM. Past studies have identified limited influence of the KJV on the text for several reasons, but whatever the reasons it is clear that there are specific ways to move the field forward. Studies have focused on the block quotations of Isaiah in the BM, and some have explored the use of Sermon on the Mount in 3 Nephi and other portions of the text. Unfortunately, there are very few studies that have attempted to broaden the scope and look at the influence of a larger section of the KJV and its more subtle uses throughout the entire BM.

It is my hope that this study can be a stepping-stone of sorts for future work. I have looked specifically at how the BM uses parts of Genesis through Deuteronomy, but this leaves the door open to exploring the influence of any and all of the other parts of the KJV and their influence on the text of the BM.

Archived by permission of the author, Colby J. Townsend

APPROPRIATION AND ADAPTATION OF J MATERIAL
IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

By

Colby J. Townsend

A Senior Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of
The University of Utah
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Honors Degree in Bachelor of Arts in
Comparative Literary and Cultural Studies
(Religion and Culture Emphasis)

In
Languages and Literature

Approved:

Dr. David Bokovoy
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Katharina Gerstenberger
Chair, Languages and Literature

Dr. Eric Laursen
Honors Faculty Advisor

Sylvia D. Torti, PhD
Dean, Honors College

May 2016
Copyright ©2016
All Rights Reserved

Contents

1.	Part I: Introduction.....	2
	1.1 Past Studies on Intertextuality and Scripture.....	6
	1.2 Approaches for Locating Intertextuality Since 1980.....	10
	1.3 The Method Used in the Present Investigation.....	25
	1.4 Past Studies on the Dependence of the Book of Mormon on the King James Bible.....	35
2.	Part II: The Documentary Hypothesis.....	74
	2.1 Current Trends in Pentateuchal Scholarship.....	76
3.	Locating Textual Dependence in the BM on the J Source.....	79
	3.1 The Yahwist in the Book of Mormon.....	79
4.	Part III: The Hermeneutics of Book of Mormon Exegesis of the J Source: Gen. 2:4b-4:16 as a Test Case.....	106
	4.1 Analysis.....	106
	4.1.1 Gen. 2:4b-25 in its Literary Context.....	107
	4.1.2 Gen. 2:4b-25 Interpreted.....	109
	4.1.3 Gen. 3:1-24 in its Literary Context.....	129
	4.1.4 Gen. 3:1-24 Interpreted.....	130
	4.1.5 Gen. 4:1-16 in its Literary Context.....	154
	4.1.6 Gen. 4:1-16 Interpreted.....	156
5.	Conclusion.....	165
	Appendix A.....	168
	Bibliography.....	170

Abbreviations*

Hebrew Bible

Gen.	Genesis
Ex.	Exodus
Lev.	Leviticus
Num.	Numbers
Deut.	Deuteronomy
Josh.	Joshua
Judg.	Judges
1 Sam.	1 Samuel
2 Sam.	2 Samuel
1 Kgs.	1 Kings
2 Kgs.	2 Kings
Isa.	Isaiah
Jer.	Jeremiah
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Hos.	Hosea
Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos
Ob.	Obadiah
Jon.	Jonah
Mic.	Micah
Nah.	Nahum
Hab.	Habakkuk
Zeph.	Zephaniah
Hag.	Haggai
Zech.	Zechariah
Mal.	Malachi
Ps./Pss.	Psalms
Prov.	Proverbs
Job	Job
Song	Songs of Songs
Ruth	Ruth
Lam.	Lamentations
Eccl.	Ecclesiastes
Esth.	Esther
Dan.	Daniel
Ezra	Ezra
Neh.	Nehemiah
1 Chron.	1 Chronicles
2 Chron.	2 Chronicles

New Testament

Matt.	Matthew
Mark	Mark
Luke	Luke
John	John
Acts	Acts
Rom.	Romans
1 Cor.	1 Corinthians
2 Cor.	2 Corinthians
Gal.	Galatians
Eph.	Ephesians
Phil.	Philippians
Col.	Colossians
1 Thess.	1 Thessalonians
2 Thess.	2 Thessalonians
Titus	Titus
Phlm.	Philemon
Heb.	Hebrews
Jas.	James
1 Pet.	1 Peter
2 Pet.	2 Peter
1 John	1 John
2 John	2 John
3 John	3 John
Jude	Jude
Rev.	Revelation

Book of Mormon

1 Ne.	1 Nephi
2 Ne.	2 Nephi
Jacob	Jacob
Enos	Enos
Jarom	Jarom
Omni	Omni
W of M	Words of Mormon
Mosiah	Mosiah
Alma	Alma
Hel.	Helaman
3 Ne.	3 Nephi
4 Ne.	4 Ne.
Morm.	Mormon
Ether	Ether
Mor.	Moroni

*Abbreviations for the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha follow *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd Edition.

ABSTRACT

This study explores the influence of the King James Bible (KJV) on the Book of Mormon (BM) by examining how the BM appropriates and adapts the text of the J source of the Pentateuch—a narrative strand from Genesis to Deuteronomy—and weaves phrases, ideas, motifs, and characters into the text. I identify the full range of influence of the J source of the Pentateuch on the text of the BM in Part II, and then analyze the use of Gen. 2-4 in its own literary context, in ancient sources, and finally in the BM. Through close reading and analysis the study highlights the gaps between the meaning of Gen. 2-4 in its own literary context and the way that the BM interprets its themes and overall message. The BM employs a thoroughly 19th century American-Christian worldview in both its use of the J source and its interpretation of that important text.

This study has important implications for BM studies broadly and for historical-critical studies of the BM in particular. Moving forward, BM studies will need to grapple with the heavy influence that the KJV had on the composition of the BM. Past studies have identified limited influence of the KJV on the text for several reasons, but whatever the reasons it is clear that there are specific ways to move the field forward. Studies have focused on the block quotations of Isaiah in the BM, and some have explored the use of Sermon on the Mount in 3 Nephi and other portions of the text. Unfortunately, there are very few studies that have attempted to broaden the scope and look at the influence of a larger section of the KJV and its more subtle uses throughout the entire BM.

It is my hope that this study can be a stepping-stone of sorts for future work. I have looked specifically at how the BM uses parts of Genesis through Deuteronomy, but this leaves the door open to exploring the influence of any and all of the other parts of the KJV and their influence on the text of the BM.

1. Part I: Introduction

Since its publication in 1611, the King James Version (KJV) of the Bible has had a significant amount of influence over Western history. Although that influence has begun to ease over the last several decades, the KJV is still lauded as one of the great masterpieces of English literature. It is undeniable that the text heavily influenced American culture from the founding of the country to well after the “Second Great Awakening” (ca. 1790-1830 CE), and then continued to impact the language of religious speech and sermon giving. Even great thinkers like Abraham Lincoln delivered speeches that were infused with King James Bible English.¹

It should not come as a surprise, therefore, to discover that one of the most influential American religious figures of the 19th century also borrowed from this storehouse of English phraseology. During the production of Mormon scripture Joseph Smith (JS) borrowed heavily² from the religious language he and his contemporaries were “swimming in.”³ The KJV was the “Authorized Translation,” and the Bible that American children were raised with during the first half of the 19th century.

Locating dependence in the Book of Mormon (BM) on the KJV can be very difficult. At times it is very clear where the KJV influences the BM, but at others it can be difficult to

¹ See A. E. Elmore, *Lincoln's Gettysburg Address: Echoes of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009); and Robert Alter, “American Literary Style and the Presence of the King James Bible”, in *New England Review*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (2009-2010), 61-65.

² See Ellis T. Rasmussen, “Textual Parallels to the Doctrine and Covenants and Book of Commandments as found in the Bible” (unpublished Master’s Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1951); Lois Jean Smutz, “Textual Parallels to the Doctrine and Covenants (Sections 65 to 133) as Found in the Bible” (unpublished Master’s Thesis; Brigham Young University, 1971); H. Michael Marquardt, *The Use of the Bible in the Book of Mormon and Early Nineteenth Century Events Reflected in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1979); Wesley P. Walters, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1990); Nicholas J. Frederick, “Line Within Line: An Intertextual Analysis of Mormon Scripture and the Prologue of the Gospel of John” (unpublished PhD dissertation; Claremont Graduate University, 2013).

³ Paul Han, *Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul's Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4.7-13.13* (Library of New Testament Studies, 519; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014).

identify dependence. My purpose in this introduction is to bring together past studies dealing with intertextuality specifically in the area of literary influence, and summarize the different methods scholars have utilized in this field of inquiry. I will then specify my own methodology to determine the use of the King James translation of the J source in the BM. To be able to reliably reconstruct the dependence of the BM on the J source of the Pentateuch⁴ it is very important to adopt a clear method so that there is consistency and clarity in the analysis and conclusions.

Although scholars strive for consensus, it is impossible for all scholars to come to complete agreement in every detail when attempting to locate literary influence between texts. As Richard Hays has pointed out, studies on intertextuality between religious texts do not allow for exact scientific precision when claiming dependence from one text to another and precision is not attainable, because exegesis is not an exact science.⁵ This being said, Hays does not hesitate to highlight the importance of studying textual dependence when he points out how we are still able to specify rules of thumb that help us to decide if a phrase is an echo or not.⁶ Although scholars may not always agree on the specific details, it is a worthwhile venture to track how and where the text of the BM is perceived to be dependent on the KJV because this comparison will shed light on future projects in the field of Mormon Studies that will seek to track the compositional history of the BM.

The study of quotation and allusion in biblical texts is tedious and has created a vast field of research. Many studies are fraught with a lack of clear defining methodology, and, until only recently, lacked the kind of scrutiny the field of historical-critical studies requires to be part of

⁴See Appendix A for a list of verses in Genesis-Deuteronomy that are identified as the J source in this study. I follow Joel Baden's past work on the Yahwistic source.

⁵Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29.

⁶Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29.

the academic enterprise.⁷ As well as the difficulty of not having a clear approach, the scholars that interpreted what they saw as biblical quotations, allusions, and echoes were often working in their own sphere, ignoring or in ignorance of past scholarship on the subject. It was common for each succeeding generation to begin the study anew, rather than taking up the advancements in method of past studies and adding to them in their own research.

The study of textual dependence is important on several levels. As Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold have recently made clear, the study of quotations and allusions to texts (in this case the Hebrew Bible[HB]) is important for (1) establishing a relative chronology of the books under consideration, (2) discovering wherever a text quotes from or alludes to another text in order to determine the influence the given text has had on other literature, and (3) textual criticism in establishing the textual history of the written text.⁸ These statements are accurate in describing ancient Jewish sources but are they applicable when discussing the importance of texts composed millennia after the biblical period and their dependence on biblical or prior writings? The KJV has influenced numerous works over the last few centuries in worldview, verbiage, interpretation of biblical text,⁹ and so on.¹⁰ Even in our day there are

⁷ Only a brief survey of past scholarship illuminates scholar after scholar complaining about earlier studies and how they simply were not careful enough in refining their methodology, and, therefore, led to conclusions that could not be sustained upon closer evaluation. See Richard L. Schultz, *Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (JSOTSup, 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) for a good example of this. Schultz is not alone in voicing complaints about past studies, as is seen in his citations of numerous other scholars that have voiced the same.

⁸ Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 15.

⁹ The KJV itself is a late 16th, early 17th century Christian reading of the Bible.

¹⁰ Many of these texts are from the 18th and 19th centuries. A few examples would include Gilbert J. Hunt, *The Late War, between the United States and Great Britain, from June 1812, to February 1815. Written in the Ancient Historical Style* (New York: David Longworth, 1816); Anonymous, *The Christian Economy: Translated from the Original Greek of An Old Manuscript found in the Island of Patmos, where St. John wrote the Book of the Revelation* (Philadelphia: M. Carey, 1808). For an examination of more texts that fall into this category, see also Eran Shalev, “‘Written in the Style of Antiquity’: Pseudo-Biblicism and the Early American Republic, 1770-1830,” in *Church History* 79:4 (December 2010), 800-826; and Eran Shalev, *American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

a number of novelists and musicians who are studied due to their heavy use of biblical images.¹¹ For critical historians, these later texts need to be examined for their use of the Bible as well, especially when some of them claim to be modern translations of ancient records but have no textual witnesses leading up to the time of translation.¹²

In this study I will review research on intertextuality within biblical studies and literary criticism. I will illustrate how the combination of two fields of research provides more rigorous criteria in order to explore these issues. I will then present my own methodology based on past research from established scholars in the field of biblical studies. My methodology focuses on how one can locate textual dependence in works that are steeped in the world of the KJV, using as a test case the BM. I will then review past studies on the dependence of the BM on the KJV. It has long been recognized that the lengthy quotations and the language of the BM in general are dependent on the KJV,¹³ but it has not been pointed out that a specifically early 19th century American printing of the 1769 edition of the KJV was the text that influenced the

¹¹ See Shirley A. Stave, ed., *Toni Morrison and the Bible: Contested Intertextualities* (African American Literature and Culture: Expanding and Exploding the Boundaries; New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2006); and Michael J. Gilmour, *Tangled Up in the Bible: Bob Dylan and Scripture* (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004).

¹² For example, some may consider the BM, the topic of the current study, to be in this category. Although I will leave aside the questions of historical dating in respect to the BM, analyzing the sources of the text will help in future discussions on that question and others, such as defining what kind of “translation” the BM is.

¹³ See, for example, the statement of Sidney B. Sperry in Sperry, *Answers to Book of Mormon Questions* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1967), 206:

In the course of our researches on the Book of Mormon we have never been able to prove historically, that is, with adequate documentation, that Joseph Smith or his scribe had at their sides copies of the King James Version of the Bible to which they made reference as the translation of the Nephite record proceeded. We shall not claim another miracle, however, in the translation, but will simply assume, as most translators would, that the prophet realized the greatness of the King James Version and used it to help him in his work of translation when he came upon familiar scriptures.

Many LDS scholars have all but abandoned Sperry’s arguments in the years after his studies. A survey of research reveals that many scholars opt for arguing for the descriptions provided by the witnesses of the translation as primary evidence that Joseph did not copy from a bible, especially when his wife, Emma Smith, told this explicitly to her son, Joseph Smith, III, in a series of interviews that ran from February 4-10, 1879 (a full 50 years after the fact). See Joseph Smith III, *Saints Herald* (Plano, Iowa), Oct. 1, 1879, 289-290.

The argument goes that since the witnesses described the translation as having no manuscript or bible, then there was no manuscript or Bible. As is argued by Sperry above, the evidence in the BM itself is undeniable: Joseph and his scribe took out a copy of the KJV and copied in at least the lengthy quotations. The primary evidence is the text of the BM, not second or third-hand reminiscences recorded decades later.

BM.¹⁴ What has been missing in the discussion of the relationship between the Bible and the BM has been a clear methodology for analyzing the use of the KJV in the BM. This study will help to fill that void by providing examples of the use of a strict methodology when searching for the influence of the KJV on the BM.

1.1 Past Studies on Intertextuality and Scripture

Comparisons of lexical links began early in the exegetical history of the texts now considered biblical.¹⁵ As early as the rabbinic period we find the Jewish sages commenting on the similarity and connections between the various prophetic writings. A standard explanation in early Rabbinic thought was that “The same communication is revealed to many prophets, yet no two prophets prophesy in the identical phraseology.”¹⁶ Later Christian fathers also recognized these similarities and attributed the phenomenon to the prophets having been “given utterance through one and the same spirit.”¹⁷ These early Jews and Christians saw the attestation of intertextuality as evidence for divine inspiration, and had no issue with similar phraseology between the prophetic texts.

¹⁴ The 1611 edition of the KJV has many archaic spelling and grammatical patterns that were revised and updated, culminating in what became the standard 1769 edition of the KJV. Many American printers in the early 19th century would also update the text as they set type, depending on their knowledge of the original languages, or simply a desire for clearer English. Isaac Collins, lauded in the late 18th and early 19th centuries as producing the most accurate bible editions, made grammatical updates to the KJV in his second, 1807 edition. Phrases like “mine hand” and “an homer” were altered to read “mine hand” and “a homer” in this edition, which was copied widely by other American printers. I am indebted to Don Bradley for this insight.

¹⁵ I do not mean to imply that Rabbinic and Patristic readings were the earliest interpretations, or the earliest to get in to writing their interpretations of the text. The earliest interpretations we have on record are those found in the biblical books themselves in how they use and reuse other scriptural texts known to the author. The same phenomenon is of course also found in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphal literature, the NT, and other early writers like Philo and Josephus.

¹⁶ B. Sanh. 89a, *The Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (ed. I. Epstein; trans. M. Simon and I. Slotki; Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino, 1948); quoted in Richard L. Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 20.

¹⁷ Theophilus of Antioch, *Theophilus to Autolytus* 2.35; (cf. also 2.9), in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. II. Fathers of the Second Century* (10 vols.; trans. M. Dods; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 94-121 (108, cf. also p. 97); quoted in Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 20, nt. 4.

Although there were early commentaries that noted some verbal similarities between the books that would later become the Jewish HB and the Christian Old Testament (OT),¹⁸ an exhaustive study of textual dependence was not taken up until the early to mid 19th century by several scholars. Scholars such as Gesenius,¹⁹ Küper,²⁰ Ewald,²¹ and Caspari²² all discussed textual dependence in the prophetic books at varying degrees of depth. Heinrich Ewald's study would turn out to be the most influential of its time.²³ Although scholars such as Ewald did much to locate places of verbal similarities between the prophets they did very little to establish reliable criteria for locating which text was influenced by the other, if in fact there was influence at all. They would often locate places where the texts intersected and base their judgment concerning dependence on either theological grounds or purely traditional assumptions.

These approaches proved difficult to maintain toward the end of the 19th century when source and historical-criticism both began to hold sway over previous scholarly constructs for understanding the growth of the HB.²⁴ Once it was understood that there were multiple

¹⁸ Patricia Tull Willey notes the earliest students pointing out verbal similarities as being Abraham Ibn Ezra in the twelfth century, John Calvin in the 16th century, the Westminster Assembly's *Annotations Upon All the Books of the Old and New Testaments* of the 17th century, and Robert Lowth in the late 18th century. Up until Robert Lowth the commentators seemed to only be interested in the verbal similarities to understand certain verbs better in other contexts. As Willey points out, Lowth noted "parallel passages with an eye to both historical sequence and rhetorical effort"; Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBL Dissertation Series, 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 12 (cf. 11-16).

¹⁹ W. Gesenius, *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Kommentar über den Jesaia* (3 vols.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1821).

²⁰ Augustus Küper, *Jeremias librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1837).

²¹ Heinrich Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (2 Vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1840-1841).

²² C. P. Caspari, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaia und zur Geschichte des jesaianischen Zeit* (Berlin: L. Oehmigke's Verlag, 1848); idem, *Über Micha den Morasthiten und seine prophetische Schrift: Ein monographischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Schriftthums und zur Auslegung des Buches Micha* (Christiania: P. T. Malling, 1852), 440-441, 444; idem, "Jesajanische Studien. I. Jeremia ein Zeuge für die Aechtheit von Jes. c. 34 und mithin auch für die Aechtheit von Jes. c. 33, c. 40-66, c. 13-14, 23 und c. 21, 1-10," *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 4 (1843), 1-73; quoted in Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 23, nt. 12.

²³ Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 21.

²⁴ Both source and form criticism have long, detailed histories that cannot be explored here. Source criticism attempts to understand the way a text came to its current state by analyzing the sources, both known and unknown, that went into compiling or writing the text. Form criticism attempts to understand the text from the perspective of its function in life, its *Sitz im Leben*.

authors of the book of Isaiah, for instance, it became difficult to simply assign which author was dependent on the other because scholars could no longer assume that all of Isaiah was written before other texts like Jeremiah. In this case it was difficult to determine if it was Deutero or Trito-Isaiah or Jeremiah.²⁵

The difficulty in locating the direction of textual dependence continued through the turn of the century. Commentators such as Cheyne,²⁶ Girdlestone,²⁷ Burrows,²⁸ Miller,²⁹ Cassuto,³⁰ and Zimmerli³¹ all spent time in their work discussing the similarities between texts, but very few of them established any kind of criteria to judge the probability of textual dependence going one way or the other. This proved problematic because these scholars were aware of the studies of Wellhausen,³² Duhm,³³ and their successors on the dating of the books of the HB. Knowing that they could not simply rely on traditional dates for the composition of the books of the HB, scholars were eventually forced to formulate methods for understanding textual dependence based on specific criteria for their research.

²⁵ Patricia Tull Willey argues persuasively in her dissertation that Deutero-Isaiah was not only aware of but also dependent on Jeremiah, Lamentations, Nahum, and a number of post-exilic psalms. See Patricia T. Willey, *Remember the Former Things*.

²⁶ T. K. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London: A. & C. Black, 1895).

²⁷ R. B. Girdlestone, *Synonyms of the Old Testament: Their Bearing on Christian Doctrine* (2nd edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956 [1897]); idem, *Deuterographs: Duplicate Passages in the Old Testament. Their Bearing on the Text and Compilation of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894).

²⁸ Millar Burrows, *The Literary Relations of Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1925).

²⁹ J. W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955).

³⁰ Umberto Cassuto, "On the Formal and Stylistic Relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and other Biblical Writers," in Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies. I. Bible* (trans. I. Abrahams; repr.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973), 141-177.

³¹ Walther Zimmerli, "Der 'neue Exodus' in der Verkündigung der beiden grossen Exilspropheten," in Zimmerli, *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei 19 (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963), 192-204.

³² Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1957 [1878]). Wellhausen was the first to systematize scholarly studies into what he called the Documentary Hypothesis. He posited four sources (J, E, D, and P) as the original 'documents' that went into the compilation of the five books of Moses. Although much of his work is still relevant today, few scholars today would agree with Wellhausen's dating the Law after the prophets. Most would agree that the final form of the Pentateuch was compiled after much of the prophetic literature, there is still a consensus today that sees some form of the Pentateuch as predating the prophets.

³³ Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892).

A shift began in the last half of the 20th century. In 1969 Shalom Paul was aware of the need for reliable criteria for discussing textual dependence when he presented a paper entitled “Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah,” at the fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies.³⁴ Paul noted that previous studies on textual dependence were not rigorous enough because:

1. They have noted sporadic surface parallels between the two without subjecting the corresponding contextual relationship and linguistic overtones to further analysis.
2. Their remarks usually are scattered throughout their commentaries rather than being presented in a systematic fashion, which would enable one to appreciate the full extent of the influence.
3. Many points of contact, to the best of my knowledge, have been overlooked so far.³⁵

Paul offered a comprehensive approach to locating more verbal similarities throughout the HB, but, as Schultz points out, “did not advance the problem much beyond the work of others. In fact, by including among his examples formulaic expressions which were found not only throughout the Old Testament but also in cuneiform inscriptions, he blurred the line between intentional and coincidental correspondences.”³⁶ Rather than offering a comprehensive list of criteria to determine textual dependence, Paul utilized the old methods and took them to further heights, making the list of correspondences longer but even more confusing for interpreters.

Influenced by the approaches created by Cassuto and Paul, Victor Eldridge reexamined the criteria in search of a clear methodology that would help resolve the relationship between the text of Jeremiah and Isaiah. Eldridge set out his approach in this way:

1. To identify the points of similarity between the texts such as words, phrases or ideas common to both passages.

³⁴ Shalom Paul, “Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah,” in P. Peli, ed., *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies (1969)* (5 vols.; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972), I:102-120; quoted in Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 35, nt. 49.

³⁵ Paul, “Literary and Ideological Echoes,” 103; quoted in Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 36.

³⁶ Schultz, *Search for Quotation*, 36.

2. To determine the degree to which these words or phrases are characteristic of Jeremiah and Deutero-Isaiah, compared to their usage elsewhere.
3. To examine the significance of the contexts for understanding the meaning of the passages being compared.
4. To determine the genres being used and the degree to which the parallels may be explained in terms of that genre.
5. To attempt to discover the theological significance of the passage in the overall message of each prophet.³⁷

Although this list was a step in the right direction, it still lacked the comprehensiveness needed for a reliable set of criteria in locating textual dependence. The first criterion on the list was a given; it was exactly as scholars had been doing since the rabbinic sages had noted some of the similarities between the books of the HB, although Eldridge was more exhaustive. The second and third are very helpful and were in many ways innovative, but cannot resolve the question of dependence. The fourth and fifth criteria have very little to do with the possibility of one text being dependent on the other. One writer is able to appropriate the works of another and create a work that is both theologically coherent and consistent in its genre(s), even if the genre differs from that of the earlier text.

The question of methodology would not start to be answered adequately until a number of works by scholars in the 1970s and 1980s set out to be both comprehensive and fair to the sources through establishing strict standards of identifying dependence. This approach led to several crucial studies that have been used and reused in research since the time of their writing. It is these works that I will analyze in order to formulate a methodology that will help me to answer the questions of textual dependence of the BM on the KJV of the J source.

1.2 Approaches for Locating Intertextuality Since 1980

³⁷ Victor Eldridge, "The Influence of Jeremiah on Isaiah 40-55," (ThD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978), 63.

Something happened between the late 1960s and early 1980s that would completely change the field of studies on textual dependence in the biblical corpora, and it did not happen in biblical studies itself. Literary critics began the serious study of what Julia Kristeva would term “intertextuality.”³⁸ Kristeva’s work was primarily based on the studies of Ferdinand de Saussure and the “relatively unknown [at the time] (to Western Europe) literary theory of Mikael Bakhtin.”³⁹ She was interested in describing the ways that texts, both oral and written,⁴⁰ are composed and how they necessarily interact with other texts, whether consciously or unconsciously. As Kristeva has said, “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another.”⁴¹ Her work would later prove indispensable in the study of textual dependence in biblical writings. This claim becomes complicated, as Irwin makes clear,⁴² because it is possible that there are just as many versions of intertextuality as there are users of the term. Keeping this in mind it is important to understand how Kristeva’s designation of “intertextuality” has been appropriated by biblical studies. Intertextuality has been appropriated in both literary and biblical studies in ways that Kristeva did not originally intend, and even she would later take a different approach to it than she originally did.

Mainstream Approaches

³⁸ Julia Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” in T. Moi, ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 34-61; and Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. L. S. Roudiez; Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), 66. These essays were originally written in 1966-1967 shortly after her arrival to Paris from her native Bulgaria. See Maria Jesus Martinez Alfaro, “Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept,” in *Atlantis* 18 (1-2) 1996, 268.

³⁹ William Irwin, “Against Intertextuality,” in *Philosophy and Literature* 28, Num. 2 (October, 2004), 228.

⁴⁰ See Timothy Beal, “Intertextuality,” in Danna Nolan Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 22.

⁴¹ Kristeva, “Word, Dialogue and Novel,” 37; quoted in Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 21.

⁴² Irwin, “Against Intertextuality,” 227.

Beginning with the work of Michael Fishbane⁴³ and Richard Hays⁴⁴ in the 1980s, scholars began to determine specific criteria that would help to establish reliable methods for locating textual dependence from one scriptural text to another. These works are exemplary because they focus on two separate religious traditions. Fishbane's work focuses on inner-biblical exegesis between the books of the HB, whereas Hays' work focuses on Paul's dependence in his NT letters on the OT.⁴⁵ Both books have become classics in the study of textual dependence in the Jewish and Christian scriptural traditions.

Michael Fishbane

Fishbane research on inner-biblical exegesis has had an incredibly important impact, especially since the first publication of his *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* in 1985.⁴⁶ The book provided a comprehensive view of the use and influence of earlier biblical texts on the writing and editing of later ones. In four parts he analyzed scribal comments and corrections, legal exegesis, aggadic exegesis, and mantological exegesis. Fishbane's language was much more technical than Richard Hays' later research, and that might explain why Hays' terms were more readily adopted in subsequent studies.

Fishbane adopted terms like *tradition*⁴⁷ and *traditum*⁴⁸ were essential to his overall argument that the interpretation of the HB did not begin simply in a post-biblical world, or even in the major Jewish writings of the second temple period. Rather, this process was already taking place in the time of the bible, and it is possible to discover traces of this development in the biblical writings themselves.

⁴³ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

⁴⁴ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*.

⁴⁵ Hays examines only the undisputed letters of Paul (i.e. Rom., 1 & 2 Cor., Gal., 1 Thess., Phil., and Philemon).

⁴⁶ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*.

⁴⁷ "...a long and varied process of transmission," Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 6.

⁴⁸ "...the content of tradition," Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 6.

Richard Hays

Hays' work has been highly influential in studies on the New Testament's use of the HB, even to the point of other scholarly works 'echoing' or 'alluding' to his own.⁴⁹ Very helpful in applying a methodology to texts later than the canonized HB, Hays offered a methodology direct, succinct, and exhaustive enough for his purposes. Although only attempting to locate echoes, not quotations or allusions, Hays' criteria for establishing an echo can be extended to both quotation and allusion. His criteria for an echo are:

1. Availability: Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers?⁵⁰
2. Volume: The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant: how distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture, and how much rhetorical stress does the echo receive in Paul's discourse?⁵¹
3. Recurrence: How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?⁵²
4. Thematic Coherence: How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing? Is its meaning effect consonant with other quotations in the same letter or elsewhere in the Pauline corpus? Do the images and ideas of the proposed precursor text illuminate Paul's argument?⁵³
5. Historical Plausibility: Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could his readers have understood it? (We should always bear in mind, of course, that Paul might have written things that were not readily intelligible to his actual readers.)⁵⁴

⁴⁹ See Christopher Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Atlanta: Brill and The Society of Biblical Literature, 2010); and Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2005).

⁵⁰ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29.

⁵¹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

⁵² Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

⁵³ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

⁵⁴ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

6. History of Interpretation: Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes?⁵⁵
7. Satisfaction: With or without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation? This criterion is difficult to articulate precisely without falling into the affective fallacy, but it is finally the most important test: it is in fact another way of asking whether the proposed reading offers a good account of the experience of a contemporary community of competent readers.⁵⁶

Even with these controls Hays clarifies that “There are always only shades of certainty when these criteria are applied to particular texts.”⁵⁷ As he points out elsewhere, the study of textual dependence is not a scientific venture.⁵⁸ There is always going to be some room for individual scholarly interpretation or preference when it comes to assigning textual dependence. However, Hays goes on to say, “the more of them [the criteria] that fall clearly into place, the more confident we can be in rendering an interpretation of the echo effect in a given passage.”⁵⁹ We may not be able to establish historical fact, but we can establish probability. Hays’ work is an example that has stood the test of scholarly criticism for twenty-five years and is still being applied to current research on echoes in the field of biblical literature. His work, and the work of those who have followed his methods, will be used heavily throughout this study.

Benjamin Sommer

Sommer has also been an influential scholar in the field of literary allusion and influence. Sommer’s book, *A Prophet Reads Scripture*,⁶⁰ looks specifically at the various ways that other HB texts are brought into Isa. 40-66 at the compositional level. Sommer was very critical of other

⁵⁵ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 31.

⁵⁶ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 31-32.

⁵⁷ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 32.

⁵⁸ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29.

⁵⁹ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 32.

⁶⁰ Benjamin Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

biblical scholars' use of terms like intertextuality, exegesis, and allusion. From his perspective, biblical scholars had not made themselves aware of contemporary literary criticism, and were therefore misunderstanding and underutilizing the discoveries made in literary-critical circles. Sommer's introductory chapter clearly shows that this was the case, and offers clear definitions for the terms he uses in his study. For purposes I will explain below, I think that Sommer went too far in his criticism, and at times I was left wondering why his examples of allusion and exegesis were so often from modern rather than ancient texts, but the overall effect of his thesis has been tremendous. The fact that Deutero-Isaiah, as he labels all of Isa. 40-66, appropriated materials from other Israelite sources can be shown effectively even if the reader disagrees with some of the assumptions undergirding the thesis. What is almost more important is that definitions and assumptions are clearly stated.

In another study, dependent on the work of Clayton and Rothstein,⁶¹ Sommer distinguishes between allusion and intertextuality, stating that they are not compatible.⁶² Sommer was reviewing the criticism Lyle Eslinger had written against the work of Michael Fishbane.⁶³ In Sommer's view Eslinger had not gone to great enough lengths to understand the terms that Fishbane employed in his work on inner-biblical exegesis in the HB, and Eslinger also did not fully understand the terms 'allusion' and 'intertextuality'.

According to Sommer, Eslinger's quest to lay aside inner-biblical exegesis (as Sommer defines it, "the use by one discrete text of other texts")⁶⁴ due to the difficulty in determining which text came first is not resolved when Eslinger claims that we should instead turn to inner-

⁶¹ Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, "Figures in the Corpus: Theories of Influence and Intertextuality," in Clayton and Rothstein, eds., *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Maddison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 5-6.

⁶² Benjmain D. Sommer, "Exegesis, Allusion, and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger," in *Vetus Testamentum* 46, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 1996), 486.

⁶³ Lyle Eslinger, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category," in *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992), 47-58.

⁶⁴ Sommer, "Exegesis, Allusion, and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible," 486.

biblical allusions and intertextuality. Allusion does posit a historical transmission of one specific text to another and therefore requires a diachronic component in its study. Intertextuality, on the other hand, includes any sort of connection between texts across space and time.⁶⁵ It is the intersection of a text with another, whether one is dependent on the other or not. With this in mind, allusion would fall under intertextuality in studying specific places where texts ‘intersect’, but specifically those occasions where one text is dependent on another in lexical, thematic, ideological, or structural means of presenting its message. Because of this I disagree entirely with Sommer’s statement that allusion and intertextuality are not compatible because I see allusion as an expression of textual dependence falling underneath the larger subject of intertextuality. “Allusion” and “textual dependence” are sub-topics of the larger topic of “intertextuality.” It is not that they are incompatible, but rather that the study of intertextuality is broad and general, whereas textual dependence is narrow and specific. The student has to begin at intertextuality to locate the places of intersection, and then move to textual dependence in order to classify the use of the primary text as allusion. They are two sides of the same coin.

The main difference between Sommer and Eslinger seems to be found in understanding and accepting similar definitions of terms. To be sure, Sommer points to places in Eslinger’s critique that simply do not pay attention to Fishbane’s work, but the main difference between the two is in how they understand the labels they are using. All throughout Sommer’s response to Eslinger he points to what he perceives as the incorrect use of literary-critical terms and their dissonance to contemporary literary critics.

The difference in use of language is not only between Sommer and Eslinger in Sommer’s response, but it is also with Fishbane’s use of terms. Late in his essay Sommer says,

⁶⁵ Sommer, “Exegesis, Allusion, and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible,” 486.

“Consequently, I think that a more appropriate term for the phenomenon Fishbane discusses would be “inner-biblical allusion,” though, following the work of literary theorists, I mean by the term something other than what Eslinger means by it.”⁶⁶ This confusion of terms has plagued intertextual studies of the HB and NT, and has been a main part of the problem that still needs to be remedied. While it is helpful that Sommer raises the issue of involving literary critical studies, it must also be understood that in biblical studies, as in other fields of research, these terms will be appropriated according to the needs the field has of them.

Recent Approaches

Dennis R. MacDonald

There have been a few outlying hypotheses that have had less influence on other studies, but are still important to discuss. In 1998 the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at Claremont Graduate University held a conference on Mimesis and Intertextuality.⁶⁷ Mimesis is “the process [in ancient Greece] of training students to write through imitation of recognized models.”⁶⁸ Mimesis requires that the author is dependent on previous writings for his new text. MacDonald has written extensively on the use of mimesis in early Christianity, especially in regard to the dependence of the passion narrative of Jesus in Mark on the death of Hector in the *Iliad*.⁶⁹

Scholars at the conference discussed many issues in mimesis, intertextuality, and textual dependence, but a major topic was MacDonald’s method. MacDonald developed six criteria that has helped him to detect mimesis in ancient texts, “even when authors disguise their

⁶⁶ Sommer, “Exegesis, Allusion, and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible,” 488.

⁶⁷ The papers read at the conference were published in Dennis R. MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001).

⁶⁸ Dennis R. MacDonald, “Introduction,” MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality*, 1.

⁶⁹ Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

reliance on models.”⁷⁰ Without reference to Hays or any other past scholarly constructs,⁷¹

MacDonald provides these six criteria that he has developed for locating mimesis:

1. Accessibility: “...refers to the physical distribution of the model and its likely availability to the author of the imitation.”⁷²
2. Analogy: “...seeks for examples of imitations of the same story by other authors.”⁷³
3. Density: “...assesses the volume of parallels between the two texts.”⁷⁴
4. Order: “...looks for similar sequences for the parallels.”⁷⁵
5. Distinctive Traits: “Occasionally two texts contain unusual characteristics that set them apart, and often one can explain the peculiarity in the model as the distinctive contribution of its author, whereas the peculiarity in the hypertext issues from imitation.”⁷⁶
6. Interpretability: “This involves an assessment of why the author may have targeted the model for imitation, such as the replacement of its values and perspectives with different ones.”⁷⁷

These are helpful criteria for locating textual dependence, but MacDonald does not offer any categories of dependence, unless we recognize mimesis as one. Although the text may be dependent on another as its model, the different places of dependence throughout the text need to be analyzed and categorized into different types of dependence. Are there places where the secondary text quotes, alludes, or echoes the primary text? Or, is mimesis only a category of structural dependence? MacDonald does not seem to think this is an issue because he never asks these or any similar questions. Rather, his methodology is focused more on structural and thematic links than on lexical links between texts.

Although he does not state it as plainly in his essay mentioned above, in another work MacDonald describes those who are too rigid in their methodology as “philological

⁷⁰ MacDonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷¹ Although MacDonald does not reference any other scholars regarding past models for locating dependence in this essay, he does point to dependence for his criteria on Richard Hays in Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, 207, nt. 32.

⁷² MacDonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷³ MacDonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷⁴ Macdonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷⁵ MacDonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷⁶ MacDonald, “Introduction,” 2.

⁷⁷ MacDonald, “Introduction,” 3.

fundamentalists who require unmistakable markers of dependence, such as shared vocabulary, similar genres, and distinctive grammatical or poetic constructions.”⁷⁸ It is not important to find verbal links between texts, instead, any approach that focuses strictly on those links is considered fundamentalist by MacDonald. Mimesis, to MacDonald, is the approach one should take in discussing dependence from one text to another. But what do we do with shorter isolated phrases that are obviously dependent on identifiable sources, but do follow larger structural patterns of a previous text? Unfortunately, MacDonald seems to think these questions are not important.

Devorah Dimant

Devorah Dimant’s 1988 study on the use of Mikra (מִקְרָא, “reading,” often synonymous with “Bible,” or “Tanakh”)⁷⁹ in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature dating to the end of the second temple period⁸⁰ is an example of a positive move forward in scholarship over the last thirty years. Recognizing “the need for a more rigorous and comprehensive methodology”⁸¹ Dimant set out to establish a reliable framework to study the use of scripture in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature.

Dimant distinguishes between two broad, yet formally distinct categories in the way apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature uses biblical texts: a compositional and an expositional use of biblical elements.⁸² In compositional use biblical elements are interwoven into the text without external formal markers such as citation formulae. The elements simply become part of the framework of the new composition. In expositional use biblical elements

⁷⁸ Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*, 7.

⁷⁹ See Martin J. Mulder and Harry Sising, eds., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988; Repr. Hendrickson Publishers, 2004), xxiii.

⁸⁰ Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in Mulder and Sising, eds., *Mikra*, 379-419.

⁸¹ Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 380.

⁸² Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 382.

are presented explicitly as coming from a former work, with clear external markers. The divine word is subservient to the overall aim and structure of the compositional use, whereas in the expositional the divine word is introduced in order to interpret it.

Dimant actually expanded these categories to three by adding an intermediate category between the expositional and compositional techniques. This category is not given a name, but is very similar to the expositional technique. Divine speeches are usually quoted directly, generally occurring in a discourse, and are provided in order to extract a specific lesson from the speech. As Dimant states, “The dominant interpretive principle here is actualization of a divine utterance, as expressed in a given biblical text.”⁸³ As Dimant goes on to point out, there is a difference between divine speeches and divine acts, where the acts are usually referred to in shorter summaries in narrative form, where biblical events and characters are mentioned. They will be introduced by explicit names or will include allusions to the original context, but not in precise quotations.

Dimant’s study distinguishes between four major uses of Mikra in apocryphal and pseudepigraphic literature: (1) Explicit Quotations, (2) Explicit Mention of Persons and Circumstances, (3) Implicit Quotations, and (4) Allusions. Dimant deconstructs each of these four types of uses, each falling under the categories of expositional or compositional use of Mikra. Her study of methodology is much more comprehensive than both Michael Fishbane’s⁸⁴ and Richard Hays’ studies, but she does not include criteria for establishing quotations or allusions. As will be discussed further below, Kevin Spawn has recently made clear that, despite assumptions to the contrary, even establishing the source or referent of an explicit quotation can be difficult, and sometimes impossible. One only needs to look at Neh.

⁸³ Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 383.

⁸⁴ Dimant states that the weakness of Fishbane’s study is that he excludes an “overall comprehensive framework.” See Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 380, nt. 6.

10:35 (34) and the scholarly literature to see that explicit quotations are not as cut and dry as we so often assume.⁸⁵

While the framework Dimant conceptualized was useful, it has had little impact on the field since its original writing. While extremely helpful in delineating between various categories of uses of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Dimant offered little in regards to establishing to a degree of accuracy that the identified quotation or allusion was accurate within the particular text. Her focus on the way that biblical elements were used within the later text was a leap forward, and in each of her case studies she successfully argued for the use of earlier motifs. Moving outside of those case studies, to the more implicit echoes, was outside the scope of her study.

More Recent Developments

The last decade of scholarship on intertextuality and religious writings has seen the publication of scholarly studies that are not only taking the question of methodology seriously but taking up the research of the past generations and seeing what can be used in their search for appropriate criteria in their studies. Not all scholars have defined their terms. As stated earlier, one of the main issues of earlier studies was that new generations seemed to ignore past studies rather than building upon the work of previous research. There are a number of studies that have made great strides in organizing clear, rigorous approaches to textual dependence. The methods of these approaches are close enough to one another that I will synthesize their work into one approach that will be applicable to this study.

⁸⁵ See Kevin L. Spawn, *“As It Is Written” and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament: Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 311; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).

A good example utilizing the work of past scholarly studies, especially Hays' work, is the recent work of Christopher Beetham.⁸⁶ In setting out a method for locating dependence in the letter to the Colossians on the HB, Beetham employs the following definition of quotation:

Quotation: An intentional, explicit, verbatim or near verbatim citation of a former text of six or more words in length. A *formal* quotation is a quotation accompanied by an introductory marker, or *quotation formula*; an *informal* quotation lacks such a marker.⁸⁷

For Beetham and several other exegetes there are two kinds of quotations, formal and informal. A formal quotation is the most direct form of dependence where the author employs specific terminology to reference a text his audience would presumably know. Certain phrases are used to introduce the quotation such as, "...as the prophet says..." (Acts 7:48, NRSV); "...what does the scripture say?" (Rom. 4:3; Gal. 4:30, NRSV); "...it is written..." (Josh. 8:31; 1 Kgs. 2:3; Matt. 2:5; 1 Cor. 14:21, NRSV); and "...as the law also says." (1 Cor. 14:34, NRSV). These are literary devices signaling to the reader that the author is now quoting a specific text or tradition.

Beetham goes on to define allusion:

Allusion: A literary device intentionally employed by an author to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context in order for the alluding text to be understood fully. An allusion is less explicit than a *quotation*, but more explicit than an *echo*. In this study, a linear marker of five words or less is considered to be an allusion.⁸⁸

One of the key aspects of allusion is the activation of both texts, the hypotext and the hypertext, in the reading. Even if it is not known exactly what the source of the allusion is the hypertext is still alluding to its precursor. It is then the job of the reader to either find the source text, guess what the source text was saying by the context of the hypertext, or simply

⁸⁶ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*.

⁸⁷ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 17, italics in original.

⁸⁸ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.

be lost as to the meaning of the allusion. In that case it is still an allusion, but the reader will have to wonder what was actually meant without having any internal or external criteria to make a verifiable interpretation.

Beetham also goes on to define echo:

Echo: A subtle, literary mode of reference that is not intended for public recognition yet derives from a specific predecessor. An author's wording may echo the precursor consciously or unconsciously and/or contextually or non-contextually.⁸⁹

Beetham continues beyond these three categories of dependence to discuss the category of parallel and its two manifestations, genealogical and analogical. In describing and defining a parallel between texts, Beetham simply quotes from Richard Altick.⁹⁰

Parallel is a category in which a given text that appears to be dependent on another identifiable text, but upon closer comparison cannot be confidently said to derive from that text because “neither internal nor external evidence is strong enough to make us confident” of dependence.⁹¹ This is most often due to the fact that there are multiple precursors that agree with the text under review. There is no single section that the text agrees with more over the others that would allow locating a single source; they all share the same word agreement.

According to T. L. Donaldson, the category genealogical parallel falls into two sub-categories, strong genealogical parallel and weak genealogical parallel.⁹² In describing Donaldson's study, Beetham explains that a “strong” genealogical parallel “covers broader elements (such as a theme or doctrine) rather than a specific textual relationship, which is

⁸⁹ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 24.

⁹⁰ Richard D. Altick and John J. Fenstermaker, *The Art of Literary Research* (4th rev. ed.; New York: W. W. Norton, 1993), 110-111; quoted in Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 24.

⁹¹ Richard D. Altick and John J. Fenstermaker, *The Art of Literary Research*, 110-111; quoted in Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 24.

⁹² T. L. Donaldson, “Parallels: Use, Misuse, and Limitations,” in *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983), 198.

adequately covered by our categories of quotation, allusion, and echo. An example of a strong genealogical parallel between the OT and the NT is the doctrine of monotheism.”⁹³

Beetham goes on to describe a “weak” genealogical parallel as also including an organic relationship between texts, but that the element of direct influence is lacking in this case, and that “the organic relationship essential to a genealogical parallel exists in a diffuse, indirect form.”⁹⁴ There may be two texts that share a common traditional element that creates the “weak” genealogical parallel. Beetham offers this example:

...both Paul (Rom. 4:1-25) and the author of the letter to the Hebrews (11:8-12) offer Abraham as a paradigm of faith for the believer to emulate. Yet almost certainly the two have employed the same OT narrative independently (Gen. 12-17). Paul at Romans 4 is not dependent on Hebrews 11, and vice-versa.⁹⁵

As Beetham describes, this parallel is between two texts that seem parallel but neither one of them are dependent on the other. Each is dependent on the same tradition, and should be labeled accordingly to their dependence on that earlier text or tradition. In Beetham’s example, Rom. 4:1-25 would be dependent on Gen. 12-17 independent of Heb. 11:8-12, and the same can be described for Heb. 11:8-12.

The next type of parallel that Beetham discusses is analogical parallel. Beetham offers the simple definition of this type of parallel as “when a strong, contextual similarity arises out of universal human experience.” He offers the similar use of “light” and “darkness” in the Gospel of John and the Qumran documents, and shows that this is a universal experience also found in the Chinese “yin and yang.”⁹⁶

⁹³ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 25.

⁹⁴ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 26.

⁹⁵ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 26.

⁹⁶ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 26.

From this review of Beetham's and other scholarly studies we can make the following list of the kinds of textual and literary dependence, with the most direct dependence being listed first, down to the least direct last:⁹⁷

1. Is the Dependence Lexical or Expository? Then,
 - a. Quotation
 - b. Allusion
 - c. Echo
 - a. Contextual
 - b. Non-Contextual
 - d. Parallel
 - a. Genealogical Parallel
 - aa. Strong Genealogical Parallel
 - ab. Weak Genealogical Parallel
 - b. Analogical Parallel

Not every one of these categories of dependence will be used in my study because these criteria attempt to account for the full range of intertextuality, whereas I will be focusing my attention specifically on textual dependence of the BM on the KJV. At the outset, my goal is to locate the places in the text of the BM that are literarily or textually dependent on the KJV of the J source. With this in mind, only those categories down to echo pertain to my study. Genealogical parallels are unnecessary because of reasons I will explain below, and analogical parallel is unnecessary to this study because those are parallels that are found outside of the KJV and are universal.

1.3 The Method of the Present Investigation

With the comments made above on past research there are two major categories that I will use to discuss how the BM uses J: in Ic. Part I will define the categories of lexical dependence (Dimant's compositional), and Ic. Part II expository use of the past source.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Beetham provides a useful figure on p. 27 that illustrates how each of these work in his study.

⁹⁸ In discussing reliable criteria for locating intertextuality, George W. E. Nickelsburg noted that, "We need controls. Explicit citation is one. MacDonald's benchmarks of density [i.e. the heavy use of a text within another text], order, distinctive traits, and interpretability, taken together, are another. They are a valuable tool for identifying conscious intertextuality and helping us to sort this out from other forms of literary and non-literary

- a. Quotation
 - a. Formal
 - b. Informal
- b. Allusion
- c. Echo

It is now necessary to provide clear definitions of these categories and how I will use them in my study. It is important to make clear what it is I mean when I apply these terms, so that it is clear where my study “intersects” with previous scholarship, and especially in how and why this study does not require some of the labels discussed above.

In my study, a quotation is when a section of text in the BM⁹⁹ is dependent on an identifiable text in the KJV, either through the use of an explicit citation formula, or of six successive words or more. This can either be a formal or an informal quotation, the former being marked with a literary device, an “introductory formula,”¹⁰⁰ that introduces the text as a quotation and allows for this category to not need a word-count restriction. An informal quotation is when a section of the BM quotes directly from an identifiable source in the KJV of six words or more while not employing an introductory formula.

An allusion is when a section of text in the BM is dependent on an identifiable source in the KJV for verbal and interpretive clues necessary to understand the section of the BM. An allusion will share vocabulary of five words or less, but will specifically hearken back to a source in the KJV known to the author and the audience he/she assumes. This requires that

interdependence and interrelationship,” in “Tobit, Genesis, and the Odyssey: A Complex Web of Intertextuality,” in Dennis R. MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, 54. Although MacDonald’s “controls” are similar to mine above, it is still necessary to explicate them further and define them more specifically. Other scholars, especially recently, have done just that. Their work is incorporated here.

⁹⁹ For each of the categories I define here, “section of text in the BM” can mean a full verse, a partial verse, a phrase, or even simply a word, depending on the category and the given section under examination. The definition of the category itself and the later use of the category for specific verses should explain and clarify what I mean by the use of this phrase.

¹⁰⁰ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Sources for Biblical Study 5; Missoula: SBL and Scholars’ Press, 1974), 7. See also Spawn, “*As It Is Written*” and *Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament*.

the audience is aware of the other text. A good example of this is Ether 9:22, where Moroni alludes to Malachi 4:2 for the “Son of Righteousness.” If the assumed audience is not familiar with Mal. 4:2 the allusion is not heard and the reader is left wondering who the “Son of Righteousness” is. It is not required for every reader to recognize the allusion for it to be considered an allusion. With the evidence from above, the question of allusion leans more toward authorial intent and a close reading of the meaning of the text, whether the author has left markers that point to texts outside of that which he/she has written.

An echo is when a section of text in the BM is dependent on an identifiable source in the KJV of five words or less, but does not require the reader to recall the source in the KJV to understand what the author of the BM means in the given section. An echo can either be intentional or unintentional, and it is impossible in most cases to determine if the author intended it or not.

Further Criteria For Establishing Dependence

I will not advance any criteria for establishing a quotation beyond what has already been discussed. It is especially unnecessary to advance a formal quotation any further because formal quotations are self-evident; the author has either pointed the reader to a specific text using a citation formula, or has invited the reader to find the quotation with enough words to support the discovery. It is also unnecessary for establishing an informal quotation due to high word count and the fact that JS and his contemporaries were deeply rooted in their work of producing the BM in the world of the KJV.¹⁰¹ If there is a text in the KJV that is identifiable

¹⁰¹ H. Grant Vest, a graduate student studying under Sidney B. Sperry said in his master’s thesis (“The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon,” [Master’s Thesis, unpublished, Brigham Young University, 1938], 3) the following about the dependence of the BM on the KJV:

“Any consideration of these facts [the close literary/verbal relationship between the BM and the KJV in the lengthy quotes of Isaiah] admit of but one conclusion, namely, that the quotations of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon which are identical, or nearly so, with their parallels in the Authorized Version of the Bible were copied from that text. Otherwise this would present a literary phenomenon unparalleled

of six words or more that matches the given section of the BM, then the BM is likely quoting either formally or from that section.

Basing his work on Hays, Beetham states that there are two tiers of evidence. When claiming dependence the first tier is the strongest evidence, and the second tier is supportive evidence of those criteria given in the first. The first criterion in the first tier is availability. Beetham asks, “was the alleged source available to the author? What is the scholarly consensus on the date of the source, and what is it for the alluding text? Does the alleged source historically precede the latter text?”¹⁰² These questions are essential in a comparison of the BM to the KJV, because at the time of producing the BM the KJV was available to Joseph and his scribes.

In studying the text of the BM I will only discuss the earliest manuscripts and first printed edition, including the original and printer’s manuscripts, both made in 1829, and the 1830 first printed edition. It is apparent that in this form the BM is a product of the 19th century. One might argue for a core being earlier than this dating,¹⁰³ but the BM’s heavy use of the KJV, especially of the New Testament, strongly argues for a dating of at least those sections dependent on the KJV compositionally to post-1611 CE.¹⁰⁴

There has been a general approach by many scholars in the past to make the claim that the BM is not dependent on the NT since that would make the text’s historical claims

in all history, one beyond human experience. No extended argument is required to prove a point on which all experience is in agreement.”

¹⁰² Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 28.

¹⁰³ See Blake T. Ostler, “The Book of Mormon as a Modern Expansion of an Ancient Source,” in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Spring 1987), 66-123.

¹⁰⁴ The statement that the final form of the BM is a 19th century document should not be too surprising to scholars involved in Mormon studies. In a similar way, if we did not have any manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible or Greek New Testament and had only the 1611 translation of the KJV and subsequent printings, we would be forced to see the Bible as a 17th century document. We of course do have many textual witnesses of the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, but we are not accorded that luxury with the BM. The translation of the 1611 KJV itself is a product of the 17th century. We should take these points into consideration when discussing the BM.

anachronistic.¹⁰⁵ Instead, it is sometimes argued that both texts are dependent on several passages in the HB or possibly several now lost shared sources. There are at least three problems with this claim. First, there are several examples in the BM that correspond to the NT where past scholarship has claimed that the two are dependent on the HB, but the specific sections of the BM and NT combine the exact same phrases of the exact same sources. Second, the translation into English of both texts is either exactly or very close to being the exact same. This does not indicate similar translation style of two separate translations, but points to the dependence of the BM on the KJV. Third, the BM not only uses the same combination of sources as specific NT passages, it also interprets those sources in a way that is resonant with Protestant Christian interpretations of those texts, rather than pre-Christian Israelite or Judean religious constructs.

Therefore, in the context of the BM's reliance on the KJV, we may answer a firm yes in response to the first question that Beetham poses. The KJV was available to JS at the time of dictation of the text of the BM. In large part we can assume that the majority of dependence on a biblical text in the BM is specifically on the KJV.¹⁰⁶ This assumption is not grounded in theory. It is, rather, grounded in detailed analysis of data, comparing the BM to several English translations of the Bible. By far the largest correspondence is with early 19th century American printings of the KJV. Keeping this in mind, it is helpful to note where the BM does agree with ancient manuscripts over that of the KJV, but it will be found that the majority of the time even the variants are either few and far between, or they are dependent on the KJV.

¹⁰⁵ John Tvedtnes's work exemplifies this approach, especially in his article about the allegory of the olive tree in Jacob 5. See John A. Tvedtnes, "Borrowings from the Parable of Zenos," in Stephen D. Ricks and John W. Welch, eds., *The Allegory of the Olive Tree: The Olive, the Bible, and Jacob 5* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1994), 373-426. Cf. Nicholas Frederick, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon: A Proposed Methodology," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 24 (2015), 1-30.

¹⁰⁶ See H. Grant Vest's statements above under footnote 101.

The second criterion Beetham discusses is word agreement or rare concept similarity. For this criterion Beetham asks, “does the proposed allusion share identical words with the alleged source text?”¹⁰⁷ He notes that in order for identical words to be suggestive in establishing dependence the more rare the vocabulary the more likely the dependence. It is even possible that one word can be an allusion if the given word is “rare and prominent enough.” This can also extend from a rare word to a rare concept.

The third criterion requires there to be an essential interpretive link between the alluding text and its source. Beetham states that, “fundamental to allusion is that the alluding text depends upon the parent text for its marker to be understood fully. The author *intends* for the reader to recognize the marker, remember the original context, and connect one or more aspects of the predecessor to the new context in order for the latter to be understood. *This interpretive link is fundamental to allusion and distinguishes it from echo.*”¹⁰⁸ Without this essential data an allusion would be indistinguishable from echo.

Beetham also describes this essential exegetical point as follows:

Does the alleged source have a component that, when brought forward to the alluding text, unlocks the riddle of the alluding text? If it does not, then the proposed source fails to meet this criterion and the proposed allusion is disqualified in the case of that particular source. Another text may yet qualify as the source text, and so the search may continue. Or the proposed allusion is in fact an echo or merely a parallel, and requires reconsideration under those categories.¹⁰⁹

This is a decisive question in determining whether or not an intertext is an allusion, echo, or possibly even a parallel. This, along with the other two criteria, needs to be taken into account when comparing texts in the BM with the KJV. If we did not include these criteria, particularly the last of the three, it would be difficult to distinguish between allusion and echo.

¹⁰⁷ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29.

¹⁰⁸ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30. Emphasis in the original.

¹⁰⁹ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30.

The second tier of evidence Beetham describes begins with the criterion of scholarly assessment. In this set of evidence Beetham asks, “have other scholars observed the proposed allusion? If so, what are their remarks concerning it? Did they classify it as an example of quotation, allusion, echo, parallel, or something comparable to our categories listed above?”¹¹⁰ It will be found throughout this study that although this question works well while discussing dependence of the NT on the OT, in the field of BM scholarship influence from the KJV onto the BM has been viewed negatively, unless you are discussing only direct quotations in the BM that can be identified with texts traditionally dating to the pre-exilic period.

As I argued in my essay on Malachi in the BM,¹¹¹ past scholars who have analyzed textual dependence of the BM on the KJV have often only researched this topic for apologetic (i.e. an antagonist makes a claim or statement that apologists see as attacking the faith and feel obligated to then make a counter-argument) or antagonistic reasons, rather than focusing their study on the text itself with no other reason than to understand it more fully. There are very few works that have set out to empirically establish dependence of the BM on the KJV outside of the long quotations of Isaiah, Malachi 3-4, Matthew 5-7, among others,¹¹² and therefore there are a limited number of studies we can utilize to meet this criteria for the entire text of the BM, let alone those specific places that have been influenced directly by the KJV of the J source.¹¹³ Where there is commentary from past scholars on specific intertexts proposed in

¹¹⁰ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 32.

¹¹¹ Colby Townsend, “Behold, Other Scriptures I would that ye should write’: Malachi in the Book of Mormon,” unpublished. See https://www.academia.edu/6694609/Malachi_in_the_Book_of_Mormon (last accessed 7/14/14).

¹¹² Nicholas J. Frederick, “Line Within Line”; and David P. Wright, “In Plain Terms that We May Understand’: Joseph Smith’s Transformation of Hebrews in Alma 12-13,” in Brent Metcalfe, ed., *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon: Explorations in Critical Methodology* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993), 165-229.

¹¹³ Even then, many do not see the lengthy quotations as dependent on the KJV. For example, Gary L. Bishop argued that, “It is more likely that Joseph Smith went through the labor of orally translating each verse individually, perhaps with his scribe following in the English... It is highly plausible that Joseph Smith independently produced his own translation, and then elected to adopt the prevailing version whenever his translation was the same,” in Bishop, “The Tradition of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon” (unpublished Master’s thesis; Brigham Young University, 1974), 110-111. Not only is this the less likely case, the evidence simply does not support Bishop’s

this study, these will be used in examining and establishing dependence. Outside of that this study will attempt to break new ground.

The next criterion in Beetham's list is Old Testament and Jewish interpretive tradition. For the purposes of my study I will revise this to Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian interpretive traditions, as I have discussed the dependence of the BM on the post-1611 English form of the biblical text. Beetham asks the pertinent questions: "Does the proposed OT text already have a history of interpretive tradition within the later OT books, as well as within early and late Judaism? If so, does it shed light upon whether the NT text is an allusion?"¹¹⁴ This is important for discovering where the dependence really lies. At times in the text of the BM it will appear as if the text is dependent on, for example, one of the books of the Pentateuch, but it is rather dependent on a NT quotation of that text.¹¹⁵ This criterion helps us to establish whether or not there are other texts in the KJV that a given passage in the BM might be dependent on. This criterion will be helpful in Part III where the given section of J is described in its historical context, then how later Jewish and Christian texts reinterpreted the J source.

The next criterion is other verified references from the same OT context in Colossians. With this criterion Beetham asks, "are there other allusions or echoes from the same OT context in the letter, whose probability has already been established?"¹¹⁶ If we are able to locate

theory. The rapid dictation of the BM argues against the idea that JS would have spent extra time going through and making his own translation (particularly when he was not working directly with the plates, but rather a stone in his hat), but there seems to be no reason for JS to make his own translation and then discard it other than for Bishop to have an argument against the prevailing theory prior to his thesis, what of Roberts, Sperry, and Vest had argued in the decades prior. If JS had made an independent translation of the Isaiah quotations of the BM, even though he could not translate in the sense that Bishop assumes, it is more likely he wouldn't need to check his translation against the KJV. That translation would be just as authoritative or accurate as the rest of the text of the BM from JS and his contemporaries' perspective.

¹¹⁴ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 32.

¹¹⁵ For example, 1 Ne. 15:18 and 22:9, 20 quote Acts 3:22-23, 25 for the promise of YHWH to Abraham and for the promise of YHWH through Moses that he would raise up a prophet like Moses.

¹¹⁶ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 33.

this same context then there may be dependence on a given text that has gone unnoticed before. Places in the BM that have been identified as a quotation, allusion, echo, or parallel will help to establish to what extent the author(s) of the BM knew that section of J.

The next criterion is occurrence elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. In this regard Beetham asks, “Has Paul quoted, alluded to, or echoed the proposed OT passage in any of his other letters?”¹¹⁷ We will find that this criterion will be extremely helpful in showing the BM’s dependence on specific verses in the KJV. I have already shown in my study of dependence of the BM on the KJV of Malachi that there are many more verses that are dependent on that text in the BM than had previously been acknowledged, and that through discovering the use of Mal. 3:1-2 and Mal. 4:1-2 it was apparent that these passages were utilized often throughout the text of the BM, not just in 3 Ne. 24 and 25. It will be important to gather all the data to show the extent of the influence each verse of the J source has had throughout the BM.

The last criterion in the second tier is thematic coherence. I will quote all of Beetham’s explanation here as this criterion is heavily borrowed by Beetham from Richard Hays, but Beetham is redefining it as a criterion for allusion where Hays defines it as pertaining to echoes:

Richard Hays offers this as one of his seven criteria for the detection and verification of an echo. I rather see it as a confirmatory criterion and want to combine it with a little of what Hays discusses under another criterion, “satisfaction.” My thematic coherence criterion asks, with Hays, “How well does the alleged [allusion] fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing? ...Do the images and ideas of the proposed precursor text illuminate Paul’s argument?” “Does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse?” Does it “fit”?¹¹⁸

Beetham then goes on to describe criteria for determining the existence of an echo by stating that “If a proposed allusion has failed to pass the criteria of the first tier, the proposed

¹¹⁷ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 33.

¹¹⁸ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 34.

text may still be tested to see if it qualifies as an echo.”¹¹⁹ According to Beetham, if a proposed allusion fails to go through the first tier of criteria it must then pass through the second tier to determine if it is an echo. Echoes are very subtle, and Beetham concedes that “there is an element of intuition and judgment in the detection and verification of echo.”¹²⁰ In my study an echo will be similar to an allusion, but has passed through the two tiers and has been found to exclude the interpretative marker found in allusions.¹²¹ (i.e. in Ether 9:22, “Son of Righteousness”).

Conclusion

Through a review of past scholarly literature on inner-biblical exegesis and intertextuality I have shown the necessity of having a firm and rigorous criteria in order to classify the different kinds of textual dependence. There have been numerous works in the past on this issue, but it has only been within the last thirty years that substantial steps forward have been made. Although many of those past studies did much to advance research in quotations and allusions in the biblical corpora, without strict methods for discussing the direction of influence there was little provided to advance the field. Future studies, including this one, need to utilize this past research in order to fully account for the intertextuality we find between the books of the Bible and post-biblical texts.

The criteria as explicated above will be the working methodology of my study for locating intertextuality and textual dependence. Except for the recent work of Nicholas Frederick, John Hilton III, and Noel Reynolds,¹²² there is a lack of defining methodology within studies of the BM’s use of the KJV. Future studies on the use of the KJV in the BM need to establish detailed

¹¹⁹ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 34.

¹²⁰ Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 35.

¹²¹ Cf. Ether 9:22 and Mal. 4:2 (“Son of Righteousness” and “sun of righteousness”).

¹²² For descriptions of their work see Section 1.4 below.

methodologies and definitions of their terms at the beginning of their work, and discuss the full use of the KJV deeply embedded within the BM passages they study.

1.4 Past Studies on the Dependence of the BM on the KJV

Contra to recent statements made by Royal Skousen, the editor of the Critical Text Project of the BM, the language of the KJV is the language of the BM.¹²³ Similar to Friedrich Delitzsch's classic assertion that there would be no Bible without Babel,¹²⁴ there would be no BM without the KJV.¹²⁵ Every single page of the earliest manuscripts and the original 1830 edition of the BM has numerous phrases and verbiage that come from both direct and indirect places within the KJV (both OT and NT).

Although Royal Skousen and now Stanford Carmack have both devoted several essays to researching BM language as Early Modern English, it remains to be seen how accurate their research really is. Their overdependence on the Oxford English Dictionary as a historical cut off for when English speakers and writers could have used certain constructs is problematic at best. What needs to be done to further the field is to analyze sources that come from the northeastern United States from about 1800-1830 and whether or not they utilize the constructs that Skousen and Carmack claim could not have been native to JS's linguistic heritage. These sources can include newspapers, diaries, travelogues, etc., anything that

¹²³ Philip Barlow notes, based on Kenneth Jenkins's work, "more than fifty thousand phrases of three or more words, excluding definite and indefinite articles, are common to the Bible and the Book of Mormon." Philip Barlow, *Mormons and the Bible: The Place of the Latter-day Saints in American Religion* (Updated Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 28.

¹²⁴ See Friedrich Delitzsch, *Babel and Bible: Three Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906).

¹²⁵ This is not that strange of a claim when you take into account a similar statement made over the pulpit by Brigham Young. Young's theory shows sensitivity to how different scriptural writings can be if they are written at different periods of time. He said,

"...I will venture to say that if the Book of Mormon were now to be re-written, in many instances it would materially differ from the present translation. According as people are willing to receive the things of God, so the heavens send forth their blessings," in G. D. Watt and J. V. Long, *Journal of Discourses*, Vol. IX (Liverpool: George Q. Cannon, 1862), 311.

represents the common speech of that region would do well to advance the kinds of questions and issues that are being raised. The BM is infused with language and phrases from the KJV, as has been noted since it was published.

Below I will describe some of who I think are the most important thinkers and commentators on the question of the KJV in the BM. There are many more that could be added to the list, but I have decided limit the list to these few in order to not go into unnecessary depth. Only those who have either been the first to note important aspects of the question or those who have done much to further the popularity of the issue or push research forward will be noted here.

Early Approaches

Alexander Campbell was the first to be acquainted with the contents of the BM and to respond at length to it in print.¹²⁶ Campbell was an important figure in the wider Restoration movement of the first half of the 19th century, and was the founder of the Disciples of Christ. He has been labeled “one of the country’s most notable theologians and preachers,”¹²⁷ and his comments on the BM have often been quoted in secondary literature.¹²⁸ Sidney Rigdon, an important figure in the development of early Mormonism, was originally a part of Campbell’s movement, but left his church as a convert to Mormonism.¹²⁹

Many of Campbell’s remarks were centered on comparing JS to other “impostors and delusions”¹³⁰ throughout history and on summarizing the narrative of the BM. He only made

¹²⁶ His later pamphlet entitled *Delusions: An Analysis of the Book of Mormon; with an Examination of its Internal and External Evidences, and a Refutation of its Pretences to Divine Authority*, was originally published as “Delusions,” *The Millennial Harbinger* Vol. II, No. 2 (Monday, February 7th, 1831), 85-96. It was republished as

¹²⁷ Richard L. Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Vintage Books, 2005), 89.

¹²⁸ See Barlow, *Mormons and the Bible*, 36-37; and Terryl L. Givens, *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture that Launched a New World Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 69-70; and Bushman, *Rough Stone Rolling*, 89-90.

¹²⁹ Bushman, *Rough Stone Rolling*, 89.

¹³⁰ Campbell, *Delusions*, 5.

a single comment on the use of the KJV in the BM. Arguing that he found many “Smithisms” throughout the BM, Campbell stated that “It is patched up and cemented with ‘And it came to pass’—‘I sayeth unto you’—‘Ye saith unto him’—and all the King James’ *baths, dids* and *doths*—in the lowest imitation of the common version...”¹³¹ He also went on to argue that the BM “has not one good sentence in it, save the profanation of those sentences quoted from the Oracles of the living God,”¹³² meaning the direct quotations from the KJV.

Although Campbell should be noted for his more thoughtful approach and reasoned critique to the BM,¹³³ Campbell did little to offer examples beyond “*baths, dids* and *doths*,” let alone a framework to understand how the BM uses the KJV. In this respect Campbell’s study will do little in this study other than the fact that he was one of the first commentators to point out the dependence of the BM on the KJV.

Eber D. Howe

Eber D. Howe, founder, editor, and publisher of the *Painesville Telegraph* from 1822 to 1835,¹³⁴ said at the beginning of his book *Mormonism Unveiled* that he undertook the work reluctantly,¹³⁵ but was convinced by friends to write and publish it. His work has turned out to

¹³¹ Campbell, *Delusions*, 15. Italics in the original.

¹³² Campbell, *Delusions*, 15.

¹³³ Bushman, *Rough Stone Rolling*, 89.

¹³⁴ Eber D. Howe, *Autobiography and Recollections of a Pioneer Printer: Together with Sketches of the War of 1812 on the Niagara Frontier* (Painesville, OH: Telegraph Steam Printing House, 1878), 26-27.

¹³⁵ Eber D. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled: Or, A Faithful Account of that Singular Imposition and Delusion, from its Rise to the Present Time. With Sketches of the Characters of its Propagators, and a Full Detail of the Manner in which the Famous Golden Bible was Brought Before the World. To which are added, Inquiries into the Probability that the Historical Part of the Said Bible was Written by One Solomon Spaulding, More than Twenty Years Ago, and by him Intended to have Been Published as a Romance* (Painesville: Printed and Published by the Author, 1834), “Advertisement” at the beginning of the book.

be one of the most influential early works on Mormonism, and an incredibly important document for understanding the earliest years of Mormonism.

In discussing the use of King James English in the BM, Howe stated that “The whole work is written in a miserable attempt to imitate the style of King James the first...”¹³⁶ Statements such as this one show the strong bias that Howe had against the BM, but this should not distract from the comparatively sophisticated approach Howe takes through much of the book when discussing the use of the KJV in the BM. He notes that theologically he was not aware that the style of the KJV was better for revealing words from Heaven than that of the present day English he and JS shared.¹³⁷

He points out that in certain places where it would seem that the BM is quoting the OT it is actually quoting the NT. For example, he discusses 1 Ne. 10, where Nephi presents Lehi’s vision of John the Baptist in words that are seemingly dependent on Isa. 40. As Howe points out, it is “not so much on account of the prophecy as the language, in which he uses to express it,”¹³⁸ because upon closer review it is apparent that Lehi’s prophecy is actually dependent on Matthew’s and John’s gospels. When Nephi quotes Lehi’s prophecy in 1 Ne. 10:8, the use of the phrase “he should go forth and cry in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight,” is exactly the same (excluding the second “and”) as it is found in parallel passages in Matt., Mark, and Luke. The use of the phrase “and he is mightier than I” in the next line confirms that it is, as Howe argued, Matt. that the BM is here dependent upon. For the phrase “there standeth one among you whom ye know not...whose shoe’s latchet I am not worthy to unloose” we must turn to John 1:26-27. Howe was ahead of his time in pointing out the use of the KJV in the BM where it was not pointed out in the text itself,

¹³⁶ Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled*, 23.

¹³⁷ Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled*, 23-24.

¹³⁸ Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled*, 28.

especially considering the fact that he simply found these in reading the BM. Today it not only takes a rigorous methodology to locate these kinds of intertexts, but it also requires at the very least a concordance or a word searchable computer program.

Although writing in a polemical style against the BM and Mormonism in general, Howe was able to show early on, and in a convincing way, that there were numerous places in the BM that were dependent on the KJV. It was definitely easier for Howe to recognize dependence because of his openness to viewing the BM critically. I will show throughout this review of literature that many studies have attempted to argue some of the most obvious places of dependence of the BM on the Bible away. Howe should at the very least be commended for his thorough research. There were many more places in his treatment that dealt with this topic, but the above is a good example of the accuracy of his work on the KJV in the BM.¹³⁹

B. H. Roberts

B. H. Roberts has been called the “defender” of Mormonism.¹⁴⁰ His voluminous work on the BM is unrivaled in Mormon studies (although Brant Gardner might be a close second in quantity), and he spent his life writing about, speaking in, and serving the LDS church as a historian and leading authority. His several volumes arguing for the historical reality of the BM have been cited in numerous studies on the BM since their publication.

In the early 1920s Roberts was asked to respond to a young Mormon’s questions about some problems he had with the BM. The young Mormon, William E. Riter, first wrote to

¹³⁹ Cf. Howe, *Mormonism Unveiled*, 38-39, 49-50, 63-64, 131.

¹⁴⁰ Truman G. Madsen, *Defender of the Faith: The B. H. Roberts Story* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980).

James E. Talmage of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, but Talmage gave the responsibility over to Roberts to answer them.¹⁴¹ The questions themselves came from a non-Mormon friend of Riter, and included topics such as the large variety of Native American languages as compared to the belief, based on the BM, that one Hebrew family founded this part of the world; historical anachronisms such as the horse, silk, swords, and scimitars in America during BM times; and the BM claims a knowledge of steel ca. 600 BCE when there is no historical record that indicates such a metal existed among the Israelites at that time.¹⁴² These questions led Roberts to a series of critical studies on the BM that have caused a lot of controversy among historians as to the question of Roberts' faith in the BM toward the end of his life. These studies were not published for fifty years after Roberts's death.¹⁴³ They reflect not only the questions Roberts was grappling with, but also the sincerity in which he wanted to provide faithful and rigorous answers for the future generations of Mormonism. Whether or not Roberts had faith in the historical assumptions of the BM is not relevant to the current study. More importantly, I will briefly describe Roberts' approach to understanding the parallels between the BM and the KJV.

During the years of 1922-1927 Roberts used much of his time spent researching possible explanations of the origins of the BM in a manuscript titled "A Book of Mormon Study."¹⁴⁴ In his research he commented on the use of the bible in the BM to some extent. For example, in describing the BM's statements about the birth of Jesus he found that "Matthew and Z[e]chariah, then, could well be thought of as furnishing material for the Book of Mormon signs of the Birth of Messiah."¹⁴⁵ He noted the awkwardness of the use of Zechariah in 3 Ne.

¹⁴¹ Brigham D. Madsen, ed. *Studies of the Book of Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985), 45.

¹⁴² Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 36.

¹⁴³ Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*.

¹⁴⁴ Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 149.

¹⁴⁵ Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 237.

1:15-21, that the Zechariah passage more easily reads, in a Mormon context, as a prophecy of Jesus's second coming, not as a prophecy about his birth.

When Roberts continued reading in 3 Nephi he found the descriptions of the destruction of Nephite cities in chapters 8-10 to be similarly dependent on the NT, particularly on Matt. 27.¹⁴⁶ From this perspective Roberts could make the statement that, “with these things as suggestions as to signs for Messiah’s birth and death and resurrection, and one of conceded vivid, and strong and constructive imaginative powers to work them all out, need not be regarded as an unthinkable procedure and achievement.”¹⁴⁷ It was not unthinkable to Roberts that JS could have had the imaginative capability to take the passages in the NT and elaborate on them and create the descriptions of the destruction after Jesus’s death in the BM.¹⁴⁸

Although these statements differ widely from Roberts’s earlier apologetic work,¹⁴⁹ Roberts was attempting to deal with new questions posed to him in the early 1920s, questions he felt needed answers. The context had changed for him, and he was more exhaustive in his analysis in his later writings about the dependence of the BM on the KJV. In his earlier writings Roberts looked specifically at the question of the KJV Isaiah in the BM and came up with the theory, later adopted by Sidney Sperry and others, that JS and scribe worked mostly from the KJV in copying the Isaiah chapters but translated from the plates where the two texts varied.¹⁵⁰ Roberts recognized the major influence the KJV played in the production of the BM both in his early writings and later. It was in his later writings, though, that he became open to questions like the influence of the KJV NT on the BM.

¹⁴⁶ Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 238.

¹⁴⁷ Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 238.

¹⁴⁸ See also Roberts’s discussion of “The Imaginative Mind of Prophet Joseph Smith: Evidence of its Existence—Examples of its Force” in Madsen, *Studies of the Book of Mormon*, 243-250.

¹⁴⁹ See especially his lengthy discussion of possible literary influences on the BM in Roberts, *New Witnesses for God: III The Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: The Deseret News, 1909), 425-460.

¹⁵⁰ Roberts, *New Witnesses for God*, 438-439.

Sidney Sperry

Sperry completed graduate work at the University of Chicago in the 1920s. His thesis looked at “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon,”¹⁵¹ and included sixteen pages of introductory material (however, roughly the first six pages were block quotations from the *History of the Church*), followed by sixty-one pages of a comparison of the MT, KJV, and BM texts of the Isaiah chapters that are found in the BM that vary from the KJV. The remaining six pages were a brief analysis of Sperry’s comparison, and a summary of the findings in his thesis.

Sperry’s thesis was not only limited by time,¹⁵² and the fact that manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls had not yet been discovered, but Sperry also made no attempt to analyze whether the BM variants with the KJV were based on a Hebrew *Vorlage*, or if they were based on the English of the KJV. He only briefly notes that the MT supports the KJV readings.¹⁵³

At the end of his thesis Sperry suggests that, “many more interesting and pertinent facts pertaining to the three versions of that part of the text of Isaiah under consideration could be brought out. A more intensive study would reveal them in detail but lack of time prevents it being done in this study. Further research on this subject is therefore desirable and would no doubt be very profitable for the time expended.”¹⁵⁴ One would assume, then, that with more time Sperry would be able to accomplish this kind of study himself. I will briefly describe the lack of this kind of study in his later writings, and suggest that this hole stems from his supervising role of his student’s, H. Grant Vest, master’s thesis on the topic.

H. Grant Vest

¹⁵¹ Sidney Brenton Sperry, “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon” (unpublished Master’s Thesis; The University of Chicago, 1926).

¹⁵² Sperry, “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon,” 81.

¹⁵³ Sperry, “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon,” 79.

¹⁵⁴ Sperry, “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon,” 81.

Vest studied under the tutelage of Sidney Sperry at BYU during the 1930s. He continued Sperry's work on the lengthy quotations of Isaiah in the BM, and agreed with both Roberts and Sperry that the best explanation of the quantity of correspondences between the KJV of Isaiah and Isaiah in the BM was that JS and his scribes took out a bible and copied the text, making corrections to be more in line with what they argued JS saw on the plates.

Vest was more forceful than many past students of the text in his argument that the BM was dependent on the KJV for the Isaiah translations. From his experience, "the quotations of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon which are identical, or nearly so, with their parallels in the Authorized Version of the Bible were copied from that text."¹⁵⁵ Although this statement was not substantially different from what Roberts and Sperry had argued before him, his reasoning for making the argument was. He said that if the Isaiah portions of the BM were not copied from the KJV, then "this would present a literary phenomenon unparalleled in all history, one beyond human experience. No extended argument is required to prove a point on which all experience is in agreement."¹⁵⁶ Vest fully recognized that this heavy dependence on Isaiah was a problem for the BM, particularly in its use of Isaiah chapters that post-date 600 BCE, and in a similar way to Sperry's work argued that because the BM claims to be a copy of a version of Isaiah pre-600 BCE then the BM can be an important witness to the textual history of the book of Isaiah.¹⁵⁷ For Vest the claims made by both the text of the BM and by JS about the dating of the Isaiah portions were taken at face value (although called "objective means" by Vest¹⁵⁸) and are assumed as reliable for a historical-critical approach to understanding both the BM and the book of Isaiah.

¹⁵⁵ Vest, "The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," 3.

¹⁵⁶ Vets, "The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," 3.

¹⁵⁷ Vest, "The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," 4, 14-15.

¹⁵⁸ Vest, "The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," 14.

Although not conclusive, I would like to suggest a possible reason Sperry never returned to the “profitable” study he outlines at the end of his thesis. First, Vest’s study was thorough, going into much more detail than Sperry’s, as well as taking Biblical scholarship of the time more seriously. Second, the implications of Vest’s approach might have suggested to Sperry that the issue was much different than he anticipated. Rather than doing a full study himself, he had a series of publications that only lightly touched on the issues, and functioned more as a response to specific critics of the unity of Isaiah rather than exploring the text for its own sake. The title of this later short study seems to be echoing Vest’s thesis: “The “Isaiah Problem” in the Book of Mormon.”¹⁵⁹ Although the other chapters share similar titles, none of the others include quotation marks around the “problem” like this chapter does. Admittedly, the evidence is not conclusive, but I cannot help noticing that Sperry never completed this study himself.

Approaches of the Last Half of the 20th Century

Hugh Nibley

Nibley wrote extensively on the BM throughout his career, and several of his collected volumes discussed in detail or mentioned in passing the influence of the bible or KJV on the BM. I will briefly describe some of his notes in a few of the volumes in his collected works on these connections, and how he understood these connections.

In his book *Since Cumorah*, originally published in 1967 and the second edition in 1988, Nibley set aside an entire chapter to explore the Bible in the BM.¹⁶⁰ He briefly discussed the issue as brought up by several critics of the BM, the problems of the NT in the BM, and the

¹⁵⁹ Sperry, *Answers to Book of Mormon Questions*, 73-97.

¹⁶⁰ Nibley, *Since Cumorah* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1988), 111-134.

idea that many NT phrases actually went back to Mesopotamian texts, before jumping into a description of the problem of having the KJV text of Isaiah in the BM. He therefore focused only on the question of Isaiah, in particular Isa. 48 and 49 (2 Ne. 20 and 21), and attempted to show that because the BM varied so much from the MT and LXX, as well as the MT and LXX diverging from each other, the original text of Isa. 48 and 49 had obviously been corrupted. In general Nibley argued that the BM was more original than the MT and LXX, and that the two latter versions of the HB cause confusions in reading certain verses in either of those editions because they are missing important clauses that the BM still has intact.¹⁶¹

Nibley spent the majority of the rest of the chapter exploring the question of the authorship of Isaiah in biblical scholarship. After briefly summarizing the research contemporary to his time, he turned to the work of Otto Eissfeldt¹⁶² to show that the question of authorship was anything but over. According to Nibley, “the trouble with dating any part of Isaiah, as Eissfeldt points out, is that we have nothing really definite to go on.”¹⁶³ Using the studies of Eissfeldt and Jones,¹⁶⁴ Nibley questions our ability to date Deutero and Trito-Isaiah (which he awkwardly accepts after pages of claiming unity of authorship) with any accuracy, and in the end argues that whatever period they date to, the original core of Isaiah would have included parts of chapters 40-55 and 56-66. To Nibley, this was likely what was on the brass plates version of Isaiah, without many of the later changes to the text.¹⁶⁵ From his perspective, “the indications are that a thorough study of the rapidly changing Isaiah problem may well leave the Book of Mormon in a very strong position indeed.”¹⁶⁶ Nibley was probably very

¹⁶¹ Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, 117.

¹⁶² Otto Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (3rd edition; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964).

¹⁶³ Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, 123.

¹⁶⁴ Douglas Jones, “The Traditio of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem,” *ZAW* 67 (1955), 226-246

¹⁶⁵ Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, 125.

¹⁶⁶ Nibley, *Since Cumorah*, 133.

surprised, then, with how research on this question turned out during the last half of the twentieth century.¹⁶⁷

In his book *The Prophetic Book of Mormon*, Nibley pointed out how the influence of the NT on the BM was, up until the time of writing in 1953-1954, the single strongest argument against the authenticity of the BM.¹⁶⁸ He argued that all of the phrases and ideas from the NT that influenced the BM are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls as well, and therefore obviously these claims are wrong.¹⁶⁹ Throughout this section of his essay,¹⁷⁰ Nibley constantly compared the Dead Sea Scrolls to the BM, and the poor treatment of the two by some scholars, Solomon Zeitlin, for example, apparently had difficulty reading the Rule of the community (Nibley called it the Manual Discipline, its name in the early 1950s).¹⁷¹

He argued that some uneducated Jew must have written the document in the medieval period. This allowed Nibley to argue at the time that the trajectory of BM research would then be similar to research on the Dead Sea Scrolls. The problem is that Nibley's writing was over sixty years ago. Much has changed in our understanding of the scrolls found in the Judean desert from that time until now and the arguments that there were clearly ideas thought to be unique to the NT in the Dead Sea Scrolls have been found to be very weak.¹⁷² All of the evidence continues to point toward the NT having an incredible amount of influence on the BM.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁷ It would be fascinating to know Nibley's

¹⁶⁸ Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon*, 78.

¹⁶⁹ Nibley quotes the work of Hilel Ragaf as critical in this way. Hilel Ragaf, "The Origin of the Religious Sect of Mormons" *Vorwärts* (26 April 1953).

¹⁷⁰ Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1989), 77-83.

¹⁷¹ Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon*, 79.

¹⁷² This is particularly true for the earlier arguments about the Messiah in the scrolls. Scholars now agree that the sectarian community of the Dead Sea Scrolls were expecting at least two Messiahs, and the expectation was very different than what is found in the NT.

¹⁷³ For further discussion of BM sources, see Nibley, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon*, 193-218.

Wesley P. Walters

Walters wrote a Master's thesis at Covenant Theological Seminary in 1981 that looked primarily at the KJV of the HB and its use in the BM,¹⁷⁴ but, as I will also need to do in Section 3 below, out of necessity also commented on the influence of the NT on the BM. Throughout the thesis Walters noted the influence of the KJV in thought, lexicon, and structure on the BM. He recognized that there are texts that are explicitly quoted from the Bible, while others take influence without a note. He assumed throughout his research that the BM was JS's own composition, and sought to show in detail how JS utilized the text of the KJV during the production of his new text. He paid close attention to prior scholarship and made a positive attempt at furthering that field of research, and in my opinion much of what he did withstood early critiques of his research.

Walters's thesis argued, that two-thirds of the names in the BM were derived from the KJV, most from the OT and some anomalously from the NT.¹⁷⁵ The language of the BM is thoroughly KJV, but because there were many mistakes in the number of endings of words (e.g. the use of "you" [object] as the subject in a sentence, or mixing the plural "ye" and the singular "thou" in the same sentence),¹⁷⁶ and the common lapse into 19th century English, Walters concluded that the use of the KJV English in the BM was imply JS's attempt at imitating the authoritative language of that Bible.¹⁷⁷ The fact that NT language was blended into sections of the BM, particularly those prior to the NT period, also lent support to the suggestion that the composition of the BM originated with JS.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁴ Wesley P. Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon."

¹⁷⁵ Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 163.

¹⁷⁶ Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 30.

¹⁷⁷ Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 163.

¹⁷⁸ Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 164.

In the final section of his thesis Walters lists several the following discoveries based on his research.¹⁷⁹ First, half of the Isaiah verses are identical to the KJV. Second, JS often kept the italics of the KJV, as well as the inaccurate KJV rendering of many words and phrases in the Hebrew. Third, because there is so much that ties back to the KJV in the BM, JS must have had a Bible out and open in front of him for much of the dictation period. This is especially necessary for the correct spelling of lengthy names, word order, and sentence structure. Since this detail was not mentioned by any of the witnesses it is possible that JS could have had other notes or materials when he composed the BM.

Fourth, where the BM differs in exact wording with a corresponding biblical text we can conclude that these alterations were made to suit whatever desire or purpose JS saw fit at the time. This is supported by the fact that the earliest manuscripts do not support the majority of the alterations. Fifth, the fact that the same KJV verse is used in different places in the BM, and that it has been altered differently in each place, argues that there was no Semitic text underlying those BM verses, but rather that the variants originate with JS. Sixth, it appears that JS didn't make as many changes to the biblical text early on as he did later. In the later sections, as note in Chris Eccel's study of the block quotations of Isaiah,¹⁸⁰ JS would make major changes to the text as he started a block quotation, and then as he went would get tired and make less and less changes until the remaining chapters had little to no changes.

Seventh, the variants in the BM quotations of Isaiah do not follow the general pattern of the ancient manuscripts Isaiah. In those manuscripts variants are scattered, not clustered in several verses the way the BM has them. Eighth, many of the changes made to the block quotations of Isaiah make little to no sense or are simply inaccurate. The Red Sea is placed 250 miles away

¹⁷⁹ Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 164-166.

¹⁸⁰ Chris Eccel, "Biblical Variant Readings in the Book of Mormon," accessed on <http://www.gptouchstone.org/variants.html> (Last accessed 4/25/2016).

from its actual location with an insertion in 2 Ne. 19:1 (Isa. 9:1). Ninth, sometimes JS tried to correct the text but in the corrections it is apparent he didn't understand the biblical verse. Tenth, JS claimed that there were plain and precious truths of the Bible that had been taken out. In the production of the BM JS didn't restore these, so they would be left for his revision of the Bible the next year.¹⁸¹ Finally, JS's familiarity with the Bible had not been recognized fully prior to Walters's thesis. JS quoted from a specific collection of verses often,¹⁸² suggesting that he knew them well and used them in constructing his theological perspectives.

While many issues could be taken with Walters's conclusions, or some of his lines of reasoning, his study was an important step forward, even if early reviewers brushed it to the side. Walters was more open to finding anachronisms within the text so he was able to locate verses from the NT and post-exilic Hebrew texts (like Malachi) that had a traceable impact on the BM. From that point of view Walters had a much larger, and more accurate, data set to work from in his theory about the composition of the BM. Whether or not one agrees with his conclusions is irrelevant to the present discussion. Walters made a major contribution to studies on the KJV in the BM.

John Tvedtnes

Tvedtnes has written numerous studies looking at the question of the influence of the Bible on the BM. In much of his writing the overarching theme has been that while the BM authors have definitely utilized biblical texts, this has only been mediated through their familiarity with those texts they had available to them in their own historical contexts, i.e. what is assumed to be on the Brass Plates. Thus, many of the variants between the BM and KJV

¹⁸¹ Walters failed to mention how the BM references the works of supposedly lost scripture from Israelite prophets like Zenos and Zenock, or a lost prophecy where Joseph of Egypt actually prophesied about JS himself.

¹⁸² Isa. 11:11-12; 49:22-23; 52:7-10; and Micah 5:8-9. Cf. Walters, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon," 166.

texts of Isaiah are based on the BM having access to a more ancient source than JS had available to him in the KJV. In a similar vein, verses throughout the BM that might at first seem to have been influenced by the NT, in fact took portions of the HB and blended them in ways similar to what the later NT authors would do. To Tvedtnes it was also possible that both the BM and the NT had a similar third source that is no longer extant, or that the source itself is found in the BM.

This is the case in Tvedtnes' essay, "Borrowings from the Parables of Zenos," aptly titled to denote his argument that Paul and several other early Jewish and Christian authors were familiar with Zenos' writings rather than the other way around.¹⁸³ To do this Tvedtnes argues that the Parable of the Olive Tree in Jacob 5 is a self-contained narrative, and that this means it is original and has priority over the NT texts it has parallels with.¹⁸⁴ Tvedtnes' criteria are incredibly problematic, and do not fully deal with the historical or textual evidence.

Tvedtnes' research is unique compared to many of the BM scholars I will comment on here because he is fully aware of the connections between the NT and the BM. Rather than acknowledging the influence of the NT on the BM Tvedtnes finds creative, yet not compelling, ways to respond to a specific group of critics of the BM. It would have been more helpful to have as the point of departure the text itself instead of looking at the issue specifically in response to those who were ideologically opposed to him.

Kenneth Jenkins

Jenkins was a non-Mormon scholar who knew John Hilton, a professor at Brigham Young University. He assisted Hilton with preparing and writing computer programs so that Hilton

¹⁸³ John A. Tvedtnes, "Borrowings from the Parable of Zenos,"

¹⁸⁴ Tvedtnes, "Borrowings from the Parable of Zenos," 374.

could perform his word-print analysis and other studies on the BM.¹⁸⁵ Although it took several years to complete, Jenkins produced a large 3-volume computer print-off that compared similar phrases between the full texts of both the BM and the KJV.¹⁸⁶ The print-off itself only remains in one known copy.

Jenkins' project has never really been used to closely analyze the dependence of the BM on the KJV, at least not outside of the short comments made about it in Philip Barlow's magisterial book, *Mormons and the Bible*.¹⁸⁷ This is unfortunate because this resource has been available for over thirty years and in that time it could have been utilized to understand better the relationship between the BM and the KJV.

David P. Wright

Wright's research has been some of the most underrated on the question of the KJV's influence on the BM, partially because much of it is simply remembered as being part of the "Book of Mormon wars"¹⁸⁸ of the early 1990s and therefore written off as not interesting or out of date.¹⁸⁹ Wright wrote several essays looking specifically at the question of the influence of the KJV on the BM, and JS's appropriation of the Bible during the production of the BM.

¹⁸⁵ John L. Hilton and Ken Jenkins, "All Book of Mormon References by Author and Literary Form: A Full Listing of Book of Mormon References by Author and Literary Form" (FARMS Preliminary Reports; Provo: FARMS, 1983); and John L. Hilton, "On Verifying Wordprint Studies: Book of Mormon Authorship," *BYU Studies* 30, no. 3 (1990), 1-17; and Hilton, "Wordprints and the Book of Mormon," in John W. Welch, ed., *Reexploring the Book of Mormon* (Provo: FARMS, 1992), 221-226.

¹⁸⁶ Kenneth Jenkins, "Common Phrases Between the King James Version and the Book of Mormon" (3 Vols.; Provo: Farms, 1983).

¹⁸⁷ Barlow, *Mormons and the Bible*, 28-29.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Massimo Introvigne, "The Book of Mormon Wars: A Non-Mormon Perspective," in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 5 (2), 1-25.

¹⁸⁹ This has been explicitly stated on social media or to the author by a small handful of Mormon scholars who write on the BM.

To do this he looked at the use of the KJV in Alma 12-13 in one essay,¹⁹⁰ and at the copied Isaiah passages throughout the BM in another.¹⁹¹ I will briefly describe the former study.

In his essay looking at the use of Hebrews in Alma 12-13, Wright went beyond observations of authorship in an attempt to show his faith community how JS interacted with his scriptures, the KJV. He wanted to provide an opportunity for his audience to learn about their scriptural heritage despite conclusions of authorship, and was in essence providing a new kind of apologetic informed by his academic research.¹⁹² This is especially seen in Wright's statement that, "one of the points I hope will be borne out is that Smith is as interesting and religiously relevant when understood to be the author of the Book of Mormon as when he is considered translator."¹⁹³

Wright shows how Alma 13 relies on Heb. 7:1-4 for its depiction of priesthood,¹⁹⁴ and how Alma 12-13 was influenced in various ways by Heb. 3-4 and 7.¹⁹⁵ He analyzes Alma 12 and concludes that its author invented a citation and masked its source. The citation comes from Heb. 3, and Wright argues that this is a good example of JS's creative reworking of the Bible.¹⁹⁶ Wright also argues that the description of Adam and Eve in Alma 12 is dependent on Hebrews.¹⁹⁷

Wright correctly argues that any argument on the influence of the Bible on the BM must be grounded on the text itself, and that evidence must take priority in compositional

¹⁹⁰ David P. Wright, "“In Plain Terms that We May Understand”: Joseph Smith's Transformation of Hebrews in Alma 12-13," in Brent Lee Metcalfe, ed., *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon: Explorations in Critical Methodology* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993), 165-229.

¹⁹¹ David P. Wright, "Isaiah in the Book of Mormon: Or Joseph Smith in Isaiah," in Dan Vogel and Brent Lee Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 157-234; and David P. Wright, "Joseph Smith's Interpretation of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 31, No. 4 (Winter 1998), 181-206.

¹⁹² Wright, "In Plain Terms that We May Understand," 166.

¹⁹³ Wright, "In Plain Terms that We May Understand," 166.

¹⁹⁴ Wright, "In Plain Terms that We May Understand," 167.

¹⁹⁵ Wright, "In Plain Terms that We May Understand," 167-184.

¹⁹⁶ Wright, "In Plain Terms that we May Understand," 181.

¹⁹⁷ Wright, "In Plain Terms that we May Understand," 196-197.

judgments.¹⁹⁸ Doing so allows Wright to notice the similarity between the composition of the BM, JS's revision of the Bible, and the Book of Abraham.¹⁹⁹ He postulates that JS's use of the KJV during the production of the BM could have been the impetus for the revision of the Bible only months after the BM was published.

Noel Reynolds

Reynolds wrote an essay in 1990 exploring what kind of Genesis text was used throughout the BM in an attempt to discover what was on the Brass Plates that Nephi took out of Jerusalem.²⁰⁰ To do this he compared key phrases from the Book of Moses and JS's revision of the Bible against the BM and the KJV,²⁰¹ starting with a list of similar terms, phrases, and concepts that he found in both the BM and the Book of Moses. That list was then compared with the KJV of the OT, and anything that was found in the OT was then taken out of the list.

The next step was to examine whether or not the similarities between the BM and the Book of Moses within the list were independent. In doing so Reynolds created criteria for establishing dependence, a first in BM studies. His criteria worked a little backwards when compared to methodologies of the time in biblical studies, but it was an important step forward. He argued the following seven criteria: (1) the greater the similarity in terms, the less likely the two are independent; (2) the more precise the similarities, the less likely the two are independent; (3) the more deliberately shaped the repetition, the less likely the two are independent; (4) the more similar the context, the less likely the two are independent; (5)

¹⁹⁸ Wright, "In Plain Terms that we May Understand," 207.

¹⁹⁹ Wright, "In Plain Terms that we May Understand," 211.

²⁰⁰ Noel B. Reynolds, "The Brass Plates Version of Genesis," in John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks, eds., *By Study and Also by Faith, Volume 2: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday 27 March 1990* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990), 136-173.

²⁰¹ Reynolds, "The Brass Plates Version of Genesis," 137.

authorial awareness of a brass plates source, the less likely the two are independent; (6) the more distinctive the terminology, the less likely the two are independent; and (7) similar terminology in the NT or OT, the less likely the two are independent.²⁰²

Reynolds's criteria are very problematic. He never explains the difference between greater similarity and more precise similarity in criteria one and two. Does greater mean quantity of word and letter agreement, or context, motif, or thought? He also does not define what he means by more precise. Is that supposed to point to a higher connection between word and letter agreement, or something else? For criterion three Reynolds never explains how the author's deliberate shaping of the repetition is to be determined, and one wonders if this is a question of historical criticism, and possibly about the intent of the author. He also does not explain who the author is, but it seems obvious throughout Reynolds's essay that the author would be the assumed author in the given section of text, so how are we supposed to determine if that author deliberately shaped the repetition?

While Reynolds' criteria appear to be rigorous and useful in explaining the range of connections between texts, when they are actually applied it becomes apparent that they are not as useful as one would hope. In comparison with the criteria of Michael Fishbane, Richard Hays, and others contemporary to Reynolds' writing I have to disagree with Reynolds' statement that his group of parallels between the BM and the Book of Moses are, "highly persuasive on the basis of criteria ordinarily used by scholars evaluating possible sources of texts." His criteria are not only dissimilar to approaches contemporary to his writing, but they are not as well defined.

Besides the problem of clearly defined terms, Reynolds' criteria do not successfully lead to his conclusions. He limits comparisons to exclude the NT, and although he makes one

²⁰² Reynolds, "The Brass Plates Version of Genesis," 138.

exception by noting Acts 4:12 and Moses 6:52,²⁰³ he fails to note several connections with the NT that would explain the language of both the BM and the Book of Moses.²⁰⁴ There are several other examples that could be made to show the failings of Reynolds' methodology, but his paper was a step in the right direction. By creating a list of criteria Reynolds' made the importance of defining approaches as an essential part of analyzing intertextuality in the BM.

Recent Approaches

*Brant Gardner*²⁰⁵

Brant Gardner has been one of the most prolific authors on the subject of the BM since B. H. Roberts. He has published a six-volume commentary on the entire text of the BM,²⁰⁶ a book on the process of translating the BM,²⁰⁷ and a recent volume arguing for the book as history.²⁰⁸ The commentary includes several notes on the influence of the KJV on the BM that

²⁰³ Reynolds, "The Brass Plates Version of Genesis," 140. Acts 4:12 also influenced Mosiah 3:17, but Reynolds' fails to note this on pages 140, and 142 where he discusses Mosiah 3:17.

²⁰⁴ For example, Reynolds' notes on page 140 the connection between Moses 6:67 and Alma 13:7, 9, but these concepts are ultimately derived from Heb. 7. His example of Moses 4:4 on page 143 also shows influence from 2 Tim. 2:26, as well as the connection he makes with Alma 12:11 and 40:13. Both of these passages are derived from 2 Tim. 2:26. The use of later terminology to describe Satan as the "father of all lies," found in Moses 4:4, 2 Ne. 2:18, Ether 8:25, and 2 Ne. 9:9 as noted by Reynolds (p. 142), is also evidence of later influence.

²⁰⁵ Brant A. Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon, Vol. 1: First Nephi* (6 vols.; Draper: Greg Kofford Books, 2007), 15, 147, 191-193, 213, 235, 280, 411-413; Brant A. Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon, Vol. 2: Second Nephi through Jacob* (Draper: Greg Kofford Books, 2007), 152-155, 207, 220 nt. 5, 266, 301, 313.

²⁰⁶ Brant A. Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon* (6 vols.; Draper: Greg Kofford Books, 2007).

²⁰⁷ Brant A. Gardner, *The Gift and Power: Translating the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2011).

²⁰⁸ Brant A. Gardner, *Traditions of the Fathers: The Book of Mormon as History* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2015).

are inconsistent with one another,²⁰⁹ and are never brought together in a systematic form. The book on translation deals a little more directly with the influence of the KJV, and the topic is not even mentioned, as far as I can tell, in the book on the BM as history. I will respond briefly to Gardner's book on translation because he engages more directly with the topic there.

First, I would like to note that most of Gardner's conclusions on the KJV's influence on the BM are sound in his book on translation. For instance, on page 193, Gardner states,

It is therefore no surprise that Joseph Smith would use a vocabulary and style that "spoke" like sacred texts. However, the influence of the King James Bible goes further than simple stylistics. The specifics of the KJV quite clearly influenced the formation of many sentences and paragraphs in the Book of Mormon where the plate text could not have supported that particular translation.

Anyone can compare a simple couple of paragraphs of the Book of Mormon with the KJV and see the reliability of Gardner's statement. As an example, 1 Ne. 10:7-10 informally quotes portions of John 1:26-29.²¹⁰ This is not a singular case, as literally hundreds, and probably even thousands, of like examples surface once a detailed comparison of the BM and the KJV has been completed. It is not the conclusions that Gardner comes to that need correction; rather, I will comment on some of the details of his explanation and the sources of specific BM passages.

On page 193, Gardner discusses how the influence of the KJV answers the use of the phrase "jot or tittle" from 3 Ne. 1:25. The terms "jot" and "tittle" only appear together in Matt. 5:18, and nowhere else in the biblical corpus. This would be the one source that 3 Ne. 1:25 would have been influenced by. Gardner uses *Smith's Bible Dictionary* to explain that "jot"

²⁰⁹ In some instances where it is apparent that Malachi influenced the BM Gardner argues that it could not be Malachi because it was written ca. 450 BCE, and therefore could not have been on the brass plates (see *Second Witness*, 2:331). In other instances Gardner recognizes the influence of Malachi on the BM and does not even mention his earlier argument that it would not have been on the brass plates (see *Second Witness*, 2:356-257).

²¹⁰ Gardner notes this similarity but assigns the dependence of the BM verses to Mark 1:2 and 7 rather than John 1:27.

is the English form of the Greek “iota,” the smallest letter in the Greek alphabet. Iota is the Greek equivalent to the Hebrew *yod*, which is in turn equivalent to the English ‘y’. As *Smith’s Bible Dictionary* says, “It is used metaphorically to express the minutest thing.”²¹¹

Gardner then turns to Easton’s *Bible Dictionary*, which defines “tittle” as “a point...the minute point or stroke added to some letters of the Hebrew alphabet to distinguish them from others which they resemble; hence, the very least point.”²¹² Gardner then describes how it might have been possible for the Nephites to use “jot” due to the possibility that it ties back to the Hebrew *yod*, but states that “tittle” could not have been known to the Nephites. In his own words, Gardner states,

The reference to the *jot* might have been part of the plates if it referred to the Hebrew *yod* and if the Nephites retained sufficient knowledge of Hebrew writing that it could be a useful metaphor. However, the *tittle* is a visual coding for vowels, a system developed after Lehi and his family left Jerusalem. Thus *tittle* could not be a literal translation of a lexeme in the Nephite vocabulary. The presence of this phrase is due to the KJV model.²¹³

I agree with Gardner’s statement that the use of “jot” and “tittle” is dependent on the KJV, and would therefore arise out of Joseph Smith’s 19th century Christian milieu, as he was “swimming in the sea of [King James] scripture.”²¹⁴ There are several problems with the details of Gardner’s analysis, though. First, before bringing up the lexical issues of having either “jot” or “tittle” in the BM, the fact that both of them are found together, and that we have only one source—a very popular and widespread source—for these terms together, would lead to the conclusion that 3 Ne. 1:25 is dependent on Matt. 5:18. Even if the Nephites used the terms “jot” and “tittle,” it is unlikely that they would happen to use them together the same way that

²¹¹ William Smith, *A Dictionary of the Bible: GospeLink 2001 CD-ROM* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 2000), s.v. “jot”; as quoted in Gardner, *The Gift and Power*, 193.

²¹² M. G. Easton, *Illustrated Bible Dictionary* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1903), s.v. “tittle”; as quoted in Gardner, *The Gift and Power*, 193. Ellipses mine.

²¹³ Gardner, *The Gift and Power*, 193. Emphasis in the original.

²¹⁴ See Paul Han, *Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4:7-13:13* (Library of New Testament Studies, vol. 519; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014).

the author of Matthew did. That is a phenomenon not found in the other gospels, and the authors of those texts lived in the same culture and society as the author of Matthew.

A major problem with Gardner's assessment is his assigning "tittle" to vowels. Nowhere in Easton's quotation is the description of "tittle" ever assigned to vowel pointings. While it is true that Lehi and Nephi would not have known vowels in 600 BCE, this is an irrelevant point because Easton is not describing the vowels. Instead, he is describing the 22-letter Hebrew alphabet itself. Easton's description is "point or stroke added to some letters of the Hebrew alphabet to distinguish them from others which they resemble," and vowels are not included in that description. These would be letters like *tav* (ת) and *chet* (ח). The "tittle" is the extra small mark on the left side of the *tav* that allows the reader to quickly spot the difference between the two.

Although this is a minor detail, it is an important note. An even bigger problem would be to ask whether or not the Nephites would have had access to Hebrew script, since the text of the BM assumes it was not written in Hebrew script but rather in Egyptian engravings. According to Mosiah 1:4 the engravings were written in Egyptian writing, not Hebrew. The only author that says he is aware of Hebrew is Moroni in Mormon 9:33, but that is a problematic text if used in this regard. Not only is the description of Hebrew idealized in Mormon 9:33, but Moroni says that they have also altered the Hebrew. What about Hebrew did they alter? Did Nephi write in Hebrew, although the language they needed to preserve was written in Egyptian script? If he wrote in Hebrew, why would Moroni later state that they didn't write in Hebrew?

The brass plates are important at the beginning of the narrative of the BM because Nephi needs to preserve his language, as he states, "it is wisdom in God that we should obtain

these records, that we may preserve unto our children the language of our fathers.”²¹⁵ If they needed the brass plates, which were written in Egyptian, to preserve the language of their fathers, presumably Hebrew, then what text did they have that included any substantial amount of Hebrew script? It is not possible to argue that the brass plates did. The “language of their fathers” is also a difficult term because it is only used here in 1 Ne. 3:19 and nowhere else in the BM.²¹⁶

Gardner turns to the issue of the NT having influence on the BM. He points out how the text of the BM will often seem as if it is alluding to a text in the Hebrew Bible, but it instead cites NT versions of the Hebrew Bible text. He gives as an example 1 Ne. 10:7-8. Gardner shows how those two verses at first seem to be alluding to Isa. 40:3-4, but on closer examination, according to Gardner, they are closer to Mark 1:2 and 7. While it is true that the text of the BM is here influence by the NT, and not by Isa. 40:3-4, it is also not true that Mark 1:2 and 7 are the closest, and therefore influential, verses in the NT.

While this section of the BM is similar to the Markan version, it is closer to the gospel of John, and blends some material from the synoptic gospels. 1 Ne. 10:7 echoes John 1:27, and then 1 Ne. 10:8 blends in material from Matt. 3:3 with John 1:23. That same verse then informally quotes John 1:26, and then echoes Matt. 3:11 before informally quoting John 1:27. The BM text continues to informally quote the gospel of John in 1 Ne. 10:9, when it states that John the Baptist would baptize in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, and then vss. 9 and 10 informally quote John 1:28 and then echo John 1:26. The structure of the passage, which is more inclusive here than the two verses Gardner notes in his study, is dependent on the flow of John 1:26-19. Ideas and language are then blended in from the gospel of Matthew with the

²¹⁵ 1 Ne. 3:19.

²¹⁶ The phrase “our language” is only used in Mosiah 8:12; 3 Ne. 5:18; and Morm. 9:34.

Johannine prologue.

Gardner's study was pointing in the right direction, but was not thorough enough in the analysis. While his identification of the influence of the KJV form of the NT on the text of the BM is commendable, his failure to make the correct connections with the NT invites careful and more detailed approaches to identifying influence in the BM. Hopefully Gardner's study will invite more researchers to look at the question of the influence of the KJV on the BM, and that in the future the methods adopted will be more refined than the ones he employed.

Grant Hardy

Hardy's research has been marked by careful attention to detail and nuanced analysis. More than previous scholars, Hardy recognizes the difficulties in determining and then describing the influence of the KJV on the BM, from literary, historical, and theological perspectives. The accuracy of his analysis in locating the texts in the KJV that have been influential within the BM is likely without rival. I will briefly describe Hardy's research as found in a forthcoming essay and his book *Understanding the Book of Mormon*.²¹⁷

In his book Hardy points out how most people that read the BM notice that the block quotations of Isaiah are specifically from the KJV, with some variation. This leads to the question for many readers of why the KJV is being used,²¹⁸ rather than having a completely independent translation by JS. He points to how, although the quotations are obviously from the KJV, it is complicated by the fact that Emma Smith, JS's wife, claimed late in life in an interview with her son, Joseph Smith, III, that during the dictation of the BM JS did not have a book or manuscript that could have been working from. Hardy notes that this would include

²¹⁷ Grant Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon: A Reader's Guide* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).

²¹⁸ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 66.

the Bible,²¹⁹ although the context of the questions was focused more specifically on the Spaulding manuscript theory of BM origins. For Hardy, it is clear that “the Book of Mormon Isaiah chapters, as we have them today, are based on the King James Bible.”²²⁰ He includes in his discussion the difficulty of the fact that sections of Isaiah are quoted that would have been written after Lehi and Nephi left Jerusalem (and therefore would not be on the Brass Plates).²²¹ He points out that when many past Mormon scholars have argued that biblical scholars concluded these chapters in Deutero-Isaiah (i.e. Isa. 40-55) were not written by Isaiah because those scholars do not believe in prophecy, their depiction of this scholarship is simply inaccurate and inadequate.²²² In a clear statement toward moving forward, Hardy argues that, “A more promising avenue for the faithful, it seems, is to acknowledge that we probably know less about what constitutes an “inspired translation” than we do about ancient Israel.”²²³ Later on in the book he points out how quotations to any other book of the Bible that dates post-600 BCE are anachronistic and “potentially challeng[e] the book’s historicity and its credibility.”²²⁴ He goes on to make arguments that highlight both the potential for antiquity and for 19th century origins, based respectively on the BM authors’s possible use of prior BM texts, and the BM’s use of books from the NT. He specifically analyzes the use of Heb. 6 and 11 in Ether 12.²²⁵

Although Hardy is not specifically looking at the influence of the KJV on the BM in his book, there are many pages that include discrepancies, some brief and others more in depth, about this influence. To date Hardy’s work in this book is some of the most sophisticated on

²¹⁹ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 68.

²²⁰ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 68.

²²¹ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 69.

²²² Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 69.

²²³ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 69.

²²⁴ Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 255.

²²⁵ Cf. Hardy, *Understanding the Book of Mormon*, 256-261.

the question of the influence of the KJV over the BM text, and that is extended to a more recent essay that Hardy has written.

Hardy's forthcoming essay, "The *Book of Mormon* and the Bible,"²²⁶ looks more specifically at how the various sections of the BM use the Bible. Hardy argues that the BM was obviously modeled on the Bible, and that "it owed much more to that book than to any other potential sources suggested through the years."²²⁷ He notes how the BM fits incredibly well with the trends of "pseudo-biblical" literature, noted in Eran Shalev's recent study,²²⁸ that was contemporary to the BM. The BM, "integrates the [Old and New] Testaments in an unprecedented fashion, with the result that it is hard to tell where the one ends and the other begins."²²⁹ Hardy recognizes how the BM is aware of both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament, and responds to both of them as if they were a single unit, i.e. the KJV. At one point he even compares the BM to Melville's *Moby Dick*, and says that the BM might perhaps be a folk art analogue to that work.²³⁰

Later in the essay Hardy examines the influence of the KJV on the BM through the lens of intertextuality, and argues that the language of the KJV utilized in the BM goes beyond grammar and style to include specific recognizable phrases. These, he argues, can be classified as quotations, allusions, or echoes, and he goes on to examine several specific examples. While I would differ on the identification of many of the passages he analyzes,²³¹ Hardy's essay is one of the most aware of current trends in intertextual studies and sophisticated of

²²⁶ Grant Hardy, "The *Book of Mormon* and the Bible," forthcoming. I am grateful to Dr. Hardy for graciously providing me with an early draft of this essay.

²²⁷ Hardy, "The *Book of Mormon* and the Bible," 1.

²²⁸ Eran Shalev, *American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

²²⁹ Hardy, "The *Book of Mormon* and the Bible," 4-5.

²³⁰ Hardy, "The *Book of Mormon* and the Bible," 8.

²³¹ I would classify all of the examples Hardy provides on page 23 of his essay as informal quotations, rather than as allusions as he labels them.

contemporary writings on the influence of the KJV on the BM. It would be well for future studies to take Hardy's research on these questions seriously.

John Hilton III

Hilton has written two essays that look specifically at the question of intertextuality in the BM. In his first essay, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton,"²³² Hilton looks at cases of intratextuality²³³ between two sections of the BM text in order to highlight "the possibility [of] intentional intertextual quotations and allusions within the Book of Mormon."²³⁴ Arguing convincingly for the importance of intertextual studies in BM scholarship, Hilton turns to the question of how exactly we can determine if similar passages indicate that the author intended for the connection to be seen by his audience or not.

To answer this question he turns to the methodology proposed by Noel Reynolds (described above), and then describes the difficulty in determining similarity because the BM "is both an abridged and translated work, thus it can be difficult to determine if minor textual similarities or differences are the result of the abridgement by Mormon, of the translation by Joseph Smith, or are part of the text from an original writer."²³⁵ Hilton claims that it is also possible that certain phrases that are shared between the BM and the Book of Moses come from the Brass Plates, following Reynolds's paper on the Brass Plates version of Genesis. To end the section Hilton brushes aside the question of influence from the NT on the BM because to him "such an argument misses the point of intertextuality within the Book of Mormon."²³⁶

²³² John Hilton III, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton," in *BYU Studies Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2012), 39-60.

²³³ Hilton never uses the term "intratextuality" himself, opting instead for intertextuality.

²³⁴ Hilton, III, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton," 41.

²³⁵ Hilton III, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton," 43.

²³⁶ Hilton III, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton," 44.

Unfortunately, Hilton's paper suffers greatly from the assumptions he makes from the beginning. For one, there are other, more plausible explanations for why the BM and the Book of Moses occasionally agree against the KJV that were purposefully excluded by Reynolds in his research. Hilton follows Reynolds' lead and therefore fails to notice several connections between the BM and the NT that significantly alter his data set and suggest conclusions other than the ones Hilton draws.

For instance, when Hilton briefly mentions Reynolds' assertion that the BM and the Book of Moses share similar historical sources, Hilton notes the use of the phrase, "*carnal, sensual, and devilish* appear together in the Book of Mormon in only two places and never appear together in the Old Testament."²³⁷ While this observation is accurate, Hilton fails to consider the NT for these words, and instead points to their appearance twice in the Pearl of Great Price. Rather than quickly concluding that the BM and Book of Moses share a similar textual source, Hilton should have checked for further uses of these terms. They are found in James 3:15: "This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish." While two of the terms are exactly the same and "carnal" is substituted for "earthly," this is the same as can be observed of other writers using James 3:15 during the first couple decades of the 19th century.²³⁸ In other words, JS's verbiage in both texts can be shown to echo the NT. Hilton's misunderstanding of the relationship of these terms does not end here, though.

²³⁷ Hilton III, "Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma's Counsel to Corianton," 44. Emphasis in the original.

²³⁸ See "His affections became carnal, sensual, and devilish. Eph. ii. 1-3. James iii. 15," in Anonymous, *Extracts from Ancient and Modern Authors, arranged so as to form a history or description of Man, in his natural, moral, and spiritual character: embracing nearly all the most important subjects of the Christian Religion*. (London: E. Bridgewater, 1828), 207; and "His affections became carnal, sensual, and devilish. (Eph. ii. 1-3. James ii. 15.)," in Robert Hawker, *The Poor Man's Concordance and Dictionary to the Sacred Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament: arranged in alphabetical order, and containing, in addition to the usual literal explanation of words, short doctrinal and practical essays upon certain points of the truths of God*. (London: Ebenezer Palmer, 1828), 244; and "As the understanding is dark, and the will perverse, so the conscience is polluted, and full of dead works; and all the affections are in sad disorder; placed upon earthly objects, being carnal, sensual, and devilish," in Thomas Taylor, *Sixteen Lectures upon the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia, recorded in the Second and Third Chapters of Revelations*. (Bristol: R. Edwards, 1800), 65; and "But I conceive

In Table 1 on page 47 Hilton presents several “cases” where similar phraseology between Alma 39-42 is compared to Mosiah 15-17. In all of the instances where he says that “Times Exact Phrase Is Used Elsewhere in Scripture” is 0, there is actually at least one example, and sometimes many more, of where the phrase is found. Almost all of these are in the NT.²³⁹ One would have to heavily emphasize the “exact” in his statement to exclude the other occurrences, but in order to do so there would need to be a demonstrable reason for making that decision. Due to these considerations, the fact that Hilton ignored possible connections with the NT, and his overall approach of searching for “exact” phrases, his analysis is severely undermined. It would take a reconsideration of his questions and comparisons, which would necessitate a new methodology, in order to salvage his paper.

In his second paper, “Old Testament Psalms in the Book of Mormon,”²⁴⁰ Hilton’s work is hampered by some of the same pitfalls of his previous study, but looking closely at his “textual connections” in Table 1,²⁴¹ it is apparent that he has refined his approach in some ways. He shows forty-three instances in the BM of dependence on the Psalms, and how these psalms are used in Jacob and in Nephi’s Psalm.²⁴² Rather than ignoring similarities to the NT, Hilton points out when connections between the BM and the Psalms also connect to a NT

that this fearful negotiation, now in progress, is ‘carnal, sensual, and devilish,’” in A Layman, “The Secret Out!” in *The Reformer* Vol. IX, No. 106 (Philadelphia, 1828), 146.

²³⁹ In case 1, “testimony against [them],” is found in Matt. 10:18; Mark 6:11; 13:9; Luke 9:5; “at the last day” is found in John 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:24. In case 5 “have no part” is found in Deut. 18:1. In case 8 “stand before God...judged...according to their works” is found in Rev. 20:12. In case 10, as already shown above, “carnal, sensual, and devilish” is found in James 2:15. In case 11 “for the redemption” is found in Ps. 49:8; Heb. 9:15. Mosiah 15:9 fits the context of Heb. 9:15 much better, and also utilizes phrases, similar to case 13, from other NT sources; see “from the foundation of the world.” In case 13, “from the foundation of the world” is found in Matt. 13:35; 25:34; Luke 11:50; Heb. 4:3; Rev. 13:8; 17:8. The one exception where Hilton has it right is case 9.

²⁴⁰ John Hilton, III, “Old Testament Psalms in the Book of Mormon,” in David R. Seely, Jeffrey R. Chadwick, and Matthew J. Grey, eds., *Ascending the Mountain of the Lord: Temple, Praise, and Worship in the Old Testament* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and the Religious Studies Center, BYU, 2013), 291-311.

²⁴¹ Hilton, III, “Old Testament Psalms in the Book of Mormon,” 294-296.

²⁴² Sidney Sperry coined this term to describe 2 Ne. 4:16-35 in his *Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Stevens & Wallis, Inc., 1948), 110-111.

text. Although there are still some mistakes,²⁴³ the final product appears to much more meticulous and methodical.

Julie Smith

Smith presented at the Mormon Theology Seminar on the topic of reading Alma 32 through the lens of Isa. 55.²⁴⁴ More specifically, she compares Isa. 54-56 with Alma 30-35, and begins by noting the fact that Julia Kristeva coined the term “intertextuality”. At the outset she asks the question “What relationship do these texts have?”²⁴⁵ and offers four options, that there is no historical or intentional connection, that the BM writers/redactors intended the connection, that Isaiah prophesied of events in the BM, or that Isaiah and the BM writers/redactors drew on a common source. Smith argues for the second option, and jumps into her reading assuming that the reader is in agreement with her about the use of terms like quotation and allusion.

Smith’s comparison is lucid and well written. It seems more practical than many of the other pieces already described, and she takes full advantage of the connections she finds between the Isaiah chapters and this section of Alma. Although not all of her connections are convincing as intended by the author, the connections she does make between the two texts are fascinating throughout. She is more careful to observe and note that places where the BM text of Isaiah varies from the KJV does not automatically signal that the BM has the original version. She points out how the addition to 2 Ne. 9:51, which corresponds to Isa. 55:2, breaks

²⁴³ For example, Hilton seems to take a rigid word-for-word approach in cases 1-11, and then in case 12 he includes passages from Proverbs, Ezekiel, and 1 Thessalonians that in the other cases would likely not have been included. This might be due to the way WordCruncher runs its reports. In any case, it appears inconsistent when going through the first eleven cases to all of a sudden include these passages in case 12.

²⁴⁴ Julie M. Smith, “So Shall My Word Be: Reading Alma 32 Through Isaiah 55,” in Adam S. Miller, ed., *An Experiment on the Word: Reading Alma 32* (Provo: Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, 2014), 71-86.

²⁴⁵ Smith, “So Shall My Word Be,” 71.

the poetic structure of Isa. 55 and is therefore more likely an addition in the BM to the source text than it is that the BM is original.

Smith's paper overall is exemplary as a model for future studies that look specifically at how the KJV is used in the BM, even though she does not explicate a thorough methodology (or any methodology really at all). She explores the major issues she sets out to explain, and makes all of the relevant connections between the two texts. Her practical approach is commendable and hopefully invites more studies in a similar vein.²⁴⁶

Nicholas Frederick

Frederick completed a dissertation in 2013 at Claremont Graduate University entitled "Line Within Line: An Intertextual Analysis of Mormon Scripture and the Prologue of the Gospel of John."²⁴⁷ From the perspective of this author, Frederick's dissertation is one of the most significant pieces of research on the BM specifically, and Mormon scripture generally, that has been produced to this point. Unfortunately, its significance has been partially offset by an essay that Frederick wrote for the *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*. Both of these studies will be described below.

Frederick noted early in his dissertation that, unlike many scholars of Mormon history who have attempted to locate JS's inspiration in the arcane or the profane, "one area where a provenance to Smith's work can be absolutely demonstrated is the Bible."²⁴⁸ For Frederick this influence was not simply a question of translation technique, but rather "In composing the two texts [the BM and the Doctrine and Covenants], Smith borrowed thousands of phrases

²⁴⁶ Smith also recently presented at the 2015 annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta on the topic, "A Double Portion: An Intertextual Reading of Hannah (1 Samuel 1-2) and Mark's Greek Woman (Mark 7:24-30)." <http://paulredux.blogspot.com/2015/04/the-intertextuality-in-new-testament.html> (last accessed 1/18/2016).

²⁴⁷ Nicholas J. Frederick, "Line Within Line."

²⁴⁸ Frederick, "Line Within Line," 2.

from the King James Bible, phrases which he merged together with his own language to create modern, American scripture that for Mormons stands as equally (if not more so) sacred with the Bible.”²⁴⁹ Throughout the dissertation Frederick takes for granted the idea that JS composed the text of the BM. Thus, “the text of John becomes relevant due to the unique nature of how Joseph Smith offers his own interpretation of John.”²⁵⁰ Frederick is able to describe the relationship of the BM to the NT in this way because of the myriad of intertextual connections between the two texts, and the way that the BM varies from the NT based on the English, KJV text. Frederick’s three-hundred forty-one page dissertation deals only with the use of John 1:1-18, showing that much more could be written if the entire NT was explored in a similar way.

Due to the nature of doctoral studies and his apparent academic abilities, Frederick’s thesis was the most focused and thorough of any research looking at the question of influence from the KJV on the BM. His knowledge of relevant literature in the field of biblical studies on inner-biblical exegesis, intertextuality, and literary influence helped to provide fertile ground from which Frederick was able to grow rich analyses and close readings of the BM text.

His approach to past research on the question of the influence of the KJV on the BM and to what extent JS could have known the Bible is commendable for its breadth and its nuanced and careful explanation of the issues. It is also an important study because it returns to an approach, similar to Sperry and Vest, that is driven by data rather than ideology or traditional assumptions. Frederick recognizes the overwhelming influence the KJV has had on the BM, developed a methodology based on prior research and tweaked to fit the texts he was analyzing, and sought to explain his data set using neutral verbiage that can be positively

²⁴⁹ Frederick, “Line Within Line,” 2.

²⁵⁰ Frederick, “Line Within Line,” 5.

engaged by any interested party. His dissertation will remain one of the most important advances forward in BM studies for the foreseeable future.

Although Frederick's dissertation significantly moved forward the discussion on the BM's use of the KJV it will likely not be as available to the general public and many scholars as his essay in the *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*. In the essay Frederick's tone and overall confidence in locating influence from the KJV on the BM is greatly diminished.

On the other hand, Frederick problematized both the discoveries and advancements he had made in his dissertation only two years after it was completed in his essay, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon: A Proposed Methodology."²⁵¹ One would expect that Frederick would have started this essay where his dissertation left off, but instead he undermined and called into question the most basic facts he had utilized throughout his dissertation.

Rather than following the generally accepted terms to discuss this particular form of intertextuality (i.e. quotation, allusion, and echo, those terms he used in his dissertation), he decided to propose terminology that seemingly skips over the question of authorship because, "If carefully defined, the terms quotation and [a]llusion can be useful. Otherwise, potentially fruitful discussions about the relationship between the two texts can quickly deteriorate into arguments over authorship, translation, and source."²⁵² There are several problems with Frederick's statement.

First, it is highly problematic if a methodological approach is held hostage from the beginning because other scholars cannot stay focused on the topic at hand. Second, when discussing the relationship between the KJV and the BM the texts themselves should dictate

²⁵¹ Nicholas J. Frederick, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon."

²⁵² Frederick, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon," 9.

how we should understand the relationship. Contrary to Frederick's statement,²⁵³ the BM formally quotes the NT often enough to let us know that its author is aware of that text. Questions of authorship can stay simply at the level of "the author of the BM" and remain neutral enough to include all interested parties.²⁵⁴ This should be particularly true when comparing the BM to the KJV. As Stanly Porter has pointed out, and Frederick quoted near the beginning of his essay, if this is taken "at least there is now debate over data, as opposed to hypotheses about reconstructed competencies"²⁵⁵ or getting heated debates by calling in specific personalities as author (i.e. JS, Nephi, Mormon, etc.).

Third, the fact that others cannot deal with the implications of using terms like quotation, allusion, and echo should not dictate whether or not those terms ought to be used. What should be decisive is if quotation, allusion, and echo of the NT in the BM can be demonstrated or not. As the lengthy dissertation of Frederick has shown, it is more than demonstrable. It is demonstrable when using only the first eighteen verses of the gospel of John, how much more so if studies similar to Frederick's dissertation looked at the use of every verse of the NT?

In the end Frederick opted to use the term "biblical interaction" rather than offer terms that dealt with what he had previously demonstrated was happening in the BM text. Instead of quotation, allusion, and echo Frederick used in their place "precise biblical interactions," "probable biblical interactions," and "possible biblical interactions." Frederick reduced the concrete terms down to something abstract that approach a general intertext more than it does

²⁵³ "...the Book of Mormon rarely acknowledges its interactions with the Bible through formal quotations, with the exception of lengthy excerpts of Isaiah quoted by Nephi or Zenos's olive-tree allegory quoted by Jacob," in Frederick, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon," 7.

²⁵⁴ If needed, "the author(s) of the BM" could be utilized if that will ease the possible tension for some readers. In this case the question of authorship would be left to the specific verse or pericope that is under examination. That could leave the question sufficiently open for any involved to discuss the issues.

²⁵⁵ Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 95; also cited in Frederick, "Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon," 6, nt. 18.

anything else. In that context it is unclear whether precise, probable, or possible have any meaning at all because any number of connections or interactions can be made between any two texts. The work that Frederick was able to accomplish in his dissertation was offset by replacing his method with something of little concrete substance.

Joseph Spencer

Spencer wrote an increasingly influential book meant to be a primer on typology in the BM.²⁵⁶ The book is organized around two major characters of the BM: Nephi and Abinadi. Each character is allotted two chapters, one each on exegesis, and then one on hermeneutics for Nephi and another on theology for Abinadi. In the course of his research Spencer occasionally made source-critical notes about what lays behind the text of the BM.²⁵⁷ Like several of the other studies already noted, he failed to make connections with the NT where it would offer the best explanation for the evidence. In discussing Alma's conversion story in Alma 36, Spencer states, "the sequence of events associated with Lehi's first vision from 1 Nephi 1:5-7 is strikingly parallel to that of Alma's encounter with the angel described in Alma 36:6-12."²⁵⁸

While there may be similarities between the two accounts, it is not that difficult when reading Alma 36 to realize that a much more striking parallel of Alma's conversion is the description of Paul's conversion in Acts 9, but this goes unmentioned in Spencer's analysis.²⁵⁹ In other places Spencer makes strained connections between texts, assigning vague relationships to the connections he perceives to be present between them.²⁶⁰

²⁵⁶ Joseph Spencer, *An Other Testament: On Typology* (Salem: Salt Press, 2012). The book has recently been printed in a second edition at the Neal A. Maxwell Institute of Brigham Young University.

²⁵⁷ In the first chapter, under the section, "Exegetical Preliminaries: Sources," Spencer asks, "What textual sources lie behind Alma 36?" Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 8.

²⁵⁸ Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 8.

²⁵⁹ Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 8-11. Cf. pages 19-20, 26.

²⁶⁰ Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 55-56.

When the connections are explicit, like Nephi's use of Isaiah, Spencer's connections are more reliable, but he still fails to explain fully some of the most important issues in approaching the way the BM uses the bible. Unlike most BM scholars before him, Spencer recognizes and accepts the scholarly consensus of the tripartite separation of Isaiah.²⁶¹ In this regard, though, Spencer avoids the question of whether or not the Nephite authors would have access to Deutero-Isaiah and instead focuses on recent scholarship that has argued for the theological unity of the entire book of Isaiah. By doing so Spencer addresses some of the recent scholarship and then is able to move on and discuss how the Nephites seem to have understood Isaiah to have only one author. While this works for his study for a time, he assumes, against the scholarly consensus, that the Nephites would have had access to all three of the sections of Isaiah. His approach becomes more problematic once Isaiah is mediated through the NT and into the BM.

In his second chapter on hermeneutics and Nephi, Spencer attempts to compare Deutero-Isaiah and 1 Nephi. He focuses on 1 Ne. 10 and the prophecy of the Messiah being baptized in water. Spencer notes how important Bethabara is as a location, "both historically and doctrinally...for Nephi."²⁶² He claims that the passage in 1 Ne. 10 draws on a passage from Deutero-Isaiah, but also notes that others might object to this connection because 1 Ne. 10 more closely connects with the NT. He is correct that others would object, because his claims about this pericope are simply untenable.

First, he argues that the rendering of Isa. 40:3 is identical to the synoptic gospels and significantly differs from the gospel of John. While this is true for the line, "prepare ye the way of the Lord, and make his paths straight," it is inaccurate and misleading to then claim that the

²⁶¹ Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 58.

²⁶² Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 71.

source behind Lehi's words is ultimately Isa. 40:3.²⁶³ To separate derived language and source the way that Spencer does is very problematic, and I am left wondering what the substantive difference between the two actually is. His explanation of the sources behind 1 Ne. 10 is far too simplistic, even though his purposes are to extract Deutero-Isaiah from the text. When you have KJV language that comes specifically from the KJV of the synoptic gospels (not Isa. 40:3), that is then blended with concepts and place names specific to the outlier gospel of John,²⁶⁴ the ultimate source of the language and ideas is the four gospels compiled together in the NT. This is not simply a case of language being passed through the NT, from Deutero-Isaiah and into the BM. The gospels have affected the way the text of the BM was composed, and is therefore the ultimate source of these passages.

While Spencer's study has a very different focus than I have here in the present study, he still could have been more careful in his observations, and that attention to detail could have assisted him still in his conclusions. My arguments here do little to his overall thesis, but these points make it clear, along with many of the other studies already reviewed, that it is now currently and has been in the past a trend in BM studies to fail to make some of the most basic and essential observations on the BM's relationship with the Bible.

2. Part II: The Documentary Hypothesis²⁶⁵

Although not as widely accepted now as it was in the mid-20th century, the DH remains the prominent thesis for understanding the final form of the Pentateuch. It has been argued that its intellectual history goes back to at least the early rabbinic period with hints that Moses did not write all of the Pentateuch, at least the eight verses in Deuteronomy describing his

²⁶³ Spencer, *An Other Testament*, 72.

²⁶⁴ Notice how in the bolded section of 1 Ne. 10:8, as provided by Spencer, includes the synoptic phrase, "mightier than I," in the middle of the informal quotation from John 1:26-27. The BM text blends the synoptic and Johannine traditions together.

²⁶⁵ Henceforth DH.

death.²⁶⁶ It was the general method of rabbinic and later medieval Jewish scholars to look elsewhere in the HB to answer the narrative problems, such as the issue of whether it was the Ishmaelites or Midianites that sold Joseph into Egypt (Gen. 37:18-36; the text has both parties selling him).²⁶⁷ It would not be until the period of the Reformation that the problems of the narrative of the Pentateuch would be approached on their own terms. The idea that the focus should be on the text of scripture rather than on the inherited traditions would eventually lay the groundwork for identifying the literary problems of the Pentateuch.

The classical DH springs out of the necessity to answer the literary problems that arise from a close reading of the narratives found in the Pentateuch itself. Exegetes had long noticed issues dealing with doublets or repetition of stories, contradictions within single narratives, various uses of divine names, discontinuities of plot, and so forth. Over time scholarly literature grew to the extent that a hypothesis was needed to answer all these issues. This scholarship came together to form a single hypothesis under the authorship of a German scholar named Julius Wellhausen.

Wellhausen organized the work of many of his contemporaries and those who came before him, and argued that there were four complete documents (hence the name DH) that were compiled by a redactor in the post-exilic era of Israelite history. These sources, in the order that they were written according to Wellhausen,²⁶⁸ are: Yahwist (J),²⁶⁹ Elohist (E),

²⁶⁶ See the discussion of specific verses that certain Rabbis assigned to Joshua rather than Moses in Joel Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 13ff.

²⁶⁷ Probably the most interesting formulation in response to the issue of whether the Ishmaelites or the Midianites sold Joseph into Egypt was that of Nahmanides, a thirteenth century Jewish scholar in Spain. Nahmanides understood the narrative of Gen. 37 to be describing the Ishmaelites and Midianites working together to sell Joseph, with the Midianites hiring camels from the Ishmaelites. See the discussion of Nahmanides, among other Jewish and Christian thinkers, in Baden *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 5-8.

²⁶⁸ Wellhausen thought that it was impossible to prove this part of the hypothesis. See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 7.

²⁶⁹ For introductory remarks on these sources, see Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 6-10.

Deuteronomy (D), and Priestly (P) sources. Although the theory as Wellhausen argued it had several problems, it remained the dominant thesis in biblical scholarship well into the 20th century. It was not until the work of Rolf Rendtorff²⁷⁰ that serious challenges to the hypothesis began to be leveled against the DH. Jean-Louis Ska equates the work of Rendtorff and his contemporaries with “the world rising up out of the ruins” of the broken post-WWII world.²⁷¹ In this context “The great masters of the past have been unmasked, and even the foundations of research have begun to crumble.”²⁷² This approach led to questioning not only the sources that had previously been identified by critical scholarship, but the historical-critical process in general. It is now the norm in European scholarship to reject the classical DH, at least the J and E sources.

While not everyone agrees with the DH there are some commonalities between the various approaches,²⁷³ and all current theories follow some version of the DH.²⁷⁴ Contemporary European approaches argue that the sources P and D not only exist, but are easily discernible, while the rest of the texts either fall under the categories of non-P or non-D.

2.1 Current Trends in Pentateuchal Scholarship

The field of Pentateuchal scholarship has been in a place of transition for several decades now, where American/Israeli approaches to the Pentateuch were not in close dialogue with

²⁷⁰ See especially his *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (transl. John J. Scullion; JSOTSup, 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977).

²⁷¹ Jean Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (transl. Sr. Pascale Dominique; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 127.

²⁷² Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 128.

²⁷³ For the best single volume representation of the various approaches, see Thomas B. Dozeman, et al, eds., *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 78; Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

²⁷⁴ For a similar comment see Michael D. Coogan, *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures* (Second Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 55. Konrad Schmid, a leading scholar in Pentateuchal criticism, commented at the Society of Biblical Literature’s 2013 annual meeting in Baltimore, MD that even Europeans who discard the classical DH still consider themselves “documentarians” (Witnessed by the author at the session on the Pentateuch).

European trends. This has caused a major rift between the scholars from the respective areas of the world, but as of the last five or so years there appears to be a movement that aims to bridge the gap and bring researchers back to more open dialogue with one another. The fruits have already begun to show in several publications, even though there are still significant differences in approach.

In American and Israeli scholarship there has arisen a “neo-Documentary Hypothesis,” which has several younger scholars at its head defending a new and refined version of the classical DH. Joel Baden and Jeffrey Stackert, in particular, represent this movement. Baden’s doctoral dissertation examined several assumptions in the classical DH that for decades went unquestioned, particularly the assumption that both the J and E documents were edited together at an early stage in the history of the composition of the Pentateuch.²⁷⁵ He showed that if J and E were actual documents at one point in history, which he argues strongly that they were, then they were not combined until all four sources of the DH were combined together. He also argued against the developments in the first half of the 19th century that saw several redactors bringing the Pentateuch together. He concluded that not only were J and E always separate until the time they were edited together with D and P, there was also only one major redactor.²⁷⁶

Jeffrey Stackert’s work focuses on the use of the Covenant Collection (CC) and Deuteronomy by the Holiness Legislation.²⁷⁷ The Holiness School, commonly denoted as ‘H’, wrote Lev. 17-26, but the work of Israel Knohl in the early 1990s has created a consensus that

²⁷⁵ Joel S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

²⁷⁶ Baden has also written an important study that utilizes German and American/Israeli models for understanding the Pentateuch. This book is essential reading for all those interested in this field. See Joel S. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

²⁷⁷ Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

the influence of H was much wider than that block of chapters in Leviticus.²⁷⁸ Dependent himself, as most scholars now are, on Knohl's research on the H, Stackert argues convincingly that these later authors were not only aware of but transformed many of the laws found in the CC for their own purposes. His research generally supports the findings of other contemporary scholars who follow a version of the DH.

Representing another approach, Konrad Schmid has been an important scholar in the European approach to understanding the composition of the Pentateuch. He has argued that the methodology of many other scholars to treat the DH and the Supplementary or Fragmentary hypotheses as exclusive is a shortcoming in contemporary research.²⁷⁹ Elsewhere, Schmid has argued that P was the first to bring together the themes the primeval story, the patriarchal story, and the exodus story.²⁸⁰ This means that the non-P materials in the Pentateuch were not narratives that had been coherently edited or written together prior to the composition of P (in the early Persian period), and therefore were not source documents. This excludes both J and E as source documents, but retains P and D as documents.

The description above, although very brief and simplistic, provides a window into the current state of Pentateuchal criticism. In American/Israeli models, the DH has found new life and has been refined and tightened to ensure that past criticisms of the theory have been explained, and hopefully future failings of the theory will be minimal. In European schools J and E have both fallen out of favor, and are generally not accepted by European researchers as viable source documents.

²⁷⁸ Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).

²⁷⁹ Konrad Schmid, "Has European Scholarship Abandoned the Documentary Hypothesis? Some Reminders on Its History and Remarks on Its Current Status," in Thomas B. Dozeman, et al, *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 17.

²⁸⁰ Konrad Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story: Israel's Dual Origins in the Hebrew Bible* (Siphrut: Literature and Theology of the Hebrew Scriptures, 3; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

I follow the contention of Baden and others that in order to grapple with the text of the Pentateuch the scholar must first begin with the text of the Pentateuch that we have, and work back from there. Baden has shown in his research that there are several places throughout the Pentateuch that create narrative continuity within each of the four documents, and has made a sustained and coherent argument for the viability of a refined view of the J source. It is primarily his work that the current study relies most heavily upon.

3. Locating Textual Dependence in the BM on the J Source

In this section I provide the full list of comparisons between the Yahwist and the BM. This will show the extent of the influence of the Yahwistic source on the BM, but will also highlight the fact that the BM text has also been influenced by the Priestly source, as well as numerous NT verses.

My original goal for this section was to only highlight the influence of J, but the more I collected the data it became apparent that J texts had been read with other sections of the KJV by the author of the BM. The texts work as what many who study intertextuality in the HB and NT have called a “chorus” or “symphony” of voices singing together. It is not a single Pentateuchal or Biblical source that has influenced the composition of the BM, but rather a meshing together of almost all of the books of the KJV.²⁸¹

3.1 The Yahwist in the BM²⁸²

BM Title Page, par. 2, lines 1-2 = Gen. 11:4a, 9a (A)

BM: Also, which is a record of the People of Jared, which were scattered at the time the LORD confounded the language of the people when they were building a tower to get to Heaven...

KJV: 4a And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven... 9a Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth...

1 Ne. Intro = Ex. 3:18b | 8:27 (P)

BM: He taketh three days' journey into the wilderness with his family.

²⁸¹ Contra John Sorenson (“The ‘Brass Plates’ and Biblical Scholarship,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 10, No. 4 [Autumn, 1977], 31-39), who has argued that the Pentateuchal text that the BM authors have access to on the Brass Plates is likely the Elohist (E) source. See also my comments on Noel Reynolds’ essay, “The Brass Plates Version of Genesis,” in Section 1.4.

²⁸² The text-critical notes in this section compare the base text (i.e. the 1830 edition of the BM) with the extant original (O) and printer’s manuscripts (P), as well as Skousen’s *The Book of Mormon: The Earliest Text* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009) (S). If a verse has an asterisk (*) this signifies that the section of O is no longer extant.

KJV: 18b and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the LORD our God...

KJV: 27 We will go three days' journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice to the LORD our God, as he shall command us.

1 Ne. 2:3 = Num. 27:22 (E)

BM: And it came to pass that he was obedient unto the word of the Lord, where²⁸³ he did as the Lord commanded him.

KJV: And Moses did as the LORD commanded him: and he took Joshua, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation.

1 Ne. 2:6-7 = Ex. 3:18b; 8:27 | Gen. 26:17 (E)

BM: 6 And it came to pass that when he had traveled three days in the wilderness, he pitched his tent in a valley beside²⁸⁴ a river of water. 7 And it came to pass that he built an altar of stones, and he made an offering unto the Lord, and gave thanks unto the Lord our God.

KJV: 18b and now let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may sacrifice to the LORD our God... 27 We will go three days' journey into the wilderness, and sacrifice to the LORD our God, as he shall command us.

BM: 6b he pitched his tent in a valley beside a river of water.

KJV: 17 And Isaac departed thence, and pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar, and dwelt there.

1 Ne. 2:22 = Gen. 27:29 (E)

BM: And inasmuch as thou shalt keep my commandments, thou shalt be made a ruler and a teacher over thy brethren.

KJV: Let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee: cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee.

1 Ne. 3:2 = Gen. 37:9a (I. Q.)

BM: And it came to pass that he spake unto me, saying: Behold, I have dreamed a dream, in the which the Lord hath commanded me that thou and thy brethren shall return to Jerusalem.

KJV: and he dreamed yet another dream, and told it his brethren, and said, Behold, I have dreamed a dream more...

1 Ne. 3:15 = Gen. 43:5 (E)

²⁸³ P, S: wherefore; O: where(fore)

²⁸⁴ P: by the side of

BM: But behold I said unto them, that as the Lord liveth, and as we live, we will not go down unto our father in the wilderness, until we have accomplished the thing which the Lord hath commanded us.

KJV: But if thou wilt not send him, we will not go down: for the man said unto us, Ye shall not see my face, except your brother be with you.

1 Ne. 4:2-3 = Ex. 14:16, 22-23, 30 (A)

BM: 2 therefore let us go up; let us be strong like unto Moses: For he truly spake unto the waters of the Red Sea, and they divided hither and thither, and our fathers came through out of captivity on dry ground, and the armies of Pharaoh²⁸⁵ did follow and were drowned²⁸⁶ in the waters of the Red Sea. 3 Now behold ye know that this is true; and ye also know that an angel hath spoken unto you, wherefore can ye doubt. Let us go up; the Lord is able to deliver us, even as our fathers, and to destroy Laban, even as the Egyptians.

KJV: 16 But lift thou up thy rod, and stretch out thine hand over the sea, and divide it: and the children of Israel shall go on dry ground through the midst of the sea... 22 And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left. 23 And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea, even all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen... 30 Thus the LORD saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore.

1 Ne. 5:11-12 = Gen. 1:1-5:5 (A)

BM: 11 And he beheld that they did contain the five Books of Moses, which gave an account of the creation of the world, and also of Adam and Eve, which²⁸⁷ was our first parents; 12 and also a record of the Jews from the beginning, even down to the commencement of the reign of Zedekiah, King of Judah;

1 Ne. 7:14a = Gen. 6:3 (E)

BM: For, behold, the spirit²⁸⁸ of the Lord ceaseth²⁸⁹ soon to strive with them; for behold, they have rejected the prophets, and Jeremiah have they cast into prison...

KJV: And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

1 Ne. 8:10-13, 15-17, 23, 27-28, 30 = Gen. 2:25; 3:2, 3, 6 (E)

BM: 10 And it came to pass that I beheld a tree, whose fruit was desirable, to make one happy. 11 And it came to pass that I did go forth, and partake²⁹⁰ of the fruit thereof; and I²⁹¹ beheld that it was most sweet, above all that I ever had²⁹² before tasted. Yea, and I

²⁸⁵ O: Pharro; P: pharia

²⁸⁶ O: drowned

²⁸⁷ P: [^]who which [^]was was

²⁸⁸ P: the [^]spirit the Lord

²⁸⁹ O: cea{th|s}es

²⁹⁰ O, S: partook; P: part{ook\ake}

²⁹¹ O, S: and beheld

²⁹² P: I ever ~~had~~ before

beheld that the fruit thereof was white, to exceed all the whiteness that I had ever seen. 12 And as I partook of the fruit thereof, it filled my soul with exceeding great joy; wherefore, I began to be desirous that my family should partake of it also; for I knew that it was desirous²⁹³ above all other fruit 13 And as I cast my eyes round²⁹⁴ about, that perhaps I might discover my family also,²⁹⁵ I beheld a river of water; and it ran along, and it was near the tree of which I was partaking the fruit...15 And it came to pass that I beckoned unto them; and I also did say unto them, with a loud voice, that they should come unto me, and partake of the fruit, which was desirable above all other fruit. 16 And it came to pass that they did come unto me, and partake of the fruit also. 17 And it came to pass that I was desirous that Laman and Lemuel should come and partake of the fruit also; wherefore, I cast mine eyes towards²⁹⁶ the head of the river, that perhaps I might see them...23 And it came to pass that there arose a mist of darkness; yea, even an exceeding great mist of darkness, insomuch that they which²⁹⁷ had commenced in the path, did lose their way, that they wandered off, and were lost...27 and it was filled with people, both old and young, both male and female; and their manner of dress was exceeding fine; and they were in the attitude of mocking and pointing their fingers towards those which²⁹⁸ had come at,²⁹⁹ and were partaking of the fruit. 28 And after that³⁰⁰ they had tasted of the fruit, they were ashamed, because of those that were³⁰¹ scoffing at them; and they fell away into forbidden paths, and were lost...30...Behold, he saw other multitudes pressing forward;³⁰² and they came and caught hold of the end of the rod of iron; and they did press their way forward, continually holding fast to the rod of iron, until they came forth and fell down, and partook of the fruit of the tree.

KJV: 2:25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed... 3:2 And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: 3 But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die... 6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

1 Ne. 8:27 = Gen. 19:4 (E)

BM: and it was filled with people, both old and young, both male and female; and their manner of dress was exceeding fine; and they were in the attitude of mocking and pointing their fingers towards those which³⁰³ had come at,³⁰⁴ and were partaking of the fruit.

293 P: desire^{able}ous

294 S: around

295 O, S: also, and I; P: also & I beheld

296 O, S: toward

297 P: ^{who}which

298 ^{who}which

299 O, S: up

300 P: that

301 O, P, S: were a scoffing

302 S: forwards

303 ^{who}which

304 O, S: up

KJV: But before they lay down, the men of the city, even the men of Sodom, compassed the house round, both old and young, all the people from every quarter:

1 Ne. 11:21 = Gen. 3:3 (E)

BM: And the angel said unto me, behold the Lamb of God, yea, even the Eternal³⁰⁵ Father! Knowest thou the meaning of the tree which thy father saw?

KJV: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.

1 Ne. 11:25 = Gen. 2:9; 3:22, 24 (E)

BM: And it came to pass that I beheld that the rod of iron which my father had seen, was the word of God, which led to the fountain of living waters, or to the tree of life; which waters are a representation of the love of God; and I also beheld that the tree of life was a representation of the love of God.

KJV: 2:9 And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil...3:22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:...24 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

1 Ne. 12:18 = Deut. 33:21 (E)

BM: and the large and spacious building which thy father saw, is vain imaginations, and the pride of the children of men. And a great and³⁰⁶ terrible gulf divideth them; yea, even the word³⁰⁷ of the justice of the Eternal God, and Jesus³⁰⁸ Christ, which is the Lamb of God, of whom the Holy Ghost beareth record, from the beginning of the world until this time, and from this time henceforth and forever.

KJV: And he provided the first part for himself, because there, in a portion of the lawgiver, was he seated; and he came with the heads of the people, he executed the justice of the LORD, and his judgments with Israel.

1 Ne. 15:21 = Gen. 31:10 (E)

BM: And it came to pass that they did speak unto me again, saying: What meaneth the³⁰⁹ thing³¹⁰ which³¹¹ our father saw in a dream? What meaneth the tree which he saw?

³⁰⁵ P: eternal ~~God~~ Father

³⁰⁶ P, S: and a terrible

³⁰⁷ S, O: sword

³⁰⁸ P: & [^]Mosiah Jesus Christ [^]who which is

³⁰⁹ P: meaneth th{e\i}s thing

³¹⁰ S: things

³¹¹ P: which ~~of~~ our

KJV: And it came to pass at the time that the cattle conceived, that I lifted up mine eyes, and saw in a dream, and, behold, the rams which leaped upon the cattle were ringstraked, speckled, and grisled.

1 Ne. 15:22, 28, 36 = Gen. 2:9; 3:22, 24 (E)

BM: 22 And I said unto them, it was a representation of the tree of life... 28 and I said unto them, that it was an awful gulf, which separateth the wicked from the tree of life, and also from the Saints of God... 36 wherefore, the wicked are rejected³¹² from the righteous, and also from that tree of life, whose fruit is most precious and most desirable above³¹³ all other fruits; yea, and it is the greatest of all the gifts of God...

KJV: 2:9 And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil...3:22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:...24 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

1 Ne. 17:25 = Ex. 2:23; 5:13 (A)

BM: Now ye know that the children of Israel were in bondage; and ye know that they were laden with tasks, which were grievous to be borne; wherefore, ye know that it must needs be a good thing for them, that they should be brought out of bondage.

KJV: 2:23 And it came to pass in process of time, that the king of Egypt died: and the children of Israel sighed by reason of the bondage, and they cried, and their cry came up unto God by reason of the bondage...5:13 And the taskmaster hastened them, saying, Fulfil your works, your daily tasks, as when there was straw.

1 Ne. 17:26-27 = Ex. 14:28, 31 (A)

BM: 26 Now ye know that Moses was commanded of the Lord to do that great work; and ye know that by his word, the waters of the Red Sea were³¹⁴ divided hither and thither, and they passed through on dry ground. 27 But ye know that the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, which³¹⁵ were the armies of Pharaoh;

KJV: 28 And the waters returned, and covered the chariots, and the horseman, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them; there remained not so much as one of them...31 And Israel saw that great work which the LORD did upon the Egyptians: and the people feared the LORD, and believed the LORD, and his servant Moses.

1 Ne. 17:29 = Ex. 17:6; Num. 20:11 (I. Q.)

³¹² S, O: separated

³¹³ S, O: of

³¹⁴ P, S: was

³¹⁵ P: wh{i\o}eh

BM: yea, and ye also know that Moses, by his word, according to the power of God which was in him,³¹⁶ smote the rock, and there came forth water, that the children of Israel might quench their thirst;

KJV: 17:6 Behold, I will stand before thee upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel.

20:11 And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts also.

1 Ne. 17:30 = Ex. 13:21 (I. Q.)

BM: and notwithstanding they being led, the Lord their God, their Redeemer,³¹⁷ going before them, leading them by day, and giving light unto them by night, and doing all things for them which was³¹⁸ expedient for man to receive, they hardened their hearts, and blinded their minds, and reviled against Moses and against the true and living God.

KJV: And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night:

2 Ne. 1:21 = Gen. 42:38; 44:29, 31 (E)

BM: And now that my soul might have joy in you, and that my heart might leave this world with gladness because of you; that I might not be brought down with grief and sorrow to the grave, arise from the dust, my sons, and be men, and be determined in one mind, and in one heart united in all things, that ye may not come down into captivity;

KJV: 42:38 And he said, My son shall not go down with you; for his brother is dead, and he is left alone: if mischief befall him by the way in the which ye go, then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave... 44:29 And if ye take this also from me, and mischief befall him, ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave... 31 It shall come to pass, when he seeth that the lad is not with us, that he will die: and thy servants shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow to the grave.

2 Ne. 2:13 = Allusion to creation (A)*

BM: And if ye shall say there is no law, ye shall also say there is no sin.³¹⁹ If ye shall say there is no sin, ye shall also say there is no righteousness.—And if there be no righteousness, there be no happiness. And if there be no righteousness nor happiness, there be no punishment nor misery. And if these things are not, there is no God. And if there is no God, we are not, neither the earth: for there could have been no creation of things, neither to act nor to be acted upon; wherefore all things must have vanished away.

2 Ne. 2:14 = Allusion to Creation (A)

³¹⁶ O: him <th{e}re> smote

³¹⁷ S: Redeemer, saying going

³¹⁸ P: [^]were ~~was~~

³¹⁹ S: sin. And if

BM: And now, my sons,³²⁰ I speak unto you these things, for your profit and learning; for there is a God, and he hath created all things, both the heavens and the earth, and all things that in them is; both things to act, and things to be acted upon;

2 Ne. 2:15-16 = Gen. 2:9, 17(A)*

BM: 15 and to bring about his eternal purposes in the end of man, after that he had created our first parents, and the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the air, and in fine, all things which are created, it must needs be that there was an opposition; even the forbidden fruit in opposition to the tree of life; the one being sweet and the other bitter; 16 wherefore, the Lord God gave unto man, that he should act for himself. Wherefore, man could not act for himself, save it should be that he were enticed by the one or the other.

KJV: 9 And out of the ground made the LORD God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil...17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.

2 Ne. 2:17-20, 22-23, 25 = Gen. 3:1, 4-6, 23-24 (F. Q.)*

BM: 17 And I, Lehi, according to the things which I have read, must needs supposed,³²¹ that an angel of God, according to that which is written, had fallen from Heaven; wherefore, he became a Devil, having sought that which was evil before God. 18 And because that³²² he had fallen from Heaven, and had become³²³ miserable forever, he sought also the misery of all mankind. – Wherefore, he sayeth³²⁴ unto Eve, yea, even that old serpent, which is the Devil, which is the father of all lies; wherefore he sayeth,³²⁵ Partake of the forbidden fruit, and ye shall not die, but ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil. 19 And after that³²⁶ Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit, they were driven out from the garden of Eden, to till the earth. 20 And they have brought forth children; yea, even the family of all the earth...22 And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed, he would not have fallen; but he would have remained in the garden of Eden. And all things which were created, must have remained in the same state which they were, after that they were created; and they must have remained forever, and had no end. 23 And they would have had no children; wherefore, they would have remained in a state of innocence, having no joy, for they knew no misery: doing no good, for they knew no sin...25 Adam fell, that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy.

KJV: 1 Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the LORD God had made: and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?...4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: 5 For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. 6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for good, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise,

³²⁰ P: Son

³²¹ S: suppose

³²² P: ~~that~~

³²³ P: became

³²⁴ P, S: saith

³²⁵ P, S: saith

³²⁶ P: ~~that~~

she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. . .²³ Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. ²⁴ So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

2 Ne. 2:19 = Ex. 10:11 (E)*

BM: And after that Adam and Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit, they were driven out from the garden of Eden, to till the earth.

KJV: Not so: go now ye that are men, and serve the LORD; for that you did desire. And they were driven out from Pharaoh's presence.

2 Ne. 2:20 = Gen. 4:1-2; 4:1-8:17(?) (A)*

BM: And they have brought forth children; yea, even the family of all the earth.

KJV: 1 And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD. 2 And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground.

2 Ne. 2:23 = Gen. 4:1ff. (A)*

BM: And they would have had no children; wherefore, they would have remained in a state of innocence, having no joy, for they knew no misery: doing no good, for they knew no sin.

KJV: 1 And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.

2 Ne. 5:3 = Gen. 37:20 (E)*

BM: Yea, they did murmur against me, saying: Our younger brother thinketh³²⁷ to rule over us; and we have had much trial because of him; wherefore, now let us slay him, that we may not be afflicted more because of his words. For behold, we will not that³²⁸ he shall be our ruler: for it belongeth³²⁹ unto us, which³³⁰ are the elder brethren, to rule over this people.

KJV: Come now, therefore, and let us slay him, and cast him into some pit; and we will say, Some evil beast hath devoured him: and we shall see what will become of his dreams.

2 Ne. 6:3 = Gen. 1-3 (A)*

BM: nevertheless, I speak unto you again: for I am desirous for the welfare of your souls. Yea, mine anxiety is great for you; and ye yourselves know that it ever has been. For I have exhorted you with all diligence; and I have taught you the words of my father; and I have spoken unto you concerning all things which are written from the creation of the world.

³²⁷ P: think {e/s} th

³²⁸ P: not ^{^have}that ^{^him}he ^{^to}shall be

³²⁹ P: belong {e/s} th

³³⁰ P: whi {c/o} th

2 Ne. 9:9 = Gen. 3:13 (A)*

BM: And our spirits must have become like unto him, and we become Devils, Angels to a Devil, to be shut out from the presence of our God, and to remain with the father of lies, in misery, like unto himself; yea, to that being who beguiled our first parents; who transformeth himself nigh unto an angel of light, and stirreth up the children of men unto secret combinations of murder, and all manner of secret works of darkness.

KJV: And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

2 Ne. 9:21 = Gen. 2-4 (A)*

BM: And he cometh into the world that he may save all men, if they will hearken unto his voice: for behold, he suffereth the pains of all men; yea, the pains of every living creature, both men women and children, which³³¹ belong to the family of Adam.

2 Ne. 9:26 = Gen. 2:7 (A)*

BM: for the atonement satisfieth the demands of his justice upon all those who have³³² not the law given to them, that they are delivered from that awful monster, death and hell, and the Devil, and the lake of fire and brimstone, which is endless torment; and they are restored to that God who gave them breath, which is the Holy One of Israel.

KJV: And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

2 Ne. 11:7 = Allusion to creation (A)*

BM: For if there be no Christ, there be no God; and if there be no God, we are not, for there could have been no creation.— But there is a God, and he is Christ; and he cometh in the fulness of his own time.

2 Ne. 25:20 = Ex. 17:6 (A)*

BM: And now my brethren, I have spoken plain, that ye cannot err; and as the Lord God liveth, that brought Israel up out of the land of Egypt, and gave unto Moses power that he should heal the nations, after that they had been bitten by the poisonous serpents, if they would cast their eyes unto the serpent which he did raise up before them, and also gave him power that he should smite the rock, and the water should come forth; yea, behold I say unto you, that as these things are true, and as the Lord God liveth, there is none other name given under heaven, save it be this Jesus Christ of which I have spoken, whereby man can be saved.

KJV: Behold, I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb; and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel.

³³¹ P: wh{ic\o}h

³³² P, S: hath

2 Ne. 26:11 = Gen. 6:3 (I. Q.)*

BM: for the spirit of the Lord will not always strive with man. And when the spirit ceaseth to strive with man, then cometh speedy destruction; and this grieveth my soul.

KJV: And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.

2 Ne. 29:1 = Gen. 9:16|Gen. 44:21 (E)*

BM: But behold, there shall be many at that day, when I shall proceed to do a marvelous work among them, that I may remember my covenants which I have made unto the children of men, that I may set my hand again the second time to recover my people, which are of the House of Israel;

KJV: 9:16 And the bow shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.

44:21

2 Ne. 29:2 = Gen. 9:16 (E)*

BM: and also, that I may remember the promises which I have made unto thee, Nephi, and also unto thy father, That I would remember your seed; and that the words of your seed should proceed forth out of my mouth unto your seed. And my words shall hiss forth unto the ends of the earth, for a standard unto my people, which are of the House of Israel.

KJV: And the bow shall be in the cloud, and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth.

Jacob 2:21 = Gen. 3:19 (A)*

BM: Do ye not suppose that such things are abominable unto him, and³³³ who created all flesh? And the one being is as precious in his sight as the other. And all flesh is of³³⁴ dust; and for the self same³³⁵ end hath he created them, that they should keep his commandments, and glorify him forever.

KJV: In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it was thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

Omni 1:22 = Gen. 11:4, 8-9 (A)*

BM: It also spake a few words concerning his fathers. And his first parents came out from the Tower, at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people; and the severity of the Lord fell upon them, according to his judgments, which is³³⁶ just; and their bones lay scattered in the land northward.

³³³ P, S: him who

³³⁴ P, S: of the dust

³³⁵ S: selfsame

³³⁶ P: [^]are_{is}

KJV: 4 And they said, Go to, let us build a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth...8 So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the earth: and they left off to build the city. 9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

Mosiah 2:20-21, 23, 25-26 = Gen. 2:7 (A)*

BM: 20 I say unto you, my brethren, that if you should render all the thanks and praise which your whole souls hath³³⁷ power to possess, to that God who hath³³⁸ created you, and hath³³⁹ kept and preserved you, and hath³⁴⁰ caused that ye should rejoice, and hath³⁴¹ granted that ye should live in peace one with another; 21 I say unto you, that if ye should serve him who hath³⁴² created you from the beginning, and art preserving you from day to day, by lending you breath, that ye may live and move, and do according to your own will, and even supporting you from one moment to another; I say, if ye should serve him with all your whole soul, and³⁴³ yet ye would be unprofitable servants...23 And now in the first place, he hath created you, and granted unto you your lives, for which ye are indebted unto him...25 And now I ask, Can ye say aught of yourselves? I answer Nay.³⁴⁴ Ye cannot say that thou art even as much as the dust of the earth; yet thou was created of the dust of the earth: but behold, it belongeth to him who created you. 26 And I, even I, whom ye call your king, am no better than ye yourselves are; for I am also of the dust. And thou beholdest that I am old, and am about to yield up this mortal frame to its mother earth;

KJV: And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

Mosiah 2:27-29 = Gen. 49:1 (E)*

BM: 27 therefore, as I said unto you that I had served you, walking with a clear conscience before God, even so I at this time have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together, that I might be found blameless, and that your blood should not come upon me, when I shall stand to be judged of God of the things whereof he hath commanded me concerning you. 28 I say unto you, that I have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together, that I might rid my garments of your blood, at this period of time when I am about to go down to my grave, that I might go down in peace, and my immortal spirit may join the choirs above in singing the praises of a just God. 29 And moreover, I say unto you, that I have caused that ye should assemble yourselves together, that I might declare unto you that I can no longer be your teacher, nor your king,

KJV: And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days.

337 P: ^have|hath

338 P: ^has|hath

339 P: ^has|hath

340 P: ^has|hath

341 P: ^has|hath

342 P: ^has|hath

343 P: &

344 P: answer you nay; S: answer you: Nay

Mosiah 3:11, 16, 19, 26 = Adam (A)*

BM: 11 For behold, and also his blood atoneth for the sins of those who have fallen by the transgression of Adam, who hath³⁴⁵ died, not knowing the will of God concerning them, or³⁴⁶ who have ignorantly sinned...16 and even if it were possible that little children could sin, they could not be saved; but I say unto you, they are blessed: for behold, as in Adam, or by nature they fall, even so the blood of Christ atoneth for their sins...19 for the natural man is an enemy to God, and has been, from the fall of Adam, and will be, forever and ever; but if he yieldeth³⁴⁷ to the enticings of the Holy Spirit, and putteth off the natural man, and becometh a saint, through the atonement of Christ, the Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father...26 Therefore, they have drunk out of the cup of the wrath of God, which justice could no more deny unto them, than it could deny that Adam should fall, because of his partaking of the forbidden fruit; therefore, mercy could have claim on them no more forever.

Mosiah 4:7, 9 = Gen. 3-4 (A)*

BM: 7 I say, that this is the man that receiveth salvation, through the atonement which was prepared from the foundation of the world, for all mankind, which ever was³⁴⁸ ever since the fall of Adam, or which is³⁴⁹ or which ever shall be, even unto the end of the world; ...9 Believe in God; believe that he is, and that he created all things, both in Heaven and in Earth; believe that he hath³⁵⁰ all wisdom, and all power, both in Heaven and in Earth; believe that man doth not comprehend all the things which the Lord can comprehend.

Mosiah 10:12 = Ex. 10:11 (E)*

BM: they were a wild and ferocious, and a blood-thirsty people, believing in the tradition of their fathers, which is this: Believing that they were driven out of the land of Jerusalem because of the iniquities of their fathers, and that they were wronged in the wilderness by their brethren; and they were also wronged, while crossing the sea.

KJV: Not so: go now ye that are men, and serve the LORD; for that you did desire. And they were driven out of Pharaoh's presence.

Mosiah 10:16 = Ex. 34:4 (I. Q.)*

BM: And again: They were wroth with him, because he departed into the wilderness as the Lord³⁵¹ commanded him, and took the records which were engraven on the plates of brass; for they said he robbed them.

345 P: ^have~~hath~~

346 P: ^or~~e~~

347 P: yie{n\l}d{e\s}t

348 P: w{as\er}e

349 P: ^who~~which~~ ^are~~is~~ or ^who~~which~~

350 P: ha{th\s}

351 P: Lord had commanded

KJV: And he hewed two tables of stone, like unto the first: and Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto mount Sinai, as the LORD had commanded him, and took in his hand the two tables of stone.

as the Lord had commanded him and took

Mosiah 11:26 = Ex. 4:24 (E)*

BM: Now it came to pass that when Abinadi had spoken³⁵² these words unto them, they were wroth with him, and sought to take away his life; but the Lord delivered him out of their hands.

KJV: And it came to pass, by the way in the inn, that the LORD met him, and sought to kill him.

Mosiah 16:3 = Gen. 3:13, 22 (A)*

BM: for they are carnal and devilish, and the devil hath³⁵³ power over them; yea, even that old serpent that did beguile our first parents, which was the cause of their fall; which was the cause of all mankind³⁵⁴ becoming carnal, sensual, devilish,³⁵⁵ knowing evil from good, subjecting themselves to the devil.

KJV: 13 And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat...22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:

Mosiah 19:7 = Gen. 42:21 (E)*

BM: And now the king cried out in the anguish of his soul, saying, Gideon, spare me, for the Lamanites are upon us, and they will destroy them; yea, they will destroy my people.

KJV: And they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us.

Mosiah 24:19 = Gen. 2:21 (I. Q.)*

BM: And in the morning the Lord caused a deep sleep to come upon the Lamanites, yea, and all their task-masters were in a profound sleep.

KJV: And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof.

Mosiah 28:17 = Gen. 11:4, 8-9 (A)*

BM: Now after Mosiah had finished translating these records, behold, it gave an account of the people which³⁵⁶ was destroyed, from the time³⁵⁷ they were destroyed, back to the

³⁵² P: spoke; S: spake

³⁵³ P: ha{th\s}

³⁵⁴ P: mankind; S: mankind's

³⁵⁵ S: devilish

³⁵⁶ P: ^who, which ^were, was

³⁵⁷ P, S: time that they

building of the great tower, at the time the Lord confounded the language of the people; and they were scattered abroad upon the face of all the earth, yea, and even from that time until the creation of Adam.

KJV: 4 And they said, Go to, let us build a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth...8 So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the earth: and they left off to build the city. 9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

Alma 8:22 = Gen. 19:3 (E)*

BM: And it came to pass that Alma ate bread and³⁵⁸ was filled; and he blessed Amulek and his house, and he gave thanks unto God.

KJV: And he pressed upon them greatly; and they turned in unto him, and entered into his house: and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat.

Alma 10:7 = Gen. 39:5 (E)*

BM: As I was a journeying to see a very near kindred, behold an angel of the Lord appeared unto me, and said, Amulek, return to thine own house, for thou shalt feed a prophet of the Lord; yea, a holy man, which³⁵⁹ art a chosen man of God; for he hath fasteth³⁶⁰ many days because of the sins of this people, and he is an hungered, and thou shalt receive him into thy house and feed him, and he shall bless thee and thy house; and the blessing of the Lord shall rest upon thee and thy house.

KJV: And it came to pass, from the time that he had made him overseer in his house, and over all that he had, that the LORD blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake; and the blessing of the LORD was upon all that he had in the house, and in the field.

Alma 12:21-23, 26 = Gen. 3:22, 24 (F. Q.)*

BM: What does this Scripture mean, which saith that God placed Cherubims and a flaming sword on the east of the garden of Eden, lest our first parents should enter and partake of the fruit of the tree of life, and live forever? And thus we see that there was no possible chance that they should live forever. 22 Now Alma saith³⁶¹ unto him, This is the thing which I was about to explain. Now we see that Adam did fall by partaking of the forbidden fruit, according to the word of God; and thus we see that by his fall, that³⁶² all mankind became a lost and a fallen people. 23 And now behold, I say unto you, that if it had been possible for Adam for³⁶³ to have partaken of the fruit of the tree of life at that time, that there would have been no death, and the word would have been void, making God a liar: for he said, If thou eat, thou shalt surely die.—...26 And now behold, if it were possible that our first parents could have went forth and partaken of the tree of life, they would

³⁵⁸ P: and ^he was

³⁵⁹ P: ^who~~which~~^is~~art~~

³⁶⁰ P, S: fasted

³⁶¹ P: sa {th\d}

³⁶² P: fall ~~that~~ all

³⁶³ P: ~~for~~

have been forever miserable, having no preparatory state; and thus the plan of redemption would have been frustrated, and the word of God would have been void, taking none effect.

KJV: 22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever;...24 So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

Alma 12:31 = Gen. 3:5 (A)

BM: wherefore he gave commandments unto men, they having first transgressed the first commandments as to things which were temporal, and becoming as Gods, knowing good from evil, placing themselves in a state to act, or being placed in a state to act, according to their wills and pleasures, whether to do evil or to do good;

KJV: For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.

Alma 14:13 = Ex. 8:10 (E)*

BM: And Alma saith,³⁶⁴ Be it according to the will of the Lord. But behold, our work is not finished; therefore they burn us not.

KJV: And he said, To-morrow. And he said, Be it according to thy word; that thou mayest know that there is none like unto the LORD our God.

Alma 18:36 = Gen. 2-4 (A)*

BM: Now when Ammon had said these words, he began to the creation of the world, and also to the creation of Adam, and told him all the things concerning the fall of man, and rehearsed and laid before him the records and the Holy Scriptures of the people, and³⁶⁵ which had been spoken by the prophets, even down to the time that their father Lehi left Jerusalem;

Alma 22:12-13 = Gen. 1-4 (A)*

BM: 12 And it came to pass that when Aaron saw that the king would believe his words, he began from the creation of Adam, reading the Scriptures unto the king; how God created man after his own image, and that God gave him commandments, and that because of transgression, man had fallen. 13 And Aaron did expound unto him the Scriptures, from the creation of Adam, laying the fall of man before him, and their carnal state, and also the plan of redemption, which was prepared from the foundation of the world, through Christ, for all whosoever would believe on his name.

Alma 27:13 = Ex. 4:30; 24:3; Deut. 9:10 (E)

³⁶⁴ P: sai{th\d}

³⁶⁵ S: people, which

BM: And now it came to pass that Ammon went and told the king all the words which the Lord had said unto him.

KJV: 4:30 And Aaron spake all the words which the LORD had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people.

24:3 And Moses came, and told the people all the words of the LORD, and all the judgments: and all the people answered with one voice, and said, All the words which the LORD hath said will we do.

9:10 And the LORD delivered unto me two tables of stone, written with the finger of God: and on them was written according to all the words which the LORD spake with you in the mount, out of the midst of fire, in the day of the assembly.

Alma 29:11 = Ex. 3:6, 15; 4:5 (I. Q.)

BM: yea, and I also remember the captivity of my fathers; for I surely do know that the Lord did deliver them out of bondage, and by this³⁶⁶ did establish his church; yea, the Lord God, the God of Abraham,³⁶⁷ the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, did deliver them out of bondage;

KJV: 3:6 Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God...15 And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.

4:5 That they may believe that the LORD God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee.

Alma 30:29 = Gen. 45:26 (E)

BM: Now when the High Priest and the Chief Judge saw the hardness of his heart; yea, when they saw that he would revile even against God, they would not make any reply to his words; but they caused that he should be bound; and they delivered him up into the hands of the officers, and sent him to the land of Zarahemla, that he might be brought before Alma, and the Chief Judge,³⁶⁸ which was governor over all the land.

KJV: And told him, saying, Joseph is yet alive, and he is governor over all the land of Egypt. And Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not.
governor over all the land

Alma 31:31 = Num. 14:19 (E)

BM: O Lord, my heart is exceeding sorrowful; wilt thou comfort my soul in Christ? O Lord, wilt thou grant unto me that I may have strength, that I may suffer with patience these afflictions which shall come upon me, because of the iniquity of this people?

KJV: Pardon, I beseech thee, the iniquity of this people, according unto the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this people from Egypt even until now.

³⁶⁶ S, O: them

³⁶⁷ S: Abraham and the

³⁶⁸ P: [^]who ~~which~~

the iniquity of this people

Alma 36:28 = Ex. 14:27 (A)

BM: and I know that he will raise me up at the last day, to dwell with him in glory; yea, and I will praise him forever, for he hath³⁶⁹ brought our fathers out of Egypt, and he hath³⁷⁰ swallowed up the Egyptians in the red sea; and he led them by his power into the promised land; yea, and he hath³⁷¹ delivered them out of bondage and captivity, from time to time;

KJV: And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the LORD overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea.

Alma 38:4 = Gen. 26:28 (E)

BM: For I knew that thou wast in bonds; yea, and I also knew that thou wast stoned for the word's sake; and thou didst bear all these things with patience, because the Lord was with thee: and now thou knowest that the Lord did deliver thee.

KJV: And they said, we saw certainly that the LORD was with thee: and we said, Let there be now an oath betwixt us, even betwixt us and thee, and let us make a covenant with thee:

Alma 40:18 = Gen. 2-4 (A)

BM: Behold, I say unto you Nay; but it meaneth the re-uniting of the soul with the body of those from the days of Adam, down to the resurrection of Christ.

Alma 42:2-3, 5-7 = Gen. 3:5, 22-24 (and some of chapter 4) (F. Q.)

BM: 2 Now behold, my son, I will explain this thing unto thee: for behold, after the Lord God sent our first parents forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground, from whence³⁷² he was taken; yea, he drew³⁷³ out the man, and he placed at the east end of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the tree of life. 3 Now we see that the man had become as God, knowing good and evil; and lest he should put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever, that the Lord God placed Cherubims and the flaming sword, that he should not partake of the fruit...5 For behold, if Adam had put forth his hand immediately, and partook of the³⁷⁴ tree of life, he would have lived forever, according to the word of God, having no space for repentance; yea, and also the word of God would have been void, and the great plan of salvation would have been frustrated. 6 But behold, it was appointed unto man to die; therefore as they were cut off from the tree of life, therefore³⁷⁵ they should be cut off from the face of the earth; and man became lost forever; yea, they became fallen man. 7 And now we see by this, that our first parents were cut off, both temporally and spiritually,

³⁶⁹ P: hat{th\s}

³⁷⁰ P: hat{th\s}

³⁷¹ P: hat{th\s}

³⁷² P: whence ^they he w{as\er}e

³⁷³ O, S: drove

³⁷⁴ O: the <for{d|b}i> <forbidden fruit> tree of life

³⁷⁵ P: ~~therefore~~

from the presence of the Lord; and thus we see they became subjects to follow after their own will.

KJV: 5 For God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. . . 22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil. And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever; 23 'Therefore, the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. 24 So he drove out the man: and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.

Alma 51:35 = Gen. 24:66 (E)

BM: And he returned again privily to his own camp, and behold, his men were asleep; and he awoke them, and told them all the things that he had done.

KJV: And the servant told Isaac all things that he had done.

Alma 60:1 = Gen. 42:6 (E)

BM: And it came to pass that he wrote again to the governor of the land, which³⁷⁶ was Pahoran,³⁷⁷ and these are the words which he wrote, saying, Behold, I direct mine epistle to Pahoran,³⁷⁸ in the city of Zarahemla, which³⁷⁹ is the Chief Judge and the governor over the land, and also to all those who hath been chosen by this people to govern and manage the affairs of this war;

KJV: And Joseph was the governor over the land, and he it was that sold to all the people of the land: and Joseph's brethren came and bowed down themselves before him with their faces to the earth.

Alma 62:20 = Gen. 34:25 (E)*

BM: And when the night came, Moroni went forth in the darkness of the night, and came upon the top of the wall to spy out in what part of the city the Lamanites did camp with their army.

KJV: And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren, took each man his sword, and came upon the city boldly, and slew all the males.

Hel. 1:19 = Gen. 34:25 (E)

BM: But it came to pass that Coriantumr did march forth at the head of his numerous host, and came upon the inhabitants of the city, and their march was with such exceeding great speed, that there was no time for the Nephites to gather together their armies;

³⁷⁶ P: whi{c\o}h

³⁷⁷ S: Parhoran

³⁷⁸ S: Parhoran

³⁷⁹ P: whi{c\o}h

KJV: And it came to pass on the third day, when they were sore, that two of the sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, Dinah's brethren, took each man his sword, and came upon the city boldly, and slew all the males.

Hel. 3:8 = Ex. 10:5 (E)

BM: And it came to pass that they did multiply and spread, and did go forth from the land southward, to the land northward, and did spread insomuch that they began to cover the face of the whole earth, from the sea south, to the sea north, from the sea west, to the sea east.

KJV: And they shall cover the face of the earth, that one cannot be able to see the earth: and they shall eat the residue of that which is escaped, which remaineth unto you from the hail, and shall eat every tree which groweth for you out of the field:

Hel. 6:26-28 = Gen. 3:13 | 11:4 (A)*

BM: 26 Now behold, those secret oaths and covenants did not come forth unto Gadianton from the records which were delivered unto Helaman; but behold, they were put into the heart of Gadianton, by that same being who did entice our first parents to partake of the forbidden fruit; 27 yea, the³⁸⁰ same being who did plot with Cain, that if he would murder his brother Abel, it should not be known unto the world. And he did plot with Cain and his followers, from that time forth. 28 And also it is that same being who put it into the hearts of the people, to build a tower sufficiently high that they might get to Heaven. And it was that same being which led on the people which³⁸¹ came from that tower, into this land; which spread the works of darkness and abominations over all the face of the land, until he dragged the people down to an entire destruction, and to an everlasting hell;

KJV: 3:13 And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

11:4 And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

Hel. 8:16, 18-19 = Gen. 26:1, 15, 18 (A)*

BM: 16 And now behold, Moses did not only testify of these things, but also all the holy prophets, from his day even to the days of Abraham...18 Yea, and behold I say unto you, That Abraham not only knew of these things, but there were many before the days of Abraham which³⁸² were called by the order of God; yea, even after the order of his Son; and this that it should be shewn unto the people of³⁸³ a great many thousand years before his coming, that even redemption should come unto them. 19 And now I would that ye should know, that even³⁸⁴ since the days of Abraham, there hath been many prophets that

³⁸⁰ P, S: that

³⁸¹ P: wh{ic\o}h

³⁸² P: wh{ic\o}h

³⁸³ P: people a great

³⁸⁴ S: ever

hath testified these things; yea, behold, the prophet Zenos³⁸⁵ did testify boldly; for the which he was slain.

KJV: 1 And there was a famine in the land, besides the first famine that was in the days of Abraham. And Isaac went unto Abimelech king of the Philistines, unto Gerar...15 For all the wells which his father's servants had digged, in the days of Abraham his father, the Philistines had stopped them, and filled them with earth...18 And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father; for the Phillistines had stopped them after the death of Abraham: and he called their names after the names by which his father had called them.

Hel. 8:21 = Ex. 10:11 (E)*

BM: And now will ye dispute that Jerusalem was³⁸⁶ destroyed? Will ye say that the sons of Zedekiah were not slain, all except it were Mulek?³⁸⁷ Yea, and do ye not behold that the seed of Zedekiah are with us, and that³⁸⁸ they were driven out of the land of Jerusalem? But behold, this is not all.

KJV: Not so: go now ye that are men, and serve the LORD; for that you did desire. And they were driven out from Pharaoh's presence.

Hel. 14:16 = Gen. 3-4 (A)

BM: yea, behold this death bringeth to pass the resurrection, and redeemeth all mankind from the first death; that spiritual death for all mankind, by the fall of Adam, being cut off from the presence of the Lord, are considered as dead, both as to things temporal and to things spiritual.

Hel. 14:22 = Gen. 11:4 (E)*

BM: yea, they shall be rent in twain, and shall ever after be found in seams, and in cracks, and in broken fragments upon the face of the whole earth; yea, both above the earth and both³⁸⁹ beneath.

KJV: And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

Hel. 15:17 = Ex. 10:2 (I. Q.)*

BM: And now behold, saith the Lord, concerning the people of the Nephites, if they will not repent, and observe to do my will, I will utterly destroy them, saith the Lord, because of their unbelief, notwithstanding the many mighty works which I have done among them; and as surely as the Lord liveth, shall these things be, saith the Lord.

³⁸⁵ P, S: Zenos

³⁸⁶ P: was not destroyed

³⁸⁷ S: Muloch

³⁸⁸ P, S: and they

³⁸⁹ S: and beneath

KJV: And that thou mayest tell in the ears of thy son, and of thy son's son, what things I have wrought in Egypt, and my signs which I have done among them; that ye may know how that I am the LORD.

3 Ne. 1:1 = Gen. 42:6 (E)*

BM: Now it came to pass that the ninety and first year had passed away; and it was six hundred years from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem; and it was in that³⁹⁰ year that Lachoneus was the Chief Judge and the governor over the land.

KJV: 42:6 And Joseph was the governor over the land, and he it was that sold to all the people of the land: and Joseph's brethren came and bowed down themselves before him with their faces to the earth.

3 Ne. 1:17 = Gen. 11:4 (E)*

BM: and they began to know that the Son of God must shortly appear; yea,³⁹¹ in fine, all the people upon the face of the whole earth, from the west to the east, both in the land north and in the land south, were so exceedingly astonished, that they fell to the earth;

KJV: And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

3 Ne. 7:20 = Ex. 4:30; 11:3 (I. Q.)*

BM: and the people saw it, and did witness of it, and were angry with him, because of his power; and he did also do many more miracles, in the sight of the people, in the name of Jesus.

KJV: 4:30 And Aaron spake all the words which the LORD had spoken unto Moses, and did the signs in the sight of the people.

11:3 And the LORD gave the people favour in the sight of the Egyptians. Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people.

3 Ne. 8:18 = Gen. 11:4 (E)*

BM: And behold, the rocks were rent in twain; yea, they were broken up upon the face of the whole earth, insomuch that they were found in broken fragments, and in seams, and in cracks, upon all the face of the land.

KJV: And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

3 Ne. 9:11 = Gen. 4:10 (I. Q.)*

BM: and because they did cast them all out, that there were none righteous among them, I did send down fire and destroy them, that their wickedness and abominations might be

³⁹⁰ P, S: the

³⁹¹ P, S: Yea, and in

hid from before my face, that the blood of the prophets and the saints which³⁹² I sent among them, might not cry unto me from the ground against them;

KJV: And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.

3 Ne. 11:4 = Gen. 3:8 (E)*

BM: And it came to pass that again they heard the voice, and they understood it not;

KJV: And they heard the voice of the LORD God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the LORD God amongst the trees of the garden.

3 Ne. 15:8 = Gen. 9:17 (E)*

BM: For behold, the covenant³⁹³ which I have made with my people, is not all fulfilled; but the law which was given unto Moses, hath an end in me.

KJV: And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.

3 Ne. 19:19 = Gen. 24:52 (E)*

BM: And it came to pass that Jesus departed out of the midst of them, and went a little way off from them and bowed himself to the earth, and he saith,

KJV: And it came to pass, that when Abraham's servant heard their words, he worshipped the LORD, bowing himself to the earth.

3 Ne. 19:27 = Gen. 24:52 (E)*

BM: And he turned from them again, and went a little way off, and bowed himself to the earth; and he prayed again unto the Father, saying:

KJV: And it came to pass, that when Abraham's servant heard their words, he worshipped the LORD, bowing himself to the earth.

3 Ne. 20:13 = Gen. 11:4 (I. Q.)*

BM: and then shall the remnants which shall be scattered abroad upon the face of the earth, be gathered in from the east, and from the west, and from the south, and from the north; and they shall be brought to the knowledge of the Lord their God, who hath redeemed them.

KJV: And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.

3 Ne. 20:22 = Gen. 9:12, 17 (E)*

³⁹² P: wh{ich\o}

³⁹³ P: covenants

BM: And behold, this people will I establish in this land, unto the fulfilling of the covenant which I made with your Father Jacob; and it shall be a new Jerusalem. And the powers of heaven shall be in the midst of this people; yea, even I will be in the midst of you.

KJV: 12 And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations...17 And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.

3 Ne. 20:29 = Gen. 9:17 (E)*

BM: And I will remember the covenant which I have made with my people: and I have covenanted with them, that I would gather them together in mine own due time; that I would give unto them again the land of their fathers, for their inheritance, which is the land of Jerusalem, which is the promised land unto them forever, saith the Father.

KJV: And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.

Mormon 3:20 = Gen. 3-4; 5(?) (A)*

BM: And these things do the spirit manifest unto me; therefore I write unto you all. And for this cause I write unto you, that ye may know that ye must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ, yea, every soul which³⁹⁴ belong³⁹⁵ to the whole human family of Adam; and ye must stand to be judged of your works, whether they be good or evil;

Mormon 9:12 = Gen. 2-4 (A)*

BM: Behold, he crated³⁹⁶ Adam; and by Adam came the fall of man. And because of the fall of man, came Jesus Christ, even the Father and the Son; and because of Jesus Christ, came the redemption of man.

Mormon 9:17 = Gen. 2:7 (A)*

BM: Who shall say that it was not a miracle, that by his word the heaven and the earth should be; and by the power of his word, man was created of the dust of the earth; and by the power of his word, hath miracles been wrought?

KJV: And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

Ether 1:3-4 = Gen. 2-11 (A)

BM: 3 And as I suppose that the first part of this record, which speaketh concerning the creation of the world, and also of Adam,³⁹⁷ an account from that time even to the great tower, and whatsoever things transpired among the children of men until that time, is had among the Jews, 4 therefore I do not write those things which transpired from the days of

³⁹⁴ P: wh{ic\o{h

³⁹⁵ P: belongs S: belongeth

³⁹⁶ P, S: created

³⁹⁷ P: Adam & an

Adam until that time; but they are had upon the plates; and whoso findeth them, the same will have power that he may get the full account.

Ether 1:35 = Gen. 11:9 (A)*

BM: And it came to pass that the brother of Jared did cry unto the Lord, and the Lord had compassion upon Jared; therefore he did not confound the language of Jared; and Jared and his brother were not confounded.

KJV: Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

Ether 2:14 = Gen. 4:26 (I. Q.)*

BM: And it came to pass at the end of the four years, that the Lord came again unto the brother of Jared, and stood in a cloud and talked to him. And for the space of three hours did the Lord talk with the brother of Jared, and chastened him because he remembered not to call upon the name of the Lord.

KJV: And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enos: then began men to call upon the name of the LORD.

Ether 2:15 = Gen. 6:3 (A)*

BM: And the brother of Jared repented him³⁹⁸ of the evil which he had done, and did call upon the name of the Lord for his brethern which were with him. And the Lord said unto him, I will forgive thee and thy brethren of their sins; but thou shalt not sin any more, for ye shall remember that my spirit will not always strive with man; wherefore if ye will sin until ye are fully ripe, ye shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord. And this is³⁹⁹ my thoughts upon the land which I shall give you for your inheritance; for it shall be a land choice above all other lands.

KJV: And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.
not always strive with man

Ether 3:15 = Gen. 6:7 (E)*

BM: And never hath⁴⁰⁰ I shewed myself unto man whom I have created, for never hath⁴⁰¹ man believed in me as thou hast. Seest thou that ye are created after mine own image? Yea, even all men were created, in the beginning, after mine own image.

KJV: And the LORD said, I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air: for it repenteth me that I have made them.

³⁹⁸ P: ~~him~~

³⁹⁹ P: this [^]{is\^a}re my

⁴⁰⁰ P: ha{th\v}e

⁴⁰¹ P: ha{t\s}h

Ether 3:24 = Gen. 11:4, 8-9 (A)*

BM: For behold, the language which ye shall write, I have confounded; wherefore I will cause in mine own due time that these stones shall magnify to the eyes of men, these things which ye shall write.

KJV: 4 And they said, Go to, let us build a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth...8 So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of the earth: and they left off to build the city. 9 Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

Ether 8:15 = Cain (A)

BM: And it came to pass that thus they did agree with Akish. And Akish did administer unto them the oaths which was given by them of old, who also sought power, which had been handed down even from Cain, who was a murderer from the beginning.

Ether 8:24 = Gen. 4:10 (E)*

BM: wherefore the Lord commandeth you, when ye shall see these things come among you, that ye shall awake to a sense of your awful situation, because of this secret combination which shall be among you, or⁴⁰² wo be unto it, because of the blood of them which⁴⁰³ have been slain: for they cry from the dust for vengeance upon it, and also upon those who build it up.

KJV: And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground.

Ether 8:25 = Gen. 3:13; 4:8 (A)*

BM: For it cometh to pass that whoso buildeth it up, seeketh to overthrow the freedom of all lands, nations and countries; and it bringeth to pass the destruction of all people: for it is built up by the devil, which is the father of all lies; even that same liar which beguiled our first parents; yea, even the⁴⁰⁴ same liar which hath caused man to commit murder from the beginning; which⁴⁰⁵ hath hardened the hearts of men, that they have murdered the prophets, and stoned them, and cast them out from the beginning.

KJV: 3:13 And the LORD God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat.

4:8 And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

Ether 13:17 = Gen. 11:4 (E)*

⁴⁰² S: you, for woe be

⁴⁰³ P: wh{ic\o}h

⁴⁰⁴ P, S: that

⁴⁰⁵ P: wh{ich\o}

BM: but he repented not, neither his fair sons nor daughters; neither the fair sons and daughters of Cohor; neither the fair sons and daughters of Corihor; and in fine, there was none of the fair sons and daughters upon the face of the whole earth, which repented of their sins;

KJV: And they said, Go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the face of the whole earth.

Ether 14:28 = Gen. 26:17 (I. Q.)*

BM: and they pitched their tents in the valley of Corihor. And Coriantumr pitched his tents in the valley of Shurr. Now the valley of Shurr was near the hill Comnor;⁴⁰⁶ wherefore Coriantumr did gather his armies together, upon the hill of⁴⁰⁷ Comnor, and did sound a trumpet unto the armies of Shiz, to invite them forth to battle.

KJV: And Isaac departed thence, and pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar, and dwelt there.

Mor. 8:8 = Gen. 2-4 (A)*

BM: Listen to the words of Christ, your Redeemer, your Lord and your God. Behold, I came into the world not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance; the whole need no physician, but they that are sick; wherefore little children are whole, for they are not capable of committing sin; wherefore the curse of Adam is taken from them in me, that it hath no power over them: and the law of circumcision is done away in me.

Mor. 10:3 = Allusion to Creation (A)*

BM: Behold, I would exhort you that when ye shall read these things, if it be wisdom in God that ye should read them, that ye would remember how merciful the Lord hath been unto the children of men, from the creation of Adam, even down until the time that ye shall receive these things, and ponder it in your hearts.

4. Part III: The Hermeneutics of BM Exegesis of the J Source: Gen. 2-4 as a Test Case

It is clear from the previous section that the J source has had extensive influence on the composition of the BM. It is also important to note that, contrary to some previous studies, the BM is not dependent simply on the J, E, P, or D sources, or a version similar to the Book of Moses.⁴⁰⁸ Rather, as will be shown in the sections below, the BM knows a version of the

⁴⁰⁶ P, S: Comron

⁴⁰⁷ P, S: the hill Comron

⁴⁰⁸ Reynolds argues that the BM and the Book of Moses share the same source in his "The Brass Plates Version of Genesis," in Lundquist and Ricks, *By Study and Also By Faith, Volume 2*, 136-173.

Bible that includes the Pentateuch in its final, compiled, and edited form. Some of the quotations are long enough that the evidence indicates that the version of the Torah that was used in the BM was the KJV. It also draws on texts and traditions from both the HB and the NT. This data has major implications for future research.

Section 4.1 will analyze in detail the use and influence of Gen. 2-4 throughout the entire BM. It is important to draw out a specific test case from the J source in order to understand how it is being used in the BM, not only to point out the fact that it is being used. As J. Todd Hibbard has stated, “Perhaps it seems axiomatic, but a valid example of intertextuality will have some bearing on the way the texts are to be read, otherwise there would be no point in the evocation of the other text.”⁴⁰⁹ With this in mind, and in keeping with the limited scope of this project, I will only analyze the influence of Gen. 2-4 on the BM in this study. It is my hope that the exhaustive list in Section 3.1 will invite other researchers to do similar studies on J in the BM, as well as other texts from the HB and the NT.

4.1 Analysis

In the following analysis I will look only at the verses of Gen. 2-4 that I can show have directly influenced the BM. It would be unnecessary to analyze each verse of Gen. 2-4 on its own, particularly when the account of creation, the garden, and the expulsion from Eden are already so well known. In the following sections I will first look briefly at the specific J verse in its own literary context, then describe how ancient Jewish and Christian texts interpreted the verse or pericope. I will then describe how it is used in the BM, and conclude each section at the end of a chapter in Genesis with a summary of how that chapter as a whole is used in the BM, comparing and contrasting that use with the ancient texts. It is my hope that through

⁴⁰⁹ J. Todd Hibbard, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2 Reihe, 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 7.

this approach much new information will be learned about the literary and historical contexts that the BM is best read in.

4.1.1 *Gen. 2:4b-25 in its Literary Context*

The majority of academic commentaries separate Gen. 1:1-2:4a from 2:4b-2:25 as two creation accounts from different authors at different points in Israel's history.⁴¹⁰ The recognition of two sources in the beginning chapters of Genesis goes back to the early eighteenth century with Henning Bernhard Witter in his *Jura Israelitarum in Palaestinam*, but his work was lost to scholarship until it was rediscovered in the 1920s.⁴¹¹ Jean Astruc was the first to systematically compare the two sources, or "Memoires"⁴¹² as he called them. To Astruc there were only two sources in Genesis, the Elohist (later called the Priestly source) and the Yahwist. This older version of the DH was an important step, but would later prove inadequate for explaining all of the problems raised by a close reading of the Pentateuch. What is important for this study is that since Astruc scholarship has in general shown that Gen. 1:1-2:4a-2:4b-25 were composed by two different authors.

With this in mind, and accepting the research of particularly neo-Documentarian approaches to the DH, I only analyze the Yahwist's account of the creation, the expulsion

⁴¹⁰ Nahum Sarna's approach was to argue that chapter two presupposes chapter one, which reiterates the main ideas of chapter two. He does not seem to realize that his basic analysis argues for parallel accounts, while he ignores the stylistic and narrative discontinuities between the two. See Nahum M. Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary: Genesis* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989).

⁴¹¹ See Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 258, nt. 14.

⁴¹² See Jean Astruc, *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux: Don't il paroît que Moÿse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese* (Repr., Paris: Editions Noeseis, 1999; Brussels: Friex, 1753), 143. Quoted in Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 258, nt. 14.

from the garden of Eden, and the first children of the “first parents”⁴¹³ found in Gen. 2:4b-4:16,⁴¹⁴ giving particular emphasis to those verses that have influenced the BM.

In Gen. 2:4b the Lord God creates heaven and earth in this creation account when there is a field but no shrubs or grass. The deity must first send rain, and man has to till the soil, before anything can grow but there is no rain and there is no man. This is a clear indicator that the text is separated from the prior literary unit, Gen. 1:1-2:4a. In v. 7 man is formed from the dust, and receives life when the deity breathes into him the “breath of life.” The deity then plants the garden of Eden, and places the man in it (v. 8), and the planting of the trees is restated in v. 9. The trees are pleasant to the sight and good for food. Both the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and bad are in the middle of the garden,⁴¹⁵ and a river splits into four separate rivers that all flow away from the garden (vv. 10-14).

In v. 15 it is stated that the deity again placed the man in the garden, making the reader wonder why it would be necessary to place him there again. The man is commanded to not eat from the tree of knowledge of good and bad, and warned that in the event that he does eat it he will die. In v. 18 the deity decides that the man needs a companion or helper, and begins to create all animals. They are brought to the man and he names them, but in the

⁴¹³ The phrase “first parents” is often used to describe Adam and Eve in the BM (cf. 1 Ne. 5:11; 2 Ne. 2:15; 9:9; Mosiah 16:13; Alma 12:21, 26; 42:2, 7; Helaman 6:26; Ether 8:25). The use of this phrase in relation to Adam and Eve is wholly unique in LDS canon to the BM. No verses in the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, New Testament, Doctrine and Covenants, or Pearl of Great Price have this phrase. For background on the BM’s use of “first parents” to describe Adam and Eve one must look to literature contemporary to the production of the BM. For example, see Mrs. Siddons, *The Story of Our First Parents, selected from Milton’s Paradise Lost: for the use of young persons* (London: John Murray, 1822); and “I know it is the general opinion, that Adam and Eve were the first parents of all the inhabitants of the earth,” in John Gardiner, *Essays, Literary, Political, and Economical* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: D. Wilson, Craig’s Close, 1803), 1:74; and chapter 8, “Of the Sin and Fall of Our First Parents,” in John Gill, *A Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity; or, A System of Practical Truths. Deduced from the Sacred Scriptures* (London: Whittingham and Rowland, 1815), 225-228.

⁴¹⁴ See the similar statement made by Claus Westermann: “The generally acknowledged conclusion that Gen 2-3 is to be attributed to a different literary source (J) from Gen 1 (P) is presupposed. All of the many studies of Gen 2-3 make this clear. Today there are only a few exegetes who think that Gen 1-3 was from the beginning a unified account of creation, e.g., U. Cassuto and B. Jacob,” in *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* (transl. John J. Scullion, S. J.; Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984), 186.

⁴¹⁵ See Mettinger on “split coordination” in the HB; Trygve N. D. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 21-22.

process it is realized that none of the animals are suitable companions for him. In v. 21 the deity puts a deep sleep over the man, then takes from his rib or side and creates a woman. She is brought to him and he realizes that she is a suitable companion for him, remarking about the similarity of אִישׁ (“man”) and אִשָּׁה (“woman”) in stating that woman was taken from man. The last two verses are closing remarks about man leaving his parents for his wife, and how the man and woman were naked but felt no shame.

4.1.2 *Gen. 2:4b-25 Interpreted*

Gen. 2:7⁴¹⁶

7 the LORD God formed man from the dust of the earth. He blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.

The man (אָדָם) is formed from the newly watered dirt (אֲדָמָה; v. 6). It is no accident that the man and the dirt share the same trilateral root. Gunkel translated אָדָם as “man of the field” because of his closeness with the dirt, his assigned job was to tend the garden (2:5; 3:23), he lives on the dirt (3:23), and he will also return to the dirt when he dies (3:19).⁴¹⁷

⁴¹⁶ Throughout Section 4 I will be using the NJPS as printed in the Jewish Study Bible unless otherwise noted. See Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Jewish Study Bible* (Second Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

⁴¹⁷ Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (trans. Mark E. Biddle; Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997), 6. Westermann argues against this latter line of reasoning, and states that one cannot simply explain the relation of אָדָם to אֲדָמָה by saying that the person must be thought of as a farmer and that consequently the narrative must have had its origin in an agricultural community. The words do not allow this. The relationship attests that human beings and earth belong together, that the earth is there for humanity and human beings are there to populate it... (Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 206).

Westermann makes the argument that our understanding of the relationship between אָדָם to אֲדָמָה is, in the context of v. 7, dependent upon רֹפֵעַ (“dry dirt”). He argues that the use of these terms together cannot limit the possibilities of man’s earthly existence in chs. 2-3, and he makes this statement specifically in response to the idea that these verses describe only the life of the farmer. He is intent on changing this aspect of the ongoing discussion on Gen. 2-3 and fails to realize that the interpretation of scholars does not limit the application of Gen. 2:7 to all aspects of life; rather, the interpretation has generally been that the verses are written from the perspective of an agrarian society because of the focus on the soil, animals being created to help man, and his assigned duties of tending the garden.⁴¹⁷ These are essential aspects to the narrative, and Westermann’s statement that the words do not allow this is problematic. In the end we are still left with the focus of the narrative on the field, and on a god that works in the soil (אֲדָמָה) to create humankind (אָדָם).

The “breath of life” is breathed into the man’s nostrils by the deity.⁴¹⁸ Although this does not receive a textual note or even a passing comment by Speiser,⁴¹⁹ this is an important part of the narrative. The breath of life comes directly from the deity, and is the narrator’s response to the question that arises when a person dies and they no longer breathe. Where is this breath from? It seems to be at the heart of human life because once a person stops breathing they are no longer alive. In v. 7, the breath that emanated from the deity and created the living man ties the man to the divine creator.⁴²⁰ The breath of life makes man a שפנ הֵיחַ (“a living being”), and without it man returns to the dust.⁴²¹

Ancient Sources

The Septuagint (LXX) or Greek translation of the HB follows the MT in Gen. 2:7, but the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) differs in one significant aspect. In the MT it is the deity that breathes into the man the “breath of life,” whereas in the SP the deity forms the man and then “breath entered his nostrils.”⁴²² The deity does not directly cause the breath to enter the man; instead, the breath itself just brings the man to life as he is formed. The Targum Neofiti agrees with the MT and LXX in that the deity breathes into the man the breath of life, but in Targum Neofiti and not the others this breath is said to have “endowed [the man] with speech.”⁴²³ This idea is also found in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, where the translator also expanded on Gen. 2:7 to include the following details about the materials from which the man is created: the dust

⁴¹⁸ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 6.

⁴¹⁹ See Speiser, *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible, vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1962), 16-20.

⁴²⁰ See Gunkel, *Genesis*, 6.

⁴²¹ Cf. Gen. 3:14.

⁴²² Benjamin Tsedaka, *The Israelite Samaritan Version of the Torah: First English Translation with the Masoretic Version* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013), 7.

⁴²³ Martin McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible, Volume 1A: Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 57.

originates in the sanctuary, the “four winds of the earth,” water from around the world, and the man was created from red, black, and white dust.⁴²⁴

In their recent collection of quotations and allusions of the bible in second temple Jewish literature, Lange and Weigold noted that Job 33:4 alludes to Gen. 2:7.⁴²⁵ When you compare the two texts it is obvious that Job is alluding to the breath of life in Gen. 2:7. In Qoheleth 3:20-21 we also find an allusion to Gen. 2:7 where humans are created from the dust and then return to the dust after death.⁴²⁶ Both of these texts agree with the general sense of Gen. 2:7 as found in the MT.

In 2 Macc. 7:23 the Yahwistic creation account is alluded to, as the deity “molded human production,” and “mercifully gives back to you breath and life, as you now take no notice of yourselves...”⁴²⁷ In the T Isaac the deity formed Adam “with his own hand,”⁴²⁸ as well as Eve and a long list of early humans.⁴²⁹ In a similar vein in the T Ab recension A Adam is “the first-formed,” and it is said that “everyone has come from him.”⁴³⁰ Later in 13:5 it is again mentioned that all people come from Adam, and because of this Abel will judge all human beings.⁴³¹ In Sir. 33:10 the author says that people are from clay, and that humans were formed from the earth.⁴³² In Sir. 17:1 the Lord created humans from the earth, where they return again.⁴³³ In JosAsen 12:1 God gave the breath of life to the whole creation, and SibOr 1.285

⁴²⁴ Michael Maher, *The Aramaic Bible, Volume 1B: Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 22.

⁴²⁵ Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, 55.

⁴²⁶ This has been noted by Thomas Krüger, *Qoheleth: A Commentary* (transl. O. C. Dean, Jr.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 93; and Norbert Lohfink, *Qoheleth: A Continental Commentary* (transl. Sean McEvenue; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 67.

⁴²⁷ Robert Doran, *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 147. According to Doran (p. 159), this is a clear reference to Gen. 2:7.

⁴²⁸ T Isaac 3:15.

⁴²⁹ According to Stinespring, “All the versions show confusions and contradictions in their lists of patriarchs at this point,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:907, nt. 3b.

⁴³⁰ T Ab 11:9. Verses 9-11 are heavily dependent on Matt. 22, especially 22:14.

⁴³¹ Adam as the first man is also mentioned in T Ab recension B 8:12.

⁴³² Cf. Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (The Anchor Bible, vol. 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 394, 400.

⁴³³ Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 276.

stresses the idea that “the first man was formed.”⁴³⁴ In the ApAdam we find Adam explaining to his son Seth how Adam and Eve were created “out of earth”⁴³⁵ and in a perfect state. The deity “separated [Adam and Eve] wrathfully,”⁴³⁶ alluding to how they were expelled out of Eden. The ApAdam later reminds the reader that God created Adam by breathing into Adam a “spirit of life for a living soul.”⁴³⁷

In the Qumran document 4QDibHam^a (4Q504) 5 II (8 recto) 4-9 the creation narrative and the expulsion from Eden are summarized, with some elements from Gen. 1 mixed in.⁴³⁸ Adam is formed in the deity’s image, and the deity blew into Adam’s nostril the breath of life. He is flesh and therefore made of dust.⁴³⁹ Similarly, we find in 1QH^a IX 21 and XI 21 the idea that humans are made out of clay.⁴⁴⁰

Gen. 2:7 is formally quoted in 1 Cor. 15:45. The idea that Adam was the first man and that he “became a living being,”⁴⁴¹ is explicit.⁴⁴² In 1 Tim. 2:13 the author of the text argues that Adam was created first, then Eve. This concept is only found in Gen. 2:7, 22, the Yahwistic creation narrative.⁴⁴³

Book of Mormon

⁴³⁴ J. L. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, & Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 310.

⁴³⁵ ApAdam 1:2.

⁴³⁶ ApAdm 1:4.

⁴³⁷ ApAdam 2:5. Macrae notes that soul can also be translated breath. See Macrae, “Apocalypse of Adam,” in Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. One*, 713, nt. 2c.

⁴³⁸ Florentino Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Second Edition; Leiden: E. J. Brill and William B. Eerdmans, 1996), 417.

⁴³⁹ Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 417.

⁴⁴⁰ Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 327, 332.

⁴⁴¹ All quotations from the NT are from the NRSV, unless otherwise noted.

⁴⁴² See Conzelmann’s commentary on 1 Cor. 15:45. He discusses this verse’s use of the LXX for Gen. 2:7 and the alteration and interpretation of the source text. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (transl. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 284-286. See also David Lincicum, “Genesis in Paul,” in Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (Library of New Testament Studies, 466; London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 104-106.

⁴⁴³ See James W. Aageson, “Genesis in the Duetero-Pauline Epistles,” in Menken and Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament*, 121.

In the BM Gen. 2:7 has directly influenced three verses, one at the beginning, one toward the middle, and one near the end. Both 2 Ne. 9:26 and Mosiah 2:20-26 blend in elements from several verses in the NT, and Mormon 9:17 blends elements of Gen. 1 with Gen. 2:7. This indicates that the author of these BM passages was familiar with a version of the bible that included much more than both the Yahwist's narrative and portions of the HB, but the NT as well.

These three passages collectively use both of the clauses of Gen. 2:7. In 2 Ne. 9:26 it is said that “those who have not the law given to them” are taken care of by Jesus's atonement, and when they die “they are restored to that God who gave them breath, which is the Holy One of Israel.” The verse has used Rom. 2:14 (“for when the Gentiles, which have not the law...”), Rev. 6:8; 20:13-14 (“death and hell”), Rev. 20:10 (“the lake of fire and brimstone...and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever”), and finally the allusion to Gen. 2:7 in that the author assumes his readers know that God has given humans breath.

Similar to 2 Ne. 9:26, Mosiah 2:21 shows a direct connection to the NT. The phrase “unprofitable servants” is found only in Luke 7:10 in the KJV.⁴⁴⁴ In this section King Benjamin alludes to the idea that God has created them (vv. 20, 23), then borrows from Gen. 2:7 to explain that even though they were “created of the dust of the earth,” they are less than the dust and therefore owe everything to God.

In Mormon 9:17 there are elements taken from Gen. 1 and 2, showing how the author knows both the P and J accounts of creation as one story. The idea that God created the world through speech, his word, comes from Gen. 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 20, 24, and 26, while the idea that man is created of the dust is found in Gen. 2:7. Not only the idea is alluded to, but also

⁴⁴⁴ Gardner also notes the connection, but says nothing about influence. See Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon, Volume 3: Enos-Mosiah*, 133-134.

“man was created of the dust of the earth,” has its counterpart in Gen. 2:7 as “formed man of the dust of the ground.” Only a couple of words have been switched (“created”=“formed”; “earth”=“ground”), and the word order is slightly altered.

It is also important to briefly note the similarities in style and word choice in the way these three sections of the BM use Gen. 2:7. In 2 Ne. 9:26 the phrase “to that God who” is also found in Mosiah 2:20, and both allude to the breath that God gives or lends to his people. Mosiah 2:25 also connects to Mormon 9:17 in the use of the words “created” and “earth,” instead of “formed” and “ground” as found in Gen. 2:7. Stylistically these three sections share important similarities when they vary from the source text. Similarities that suggest each of the verses were composed by the same author.

Gen. 2:9

9 And from the ground the LORD God caused to grow every tree that was pleasing to the sight and good for food, with the tree of life in the middle of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and bad.

Gen. 2:9 is only used in the BM in relation to its allusions to the tree of life, found also in Gen. 3:22, 24, so I will briefly comment on the tree of life. Here in 2:9 the tree of life is described as being in the middle of the garden. It is difficult to know if the tree of knowledge of good and bad is also described as being in the middle of the garden, but I follow Mettinger in his use of Michel’s phenomenon of “split coordination” in the HB, which shows that in several other cases in the HB “two elements of [a] clause are separated by an intervening element.”⁴⁴⁵ This shows that it is likely that “in the middle” is referring to both trees. The reading would also make Gen. 2:9 and 3:3 much more understandable.

⁴⁴⁵ Metting, *The Eden Narrative*, 21-22.

It is also important to note, as Mettinger has argued in his narratological analysis, that the man and woman are never notified about the existence of the tree of life.⁴⁴⁶ They were not created as immortals, and had not eaten from the tree. As Paul Humbert has argued concerning לֵב (“lest”) in Gen. 3:22, this must imply that neither the man or woman had before this verse eaten from the tree, and as Mettinger has summarized James Barr’s argument, the phrase “‘put out his hand and do something’ is an inchoative expression and cannot easily mean ‘to continue to do what he has been doing all along.’”⁴⁴⁷

Ancient Sources

The LXX varies from the MT in one significant way in this verse. The “tree of knowledge of good and evil” has become the “tree of learning the knowledge of good and evil,” an interpolation on the part of the LXX translator to confirm what is implied by the text: Adam and Eve, and therefore humankind, learned the knowledge of good and evil when the fruit of the tree was eaten. The SP follows the MT, but Targum Neofiti is similar to the LXX. In all parts of the verse the MT is followed except at the “tree of knowledge of which anyone who would eat would know to distinguish between good and evil.”⁴⁴⁸ According to the Targum, for humans to be able to distinguish between good and evil the fruit had to be eaten.⁴⁴⁹ Targum Pseudo-Jonathan takes a similar approach and adds even more to the verse. There the tree of life is so tall its “height was a journey of five hundred years” and the other tree “whose fruit enables those who eat it to distinguish between good and evil.”⁴⁵⁰ The Targums expand on the

⁴⁴⁶ Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 37. Mettinger argues more fully that Eden was meant to be a test for the man and the woman, and that the reward for completing the test was probably the ability to eat from the tree of life and gain immortality.

⁴⁴⁷ James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 58; quoted in Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 20.

⁴⁴⁸ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 57.

⁴⁴⁹ This differs from the BM’s interpretation where the fact that there were two trees made Adam make a decision between good and bad.

⁴⁵⁰ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 23.

image of the trees to a much larger extent than the previous translation in the LXX, and the SP appears to have virtually the same text as the MT.

There are no known quotations or allusions to Gen. 2:9 in the HB,⁴⁵¹ but there are several in other second temple Jewish texts. In 1 En. 32:3 the tree of knowledge of good and evil is interpreted positively as “the tree of wisdom, whose fruit the holy ones eat and learn great wisdom.”⁴⁵² Nickelsburg argues that “1 Enoch 20-36 reflects both biblical versions of the Eden story,”⁴⁵³ referring to Gen. 2-3 and Ezek. 28 and 31. This section of the Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36), specifically 1 En. 32:3-6, is noted by Nickelsburg as describing the garden mentioned in Gen. 2-3.⁴⁵⁴ In 1 En. 25:4 the tree of life is completely inaccessible to humans until after the end of the world and the final judgment. This is similarly found in the LAE Greek, LAE, and T. Levi 18:10-11.⁴⁵⁵ JosAsen 4:2b uses language from Gen. 2:9 when Aseneth rejoices over the fruit that her parents brought to her, saying that “they were all handsome and good to taste.”⁴⁵⁶

1QH^a XVI 6-7 mentions the tree of life “in the secret source, hidden among the trees of water,”⁴⁵⁷ and 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 7 14 mentions how “every young shoot which is in its [the garden of Eden’s] midst is a holy thing.”⁴⁵⁸ Finally, 2 En. 8:2-3 summarizes parts of Gen. 2:9, stating that in the garden of Eden everything about the trees was perfect, and that

⁴⁵¹ Cf. Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 55; and Bradley H. McLean, *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings through 180 C.E.* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992), 18.

⁴⁵² Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia Commentary; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 320.

⁴⁵³ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 327.

⁴⁵⁴ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 327.

⁴⁵⁵ These are all pointed out by Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 314. T. Levi 18 was also pointed out by Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 55.

⁴⁵⁶ C. Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 206.

⁴⁵⁷ Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 345.

⁴⁵⁸ Joseph M. Baumgarten and Lidija Novakovic, “Miscellaneous Rules, 4Q265,” in James H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 3, Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck and Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 266-267.

the tree of life is in the garden and that the Lord takes a rest under that tree when he takes a walk in the garden.⁴⁵⁹

Book of Mormon

The connection between the BM and Gen. 2:9 also extends to 3:22, 24. In Gen. 2:9 the creation of the **עץ החיים** (“tree of life”) is described, and although the tree of life appears in seven other places in the KJV⁴⁶⁰ the connection of 1 Ne. 11:25 is made specifically to the Eden narrative because of the strong connections in 1 Ne. 8:10-13, 15-17, 23, 27-28, and 30, which are being reiterated for Nephi there. It is described again by Nephi for his brother in 1 Ne. 15:22, 28, and 36. The tree of life is also mentioned briefly in 2 Ne. 2:15-16.

In 1 Ne. 11:25 the tree of life is equated to “the fountain of living waters,” a phrase found only in Jer. 2:13 and 17:13. The “rod of iron” leads to this fountain, and the rod of iron is said to be the “word of God.” There are many insertions into the different lines of thought in this BM verse. The phrase “or to the tree of life” is awkwardly placed between the lines “which led to the fountain of living waters,” and “which waters are a representation of the love of God.” But, without the tree of life placed before the second half of that statement the next line (“and I also beheld that the tree of life was a representation of the love of God.”) becomes even more awkward than it is now. The entire verse is filled with duplicates and redundancies. The main point for my present purposes is that the tree of life is being equated with Jeremiah’s “fountain of living waters,” and that it is “a representation of the love of God.” Both of these specific concepts are not found in Gen. 2-3, although water does play an important role in the garden.

⁴⁵⁹ F. I. Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 114-115.

⁴⁶⁰ See Prov. 3:18; 11:30; 13:12; 15:4; Rev. 2:7; 22:2, 14.

In 1 Ne. 15:22, 28, and 36 the tree of life is mentioned several more times. In this chapter Nephi is responding to several questions his brothers have asked him. In relation to their father's vision of the tree of life in 1 Ne. 8 they ask the meaning of the tree in the vision. Explaining to his brothers in v. 22 what he and the readers already know, he says that the tree "was a representation of the tree of life." Nephi also describes, in terms similar to Luke 16:26, that in Lehi's vision there was a "gulf" that separated the righteous and the wicked,⁴⁶¹ as well as keeping the wicked away from the tree of life (vv. 28b, 36a).

Lehi's vision of the tree of life is not only a visionary experience of a potential otherworldly realm. It represents the situation of Lehi and his family in their immediate context in the narrative. While Lehi and most of his family choose to follow the rod of iron back to the tree of life, a literal return to Eden, Laman and Lemuel decide to not follow and become wicked instead. For the audience of the BM it suggests that returning to Eden and eating the fruit of the tree of life is something that can happen in the 19th century. For the narrator, it is a present reality as one follows "the word of God." In this sense one does not need to wait for the eschaton or to pass from this life in order to return to Eden. As the BM makes explicit time and again, the author believed that there was no need to wait because Jesus's death and resurrection undoes the rift that was created in the expulsion from Eden.

In 2 Ne. 2:15-16 the creation is summarized in words reminiscent of Gen. 2:19 (which will be discussed further below), although the use of the phrase "first parents" to describe Adam and Eve in the narrative appears in a much later context and interpretive tradition, rather than in the Eden narrative itself.⁴⁶² The two trees are contrasted as opposites, and it is not clear which tree is supposed to be sweet and which one is supposed to be bitter. Royal Skousen has

⁴⁶¹ "...between us and you there is a great gulf fixed..." Luke 16:26a (KJV).

⁴⁶² Cf. footnote 413.

argued that we should read the parallelism similar to other uses of the construction “(the) one...(the) other” where the pair does not fit an exact one-for-one parallel.⁴⁶³ In this case we would read sweet as referring to the tree of life.

Brant Gardner has argued directly against Skousen’s reading. Rather than showing similar passages that are suggestive for his reading, he argues that, “While [Skousen] is correct, I still see the parallel as instructive just as it is. While it might counter our expectations, it highlights the lesson th[at] Lehi was teaching.”⁴⁶⁴ Gardner’s reading is problematic for several reasons. First, Gardner argues that the act of eating the fruit was what created the opposition, but this is not necessarily what the text itself says. According to the passage, the opposition became an aspect of the situation after the two trees were created and placed side by side, as v. 16 makes clear.⁴⁶⁵ After creation the man is placed near the trees and “could not act for himself save it should be that he was enticed by the one or the other.” The context is several steps prior to how Gardner is reading the text. The opposition is in the garden, and at this point access to the tree of life means continued life in the garden, in the presence of God, no work for food, etc. To take the forbidden fruit means to go against what he had been told by God, and earlier God had explained that meant death. Even though the forbidden fruit was tempting, that does not necessarily mean that the author of 2 Ne. 2:15-16 thought it was sweet as Gardner argues. In my view Gardner’s last comment on v. 15 is more in line with the general sense of the verse. The fact that the “first parents” took the forbidden fruit and became “as the gods,” and by extension all humans then have the ability to do so, “is often all too bitter.”⁴⁶⁶ That bitterness comes, though, through the forbidden fruit in this passage of the BM.

⁴⁶³ Royal Skousen, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon, Part One: 1 Nephi 1–2 Nephi 10* (Provo: The Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Brigham Young University, 2014), 501-503.

⁴⁶⁴ Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:46.

⁴⁶⁵ This reading loses vitality if Mettinger’s theory of Eden as a test, and the non-disclosure of the existence of the tree of life to Adam and Eve is accepted. Cf. Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 37.

⁴⁶⁶ Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:46.

In those three pericopae the tree of life is the “fountain of living waters,” and “a representation of the love of God.” The unrighteous do not have access to the tree of life in Lehi’s and Nephi’s shared vision, and a “gulf” separates the righteous from the wicked. Lehi’s vision of the tree of life is not explicitly equated with Adam and Eve or Eden, although the parallels create a strong argument for reading the vision’s motifs in light of Gen. 2-3. Rather than being about Adam and Eve specifically, the text invites its reader to be an “Adam” or an “Eve” by partaking of the tree of life on a daily basis by following the “word of God” or “rod of iron” to the tree of life and receiving the “love of God.” The text also calls the tree of life sweet, contra Gardner, and the forbidden fruit bitter.

Gen. 2:17

17 but as for the tree of knowledge of good and bad, you must not eat of it: for as soon as you eat of it, you shall die.

In this verse the man is told that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is off limits, and that he cannot eat from it. While it has often been pointed out that this means the tree is “forbidden,” it has rarely been described as a test.⁴⁶⁷ It is also important to note that while many have argued that the curses appended to the warning are temporal, it is more likely that it is a conditional construction because the verb is in the Qal form.⁴⁶⁸ In this sense the threat of death is not a death sentence per se, but a warning of what could potentially happen if the man decides to eat from the tree.

Ancient Sources

The LXX generally follows this verse as found in the MT, and the SP does as well. Targum Neofiti, however, expands on v. 17 similar to what was found in v. 9. The phrase “the tree of knowledge of good and evil” is expanded to “the tree of knowledge, however, from which

⁴⁶⁷ Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 23.

⁴⁶⁸ Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 22.

anyone who eats would know to distinguish between good and evil.”⁴⁶⁹ The tree itself is not described as the tree of knowledge of good and evil, but people who have eaten from the tree are defined as gaining the ability, the knowledge, to distinguish between the two. The expansion comes from an interpretive reading of the earlier version of the narrative, a reading we also find in Targum Pseud-Jonathan. There it is “the tree of which those who eat its fruit have the wisdom to distinguish good and evil.”⁴⁷⁰ It is obvious that these interpretive expansions were shared within the Aramaic speaking communities that produced these Targums.

It appears that no quotations, allusions, or echoes to Gen. 2:17 have been discovered in the HB. Jub. 4:30 formally quotes this verse to argue that in “the testimony of heaven”⁴⁷¹ one day is one thousand years, and because Adam died seventy years prior to one thousand the word of the deity was accurate when he said, “On the day that you eat from it you will die.”⁴⁷²

In 2 En. 24-32 the creation and Eden narratives are expanded upon. 2 En. 30:15 quotes Gen. 2:17, but alters the text to clarify the meaning of the source text. Instead of two trees there are two ways, light and darkness. The statement that the deity makes in Gen. 2:16b-17, “Of every tree of the garden you are free to eat; but as for the tree of knowledge of good and bad, you must not eat of it,” simply becomes, “This is good for you, but that is bad.”⁴⁷³ The deity also claims that when he placed these two ways in front of the man he “gave him his free will.”⁴⁷⁴ This was a test, similar to how Mettinger reads the Eden narrative, to see if he loves the deity or not. The instruction to not touch the tree is also found in SibOr 1:39 as part of

⁴⁶⁹ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 58.

⁴⁷⁰ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 24.

⁴⁷¹ James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vol. 511; Scriptores Aethiopici, Tomus 88; Lovani: Peeters, 1989), 30.

⁴⁷² VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 30.

⁴⁷³ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 152.

⁴⁷⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 152.

the introduction that describes the creation, the Eden narrative, and the expulsion from the garden.”⁴⁷⁵

The instruction is also found in the Greek version of 3 Baruch. In 3 Bar. 4 Baruch is being shown visions and guided by an angel. In 4:8 Baruch asks about “the tree which caused Adam to stray,”⁴⁷⁶ and the angel mentions how Adam was not allowed to touch it because “It is the vine which the angel Samael planted by which the Lord God became angered, and he cursed him and his planting...And because of this the devil became envious, and tricked him by means of his vine.”⁴⁷⁷ The tradition found in 3 Baruch is similar to what was seen previously in the Targums, although here we get the extra detail that Sammael planted the tree of knowledge of good and bad.

The instruction of Gen. 2:17 is also clearly found in LAW Apoc 7:1. In this text Adam is answering questions for his son Seth, and he mentions how he and Eve had access to all the plants of the garden except the “one he [god] commanded us not to eat of it, (for) we would die by it.”⁴⁷⁸ The instruction is also found in LAW Apoc 17:5, but this verse is quoting Gen. 3:3, not Gen. 2:17.

Book of Mormon

Although the phrase “forbidden fruit” is not found in the Eden narrative, Gen. 2:17 is alluded to using this phrase in six verses of the BM. The command to “not eat of” the “tree of the knowledge of good and evil” leads naturally to the interpretation found in the BM that the fruit of that tree was “forbidden.”

⁴⁷⁵ See John J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 335-336.

⁴⁷⁶ H. E. Gaylord, Jr., “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. One*, 667.

⁴⁷⁷ Gaylord, Jr., “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” 667.

⁴⁷⁸ M. D. Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 271.

In 2 Ne. 2:15 the “forbidden fruit” is described as being the “opposition” to the tree of life, and only three verses later (v. 18) the phrase is placed on the mouth of the “old serpent, who is the devil.” In v. 19 Adam and Eve are driven out of the garden after eating the forbidden fruit. In Mosiah 3:26 mercy and justice are contrasted with one another, and it is claimed that it was because of justice that Adam and Eve fell because “mercy could have claim on them no more forever.” In Alma 12:22 it is similarly stated that Adam and Eve fell because they ate the forbidden fruit, and in Hel. 6:26 it is said that Gadianton, a legendary evil figure by the end of the BM, had made oaths with “that same being who did entice our first parents to partake of the forbidden fruit.”

Throughout the BM there is a systematic and uniform approach to understanding Gen. 2:17. Rather than referring to the verse by using phraseology that is found there in the verse itself, the author employs the shortened “forbidden fruit” to allude to this part of the Eden narrative, and develops its source in ways that reflect influence from later Christian writings and traditions.

Gen. 2:21

21 So the LORD God cast a deep sleep upon the man; and, while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed up the flesh at that spot.

As Gunkel noted in his commentary, *המדרה* is a very deep sleep, especially compared to *הנש*, “normal sleep.”⁴⁷⁹ He also notes the important contrast of the beasts of the field for the man’s companionship, and how the man only finds companionship once god makes a creature out of the man. Hamilton has argued that *עלצ* should be translated as “side,” not “rib,” and that Gen. 2:21 is the only place that modern scholarship has decided to translate the word as

⁴⁷⁹ Gunkel, *Genesis*, 12.

“rib.”⁴⁸⁰ This may have been influenced by a similar Arabic root meaning “to be crooked, bent.”⁴⁸¹ This seems supported by Koehler and Baumgartner’s *HALOT*,⁴⁸² although it still has not been used in modern translations as Hamilton pointed out.

Ancient Sources

The LXX here again follows the MT, and the same goes for the SP and Targum Neofiti. Although these versions show little signs of interpretation, as all translations do, they do not necessarily expand on the source text. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan diverges, though. In this Targum we find that the exact rib from which the deity takes from the man to create woman is described. “And he took one of his ribs—it was the thirteenth rib of the right side—and he close its place with flesh.”⁴⁸³ It has been said before that “It is generally acknowledged that stronger folkloristic influences can be detected in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, but the precise reasons for this difference between this and the other Targums is still a subject of discussion.”⁴⁸⁴ The expansions in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan that have been seen thus far, and in particular its disagreement with Targum Neofiti here, support von Heijne’s statement.

There is only one early Jewish text that alludes to Gen. 2:21, Pseudo-Philo’s LAB. The rib in Gen. 2:21 is alluded to in LAB 32:15, which states, “Not unjustly did God take from you the rib of the first-formed, knowing that from his rib Israel would be born.”⁴⁸⁵ Out of context one might assume that this was directed at Eve, but it is fact addressed to Deborah. The entire

⁴⁸⁰ Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990), 178.

⁴⁸¹ Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Study Edition; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:1030.

⁴⁸² *HALOT*, 1030.

⁴⁸³ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 24.

⁴⁸⁴ Camilla Helena von Heijne, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretations of Genesis* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 412; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 36.

⁴⁸⁵ D. J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 347.

chapter is a hymn that Deborah, Barak, and others are singing. It does not mention putting the primordial man to sleep.

The idea that Adam was formed first and that male and female are paired in creation are both found in 1 Tim. 2:13, although Gen. 2:21 is not directly involved in the allusion, and neither the rib or putting Adam into a deep sleep come up at all.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 2:21 is only found in one place in the BM. It is informally quoted in Mosiah 24:19 to describe a miracle God performs on behalf of the Nephites in order for them to escape the oppression and suffering they have found themselves in under Lamanite servitude. Although the narrative itself closely echoes the Israelite Exodus narrative, especially when you consider how “taskmasters” only appears in Mosiah 24:9, 19 in the BM and in the KJV only in Ex. 1:11; 3:7; 5:6, 10, 13-14, the verse in Mosiah 24 takes eight words directly from the KJV of Gen. 2:21, and alters the KJV’s “fall upon” to “come upon.”

In the KJV the deity creates woman out of man’s rib, and in order to do so puts him to sleep to workout the process. In the BM the Lamanites are put to sleep by the deity in order to allow his covenant people to simply walk free of their bondage, echoing the Exodus narrative. In both Gen. 2:21 and Mosiah 24:19 it is the deity who is in control, and uses his power to miraculously put people to sleep in order to accomplish his goals.

Gen. 2:25

25 The two of them were naked, the man and his wife, yet they felt no shame.

The word ashamed is found in the Eden narrative only at Gen. 2:25, but this verse is tightly connected to Gen. 3:7-10. In 2:25 the man and woman are not ashamed of their nakedness because they have not yet had the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good evil. After eating the fruit in v. 6 it is said in v. 7 that “the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that

they were naked.” It does not say in this verse or in v. 10 that Adam and Eve were ashamed, but reading this pericope in light of Gen. 2:25, part of the same overall literary unit, strongly suggests that they were ashamed, which caused them to make the leaf aprons in v. 7.

Ancient Sources

The LXX follows the MT in this verse, and the SP only changes האדם (“the man”) to אדם (“Adam”).⁴⁸⁶ Targum Neofiti alters the source by saying that up to this point in the Eden narrative the man and woman did not know what shame was, rather than they were not ashamed because of their nakedness. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan completely alters the sense of the verse by saying that “the two of them were wise, Adam and his wife, but they did not remain in their glory.”⁴⁸⁷ Nakedness and shame are completely removed from the verse, possibly, as Cook argues, because the translator believed the expulsion was due to disobedience and not sexual intercourse,⁴⁸⁸ and so remove anything that could potentially be read that way.

Other than a slightly rewritten version of this verse in Jub. 3:16, there are no known quotations, allusions, or echoes to Gen. 2:25 elsewhere in the HB, early Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphic texts, and early Christian literature.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 2:25 has influenced the BM in two places and both times it is found in the same chapter, 1 Ne. 8:25, 28. This entire chapter has been heavily influenced by the Eden narrative, not only in the use of the term “the tree of life,” but also in much of its terminology.⁴⁸⁹

⁴⁸⁶ Tsedaka, *The Israelite Samaritan Version*, 8.

⁴⁸⁷ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 25.

⁴⁸⁸ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 25, nt. 49.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. 1 Ne. 8 in Part II.

Toward the end of the chapter the wicked are described as inhabiting “a great and spacious building” that is suspended in the air. As people in Lehi’s vision come near to and eat from the tree of life they see the wicked in the building mocking them. Many of the people are “ashamed, because of those that were scoffing at them,”⁴⁹⁰ but many of them had also felt ashamed prior to noticing the building and its people in v. 25. In both verses, though, the shame comes only “after they had [partaken/tasted] of the fruit.”

When 1 Ne. 8:25, 28 is read in light of Gen. 2:25 and 3:7-10 the people who are ashamed of eating the tree can be seen as doing the same thing that Adam and Eve did when they realized they were naked and hid. They continue to fall and are not in the presence of the divine because they have allowed worldly cares to overcome their righteous desires. By connecting this idea of shame found in Gen. 2:25 and 3:7-10 the author of the BM attempts to make a strong appeal to the pathos of his readers to not be ashamed about partaking of the fruit of the tree, which to the author is the love of God.

Summary

In this section I have analyzed the influence of Gen. 2:7, 9, 17, and 21 on literature of Jewish and Christian antiquity, and the BM. I have also looked at each of these verses in their own contextual setting. Gen. 2:7 was alluded to in three BM passages, and those passages were shown to have also blended ideas and phrases from Gen. 1 and the NT.

The tree of life, found in Gen. 2:9; 3:22, 24 was also found to have influenced three BM passages. In 1 Ne. 11 the tree of life is recontextualized. Although the basic ideas and descriptions in this chapter come from the Eden narrative, it is never explicit in Lehi’s vision that he has the garden of Eden in mind. The tree of life is Christianized, and motifs from the Eden narrative that described the two trees are here used to describe just the tree of life, with

⁴⁹⁰ 1 Ne. 8:28.

some alteration. One might think that this fact goes along well with the argument that the earliest version of the Eden narrative had only one tree, and therefore the antiquity of the BM narrative has some evidence. That argument would not only ignore other passages that explicitly know the two-tree tradition (cf. 2 Ne. 2), but also the large amount of evidence that the NT influenced the composition of many of these passages.

In 2 Ne. 2 the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and bad are contrasted, and depicted as essential to the early establishment of the agency of the humans by the creator. According to 2 Ne. 2:15-16, in order to exercise their agency Adam and Eve had to have the opposites presented to them so that they could make a choice. This would not be possible if the two of them did not know about the second tree, as was noted in the section describing Gen. 2:9. According to Mettinger's narratological reading, the tree of life was hidden from the man and woman until Gen. 3:22.⁴⁹¹ This is supported by the use of לִמְנָח ("lest") and the phrase "put out his hand and," which together make it clear that Adam and Eve had not eaten from the tree of life prior to that verse.⁴⁹² This does not support the BM reading of the importance of the tree of life for Adam and Eve's agency in 2 Ne. 2, and in my review of ancient texts none of them showed any knowledge of a tradition of agency in the garden based on the two trees.

In my analysis of 1 Ne. 15:28, 36 it was noted that only the righteous had access to the tree of life, and that the unrighteous were separated from it by a large gulf. It was noted that in the interpretations of ancient texts the tree of life was completely inaccessible to humans until after the end of the world and the final judgment. One might argue that in 1 Ne. 15 the motifs of the Eden narrative are represented in a new context, and therefore differ from what

⁴⁹¹ Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 9.

⁴⁹² Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 20.

we find in second temple literature. This argument would be shortsighted, though, because the context of Nephi's vision of the tree (i.e. apocalyptic vision where the protagonist is escorted by an angelic ministrant) is very similar to Enoch's in 1 En. 25, but the two texts disagree on the accessibility of the tree of life.

Throughout the BM the use of Gen. 2 was intermingled with phrases and ideas that come from other parts of the KJV, whether it be the OT or NT. It also became apparent as consequential to my study that descriptions of Adam and Eve as "first parents" did not find support in any of the textual traditions of Gen. 2, nor in second temple literature or other literature of antiquity.⁴⁹³ Rather, sources of the 18th and early 19th centuries had to be provided in order to give context to the phrase.

The BM's approach to understanding and interpreting Gen. 2 derives from a thoroughly Christian environment, one steeped in the KJV and interpretations based on that translation and the cultures that would later grow out of that version of the Bible.

4.1.3 *Genesis 3:1-24 in its Literary Context*

Gen. 3 begins with a note about how the serpent was shrewder than any of the other created animals. The serpent and woman begin a dialogue about eating from the trees of the garden. The woman is aware of the command to not eat the "fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden," (v. 3) and the serpent is aware of a variant form of the command, even though neither of them were there when the man received the command. The serpent responds negatively to the deity's⁴⁹⁴ stipulation in the command. From the serpent's perspective God knows that when the woman eats the fruit her eyes will be opened, and she will be like divine

⁴⁹³ Some texts, like 1 Enoch, refer to Adam as "your father of old" and Eve as "your mother of old." Not only do these interpretations reflect late second temple developments, the form of the tradition found in the BM is that of the 18th and 19th centuries already noted in the use of "first parents" in the literature of that period.

⁴⁹⁴ It should be noted that in the dialogue between the snake and the woman **אֱלֹהִים** ("god") is used rather than **יהוה אֱלֹהִים** ("Lord God").

beings who know good and bad (v. 5). This convinces the woman that the tree is desirable, so she eats from it and shares the fruit with her husband. After eating they realize they are naked, and sew fig leaves together to make loincloths for themselves.

The narrative then describes how the Lord God was moving around in the garden and called out to the man. The deity questions him and finds out that he and the woman had eaten the fruit the man was commanded not to eat. The man turns the blame to the woman, and the woman to the serpent. In vv. 14-15 the serpent is cursed, in v. 16 the woman is cursed, and in vv. 17-19 the man is cursed.

The text moves quickly away from these curses and states that the man called his wife Eve, “because she was the mother of all living” (v. 20). This alludes back to Gen. 2:19-20 where the man was responsible for naming all the creatures. In contrast to the fig leaf loincloths of v. 7, the Lord God made them animal skin clothing (v. 21). The remaining verses, 22-24, describe the expulsion from the garden. The Lord God, speaking to some kind of divine entity or group, points out how the man has become like the divine beings, knowing good and bad and proving the serpent’s argument right that they would become so. Not wanting the man to eat from the tree of life, he expels him from the garden, and presumably the woman as well, although she is not explicitly mentioned. After the man is driven out, the deity put cherubim and a fiery turning sword to guard the tree of life.

4.1.4 *Gen. 3:1-24 Interpreted*

Gen. 3:1-6

1 Now the serpent was the shrewdest of all the wild beasts that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, “Did God really say: You shall not eat of any tree of the garden?” 2 The woman replied to the serpent, “We may eat of the fruit of the other trees of the garden. 3 It is only about fruit of the tree in the middle of the garden that God said: ‘You shall not eat of it or touch it, lest you die.’” 4 And the serpent said to the woman, “You are not going to die, 5 but God knows, that as soon as you eat of it your eyes will be opened and you will be like divine beings who know good and bad.” 6 When the woman saw that the tree was good for

eating and a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was desirable as a source of wisdom, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave some to her husband, and he ate.

Gen. 3:1 shifts the scene of the narrative away from God creating and into the actions of some of his creations. The text describes the serpent as shrewder than any other beast, hinting at his character and how he might act in the story. Interpreters over the centuries have tried to understand this serpent, and for much of that time the traditional understanding in Christianity, not necessarily in Judaism, has been that the serpent was Satan. Ibn Ezra pointed out how the text precludes this option, as the curses that the serpent receives in vv. 14-15 could hardly be applied to Satan.⁴⁹⁵

There has been some debate about whether what the serpent says in v. 1 should be taken as interrogative, and therefore be read as a question, or if it is a statement of surprise.⁴⁹⁶ Most modern translations understand it as a question. The woman responds to the serpent's question with a correction, noting that it is not all fruit that is banned in the garden, only the tree that is in the middle of the garden.⁴⁹⁷ The serpent responds negatively to the woman's restatement of the deity's warning. He points out how the fruit would actually make the woman like a divine being, so of course God doesn't want her to eat it. The woman would then know good and bad, and become like the deity. After this point is made the woman sees that the fruit of the tree is good, as it was a source of wisdom and a "delight to the eyes," so she eats it. She also shares the fruit with her husband, who eats as well.

⁴⁹⁵ Strickman and Silver, eds., *Ibn Ezra's Commentary on the Pentateuch, Genesis (Bereshit)* (New York: Menorah Publishing Company, Inc., 1988), 65. The BM assumes that "that being," the serpent, was Satan. In OT1, the earliest manuscript of JS's revision of the Bible, the text says that "Satan put it into the heart of the serpent for he had drew away many after him..." See Faulring, Jackson, and Matthews, eds., *Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts* (Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2004), 90. This passage is now Moses 4:6 in the current edition of the Pearl of Great Price.

⁴⁹⁶ Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17*, 186.

⁴⁹⁷ At this point the reader might wonder which tree, because both the tree of life and the tree of knowledge of good and bad are in the middle of the garden according to Gen. 2:9. I follow Mettinger here in that Adam and Eve are still not aware of the existence of the tree of life. See Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 37.

Ancient Sources

Besides some small semantic shifts both the LXX⁴⁹⁸ and the SP follow the MT closely. The SP expands only minimally in v. 3, where it appears that an accidental “this” was added to the text so that instead of reading “the fruit of the tree which is” it reads “the fruit of this the tree which is.”⁴⁹⁹ The LXX and the SP have both Adam and Eve eating the fruit together after Eve gave him the fruit from the tree. The MT only says that he ate also.

There are more expansions in the Targums. In Targum Neofiti the expansions follow the ones already noted throughout chapter two. When the serpent tells the woman in v. 5 she won’t die from eating the forbidden tree the translator adds, “because it is manifest and known before the Lord that on the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and that you will be like angels before the Lord, knowing to distinguish between good and evil.”⁵⁰⁰ The Aramaic translator interprets the מִיְהוָה of v. 5 as “angels before the Lord,” downplaying the unique divine nature that is attributed to these beings in the other translations.⁵⁰¹ The last part of v. 5 also includes the now familiar gloss on the tree of knowledge that it allows those who eat from it to “distinguish between good and evil.” Targum Neofiti also differs from the LXX and SP at the end of v. 6 (v. 7 of the LXX), and agrees with the MT that after Eve gave the fruit to Adam he is the only one eating.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan expands on the MT as well. In v. 4 it puts words in the serpent’s mouth, as well as stating that the serpent, “spoke slander against his creator.”⁵⁰² At the end of v. 4 Targum Pseudo-Jonathan puts the following into the serpent’s mouth: “You shall not die,

⁴⁹⁸ The LXX also has different chapter and verse designations here. Gen. 2:25 (MT) is Gen. 3:1 in the LXX for this chapter, Gen. 3:1 (MT) is Gen. 3:2 in the LXX, and so on.

⁴⁹⁹ Tsedaka, *The Israelites Samaritan Version*, 9.

⁵⁰⁰ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 60.

⁵⁰¹ The LXX has θεοι, “gods.”

⁵⁰² Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 25.

But every craftsman hates his fellow craftsman.”⁵⁰³ In v. 5 the word אַהֲלֵי, similar to Targum Neofiti, is interpreted as “great angels” and in v. 6 it says that “the woman saw Sammael the angel of death and she was afraid,”⁵⁰⁴ and she understands that eating from the fruit would cure “the light of the eyes.”⁵⁰⁵ Targum Pseudo-Jonathan also follows the MT and Targum Neofiti in saying only Adam eats the fruit at the end of v. 6, after Eve had already eaten and brought the fruit to him.

There are no known quotations, allusions, or echoes to Gen. 3:1-6 in the HB, but there are several early Jewish texts that do, and one NT text. 1 En. 25:4 is reminiscent of the woman’s explanation to the serpent that they could eat from any tree in the garden except “the one in the middle of the garden.” In 1 En. 25:4 a similar tree is described and it is said that, “no flesh has the right to touch it until the great judgment...”⁵⁰⁶ Later in 1 En. 32:5-6 the expulsion narrative is alluded to, including some material from Gen. 3:1-6. In 1 En. 32:6 Gabriel explains the tree of wisdom to Enoch, how “your father of old and your mother of old, who were before you, ate and learned wisdom. And their eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked, and they were driven from the garden.”⁵⁰⁷ The serpent is curiously missing from the description, due to the passage’s focus on the beauty of the tree and importance of wisdom.

Jub. 3:17-21a is a block quotation of Gen. 3:1-6.⁵⁰⁸ The text follows the MT closely until Eve is getting to give Adam some of the fruit. After she ate the fruit “she first covered her

⁵⁰³ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 25, nt. 4 notes that in Genesis Rabbah the tree of knowledge is what the deity ate right before creating the world. If the man was to similarly eat from the tree then he would also become a craftsman and hate his fellow craftsman.

⁵⁰⁴ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 26.

⁵⁰⁵ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 26.

⁵⁰⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 312.

⁵⁰⁷ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 320.

⁵⁰⁸ The quotation goes on following the Genesis text, but it is only necessary here to identify the specific verses in Jubilees that use Gen. 3:1-6.

shame with fig leaves and then gave it to Adam.”⁵⁰⁹ To the author of Jubilees it makes sense that Eve would have learned that she was naked right after eating the fruit from the tree. She is ashamed of the fact, so she makes a covering out of fig leaves. It wouldn’t take Adam and Eve together to figure this out, at least in the depiction found here in Jubilees.

SibOr 1:39b-45 likewise references the narrative of Gen. 3:1-6. After several lines on the creation (lines 9-21) reminiscent of the Priestly account in Gen. 1, the Sibyl turns to the Yahwistic account of creation, the Eden narrative, and the expulsion from Eden in lines 22-64. In lines 39b-45 the emphasis of the retelling of Gen. 3:1-6 is on the decisions of the woman and the negative consequences her decisions had for Adam and the rest of humanity. As Lightfoot has pointed out,

In midrash, in the large body of Adam-and-Eve literature, in the Christian Latin epicists, and elsewhere, the story is subjected to constant retelling and reinterpretation: in comparison to these, the Sibyl’s version may seem rather pared-down, with none of the more dramatic departures in the story (such as the idea that the serpent was Satan). There is little embellishment, and no direct speech until God pronounces the end...⁵¹⁰

The Sibyl follows the source text rather closely, but focuses heavily on the woman’s role in the expulsion. Later in SibOr 8:259-263 the Sibyl alludes to the serpent, and the knowledge of good and evil.⁵¹¹

Sir. 25:24 alludes to the woman’s decision to go against instruction and eat from the tree. According to that verse, “In a woman was sin’s beginning: on her account we all die.”⁵¹² This verse is sandwiched between several verses where Ben Sira makes negative statements towards

⁵⁰⁹ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 19.

⁵¹⁰ Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles*, 331-332.

⁵¹¹ See Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” 424.

⁵¹² Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 343.

women.⁵¹³ The text clearly alludes to the Eden narrative, particularly the woman's decision to transgress instructions in Gen. 3:1-6.

The serpent's duping of Eve is alluded to in the ApAb 23:1,⁵¹⁴ GkApEzra 2:16,⁵¹⁵ PssSol 4:9,⁵¹⁶ HelSynPr 12:46,⁵¹⁷ 4 Macc. 18:8,⁵¹⁸ 3 Baruch 4:8,⁵¹⁹ and 2 En. 31:6.⁵²⁰ For the most part these passages simply allude to this pericope without much change or comment, incorporating this part of the Eden narrative into their own text.

The *LAE*, in both recensions Apoc and Vita, references Gen. 3:1-6 several times. *LAE* Apoc 7:2 says that the "enemy" gave fruit from the tree to Eve after the angels who guarded Eve, the audience's "mother," ascended to heaven to worship the Lord.⁵²¹ The Eve gave to Adam, the narrator, to eat also. The verse deviates from the Yahwistic account in that the "enemy" gave the fruit to Eve rather than convincing her the fruit was good and then independently eating it.

LAE Apoc 16:1-5 slightly differs in that the devil and the serpent were not conflated, but instead these verses say that the devil spoke to the serpent and convinced the serpent to deceive Adam and Eve to get them thrown out of the garden. This narrative continues into chapters 17 and 18, where the serpent climbs over a wall to get into paradise. This is during the hour when the angels would go sing to God,⁵²² and therefore he is undetected. He finds Eve and convinces her to eat from the tree. She in turn finds Adam and convinces him to eat,

⁵¹³ See Skehan and Di Lella's discussion of this issue, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 351-352.

⁵¹⁴ Cf. R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 700.

⁵¹⁵ Cf. M. E. Stone, "Greek Apocalypse of Ezra," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 572.

⁵¹⁶ R. B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 655.

⁵¹⁷ D. A. Fiensy and D. R. Darnell, "Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 692.

⁵¹⁸ H. Anderson, "4 Maccabees," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 563.

⁵¹⁹ Gaylord, Jr., "3 Baruch," 666-667.

⁵²⁰ Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 154.

⁵²¹ M. D. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," 273.

⁵²² This text makes praise and worship seem like it is a time when the angels' guards were down.

but the text claims that the devil spoke through her in order to convince him. Gen. 3:1-6 is quoted and expanded upon in *LAE* Apoc 16:2-21:5a. *LAE* Vita 26:2 alludes to Gen. 3:6, but in the context of Gen. 3 it is the cursing of Adam in Gen. 3:17 that this verse is quoting. The only remaining text is 1 Tim. 2:13-15, which claims that it was Eve that was deceived and became a transgressor, not Adam. It further claims that she will be saved through bearing children as long as they continue in faith.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 3:1-6 has had an important impact on the composition of the BM. Lehi's dream of the tree of life has had one of the most enduring legacies on the thought, culture, and even art of Mormon life for more than fifty years. Artist renditions of the vision have captivated many who have read the passage and seen the images. Without the Eden narrative it is doubtful that the other, more limited, references to the tree of life in the KJV would have been influential enough to catalyze the author of 1 Ne. 8 to write what he did, or the same for Alma 12 or 42. The depictions of Eden in the BM all have an important place in BM exegesis of the Bible.

Gen. 3:1-6 is summarized in 2 Ne. 2:18b-19a, only about one verse. Verses 1 and 4-6 have been summarized using terminology specifically from these verses. In vv. 17-18a elements from Isa. 14:12-20 are summarized and represent the author's understanding and identification of Satan with the king described in Isa. 14 and the serpent described in Gen. 3:1.⁵²³ They are one and the same person,⁵²⁴ as this fallen being from heaven is described in the same verse as

⁵²³ It is possible that in the alternative version of a primordial man and a garden found in Ezek. 28:12-16 and 31:2-18 that Isa. 14 is also invoked. Cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 327. The difference is that the king of Tyre in Ezek. 28:2-7, 17 is not connected to a serpent or adversarial character. Rather, it is the primordial man himself that is compared to the king of Isa. 14. See also 2 En. 9:1-6, esp. Andersen's notes on this topic. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," 149, nt. i.

⁵²⁴ This is a fascinating shift partially because there is a serpent figure in Isa. 14 that acts as the messenger of God that brings justice, judgment, and goodness. See James H. Charlesworth, *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol Became Christianized* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 248. The serpent in Isa. 14 is an entirely different entity from the king.

“that old serpent, which is the devil, which is the father of all lies,”⁵²⁵ and that he says to Eve, “Partake of the forbidden fruit, and ye shall not die, but ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil.”⁵²⁶ After this, v. 19 describes how Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit. The emphasis of the verses is on the Devil and describing his significant role in getting Adam and Eve to break God’s command by eating the fruit, thereby deceiving them.

The last line of 2 Ne. 2:18 is very similar, almost word for word, to Gen. 3:5. It is important to note that the “gods” of the KJV have been altered and instead read as the singular noun “God.” This section of the original manuscript (O) of the BM is no longer extant, but the printer’s manuscript (P) is and has recently become available for research in the *Joseph Smith Papers Project*. In P the singular noun “God” is found at 2 Ne. 2:18. This verse should be compared with Alma 12:31 and Alma 42:3 prior to making any conclusions about a possible monotheistic updating to the Genesis text on the part of the author of the BM.

Alma 12:31 informally quotes Gen. 3:5 after it alludes to Adam and Eve who “first transgressed the first commandments...and becoming as Gods, knowing good from evil.” The text of this verse in O is only partially preserved. According to Skousen’s typographical facsimile, the “Go” on “Gods” is only partially legible, and the “ds,” which was written on the next line, is now missing because the left half of the page has been lost. The verse is fully

⁵²⁵ The phrase “that old serpent, which is the Devil” is derived specifically from Rev. 20:2 (KJV). The closest language in the KJV to Rev. 20:2 in describing the serpent this way is found in Rev. 12:9, “that old serpent, called the Devil...” The phrase “father of all lies,” used to describe the devil, finds its source in John 8:44 (KJV) although the exact phrase is not there. It is known that John 8 was interpreted this way, with the specific phrase “father of all lies,” in the early 19th century. For example, Rev. Legh Richmond wrote, “But forasmuch as the devil, the father of all lies (John, viii.), knoweth that such as he inspireth with lies, cannot do harm with his lies, except they be used as the persons be qualified, amongst whom the lies must be sown...” in Rev. Legh Richmond, A. M., *A Selection from the Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant Divines of the Church of England*. (London: Published by John Hatchard, 1817), 587. As noted by Martin Hengel in the context of John 8:44, “Behind this is the ancient story from Genesis 3 and 4: the devil brings death to humankind and Cain, the first murderer (cf. 1 Jn 3.12), is his son. The closest Jewish parallel to this type of language is the reference to the ‘Sons of darkness’ and of Belial from Qumran, which includes both the Gentiles and rebellious Israel,” in Martin Hengel, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, eds., *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 387.

⁵²⁶ 2 Ne. 2:18.

preserved in P, where we find the plural noun “Gods.” This complicates the picture, especially when we consider how Alma 42:3 is preserved in O, where it reads the singular noun “God.”

We have three verses that have been influenced directly by Gen. 3:5, and two of the three have altered the source text to the singular, monotheistic “God.” The remaining text also views the “Gods” as more important than at least the KJV translators and later printers did of the “gods” of Gen. 3:5. The tendency in the BM is toward a singular noun variant reading, suggesting that the author of the BM had a theological issue at least to a small degree with the idea that there were “gods” that humans could be like, rather than “God.”

In 1 Ne. 8:10 the fruit of the tree is described as being “desirable, to make one happy.” This is contrasted in this section’s source text where it is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, not the tree of life, that is “desired to make one wise.”⁵²⁷ Wisdom in Eden has been replaced in Lehi’s vision with happiness as the desired outcome of eating the fruit of the tree. While the Eden narrative may have been a polemical text written in response to wisdom literature, it is a significant fact that wisdom has been replaced with happiness in 1 Ne. 8:10, as Lehi’s vision depicts a metaphorical return to Eden.

Besides this move away from wisdom, the line in Gen. 3:6 where Eve “took of the fruit thereof” has influenced 1 Ne. 8:11-13, 15-17, 27, 30 and 2 Ne. 2:19. The idea that the fruit was desirable, also found in Gen. 3:6, has influenced 1 Ne. 15:36; 2 Ne. 8:10, 15, 17. In these verses the fruit is “desirable above all other fruit,” an idea that is not found anywhere in Gen. 3.

Gen. 3:8

8 They heard the sound of the LORD God moving about in the garden at the breezy time of day; and the man and his wife hid from the LORD God among the trees of the garden.

⁵²⁷ Gen. 3:6.

Many English translations of Gen. 3:8 translate קול as “voice,” but as Westermann and others have shown it is not voice but the sound made from footsteps.⁵²⁸ Alluding to Gen. 2:25, the man and woman now feel shame for their nakedness and from the deity.⁵²⁹

Ancient Sources

The LXX mostly follows the MT in this verse, and the SP only alters the “breezy time of day” for “the refreshment of the day.”⁵³⁰ Targum Neofiti adds to the beginning of the verse that “they heard the sound of the Memra of the Lord God...”⁵³¹ The root of this word, שמע, means the same in both Hebrew and Aramaic,⁵³² and implies that they heard the deity’s speech. This is similar to the LXX’s reading that they heard the deity’s voice. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan also mentions the Memra, and alters the “breezy” time of the day for “the decline of the day.”⁵³³

2 En. 8:3 alludes to the tree of life in Gen. 3:8, and more specifically that it is that tree that the deity takes rest under whenever he would take a walk in Paradise. According to 2 Enoch the tree of life, “is indescribable for pleasantness of fragrance.”⁵³⁴ 3 En. 23:18, a late addition to the book, quotes Gen. 3:8 directly⁵³⁵ and describes how in the future “the righteous and the godly...shall inherit the garden of Eden and the tree of life in time to come,” ending with a quotation of Song 4:16 that is applied to the Genesis verse. In *LAE* Apoc 8:1 the deity comes onto the scene with a loud voice rather than softly moving around in the garden “at the breezy time of the day.” In this text God comes into the garden, “with a frightful, saying, ‘Adam,

⁵²⁸ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 254. Cf. 2 Sam. 5:24; 1 Kgs. 14:6; and 2 Kgs. 6:32.

⁵²⁹ See also Gen. 3:10.

⁵³⁰ Tsedaka, *The Israelite Samaritan Version*, 9.

⁵³¹ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 60.

⁵³² Koehler and Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume 2 ט–ת*, 1815.

⁵³³ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 26.

⁵³⁴ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 115.

⁵³⁵ “...as it is written, ‘He walked in the garden at the time of the daily wind,’” in P. Alexander, “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 308.

where are you? And why do you hide from my face? Can the house hide from its builder?” In *LAE* Apoc 8:2 the deity proceeds to give curses that are far worse than the ones in Gen. 3:14-19. The depiction of the deity is much stronger, and a polemic against the idea that God did not know where Adam and Eve were appears to be written into this text.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 3:8 is echoed in arguably one of the most significant chapters in the BM: 3 Ne. 11. It has also been heavily influenced by the NT in its description of Jesus descending down from the sky,⁵³⁶ but more importantly for the present purpose is how 3 Ne. 11:4 uses the phrase “they heard the voice” from the KJV of Gen. 3:8.

In this chapter the Nephites that gathered at the temple in Bountiful were discussing the destruction of their lands that had taken place in the previous three chapters. As they were talking, “a voice as if it came out of heaven” (v. 3) was heard, but they weren’t sure what it was saying. After being spoken three times, the voice is finally heard clearly and understood to be announcing that Jesus was descending out of heaven. For the narrative and characters of the BM this is a literal return to Eden. It takes place at the temple and has Jesus, the God of the BM, come down to the people to be in their presence. It is a reversal of what we see happen in Gen. 3.

In contrast to 3 Ne. 11, the voice that the people, in this case Adam and Eve, hear does not signal a positive event. First, they hide because they now know they are naked. Ultimately, this hearing of the voice would not happen again in so intimate a way for Adam and Eve because they are sent out of Eden and out of the deity’s presence.⁵³⁷ Jesus’s return, although

⁵³⁶ Cf. Acts 1:9-11.

⁵³⁷ It does seem implied by the text in Gen. 4 that being in the presence of God was at least enjoyed by Cain prior to his murdering Abel. See Gen. 4:14-16.

to the Nephites and not Adam and Eve, in 3 Ne. 11 undoes what is described in the latter half of Gen. 3.

Gen. 3:13

13 And the LORD God said to the woman, “What is this you have done!” The woman replied, “The serpent duped me, and I ate.”

In vv. 11-13 the man and woman are interrogated by God and almost the entire scene of what happened is explained. As Westermann points out,⁵³⁸ not all questions about the preceding narrative are answered in this scene. The man explains that he ate from the fruit because the woman gave it to him, and the woman explains that she ate because the serpent beguiled or duped her. The interrogation makes these two facts clear, but the serpent never explains why he convinced the woman to eat, so one of the most important questions about the story goes unanswered. In the end the serpent is the culprit, and that all three of them will receive punishment in the following verses.

Ancient Sources

The LXX (Gen. 3:14) again follows the MT in this verse, and the SP follows it closely as well. Targum Neofiti also follows the MT closely, but Targum Pseudo-Jonathan expands the woman’s statement to the deity. Rather than simply being duped or beguiled, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan has her explain that “The serpent lured me with his cleverness and led me astray in his wickedness, and I ate.”⁵³⁹ The first part of the expansion alludes to Gen. 3:1 where it is said that the serpent was the shrewdest of the creatures of creation, and the second part of the expansion alludes to later interpretations of the serpent figure as being evil.

LAE Apoc 23:5 includes a rewritten version of the Genesis story. First, the question is addressed to Adam and not Eve. Eve does not have any role in *LAE* Apoc 23 in responding

⁵³⁸ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 256.

⁵³⁹ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 27.

to God. Adam responds with essentially the same thing as Eve about being deceived by the serpent, except that he does not include the clause about eating. In the NT, 1 Tim. 2:13-15 alludes to the idea that it was the woman, not the man, who was deceived.⁵⁴⁰

Book of Mormon

Gen. 3:13 is used in four verses in the BM, all from different sections of the text. In Hel. 6:26 Satan is alluded to in the context of “secret oaths and covenants” that Gadianton had known and taught to his followers. It is claimed in the text that Gadianton learned secrets from the Devil himself, who had “put [them] into the heart of Gadianton.” Satan is described here as “that same being who did entice our first parents to partake of the forbidden fruit.” It is clear what the author of Hel. 6:26 is alluding to, and it is in a similar form to each of the other three times this verse appears in the BM.

In Ether 8:25 the identification of the Devil with the serpent is even more explicit. In the context of secret oaths again, the text says, “for it is built up by the devil, which is the father of all lies; even that same liar which beguiled our first parents...” Ether 8:25 is strikingly similar to the portrayal of Satan in Hel. 6:26. Both are writing in the same context, interpreting the serpent as the Devil, and, although not related to Gen. 3:13, both include an allusion to Satan’s involvement with Cain murdering Abel.

In 2 Ne. 9:9 the Devil is described as the father of all lies, being in misery and making those who he had power over miserable as well. The depiction of his pathetic state is reminiscent to what is found in 2 Ne. 2:18 and its interpretation of Isa. 14:12-20. Gen. 3:13 has also clearly influenced this verse, as the author equates the Devil with “that being who beguiled our first parents.” Satan is described in the same context as was found in Hel. 6:26

⁵⁴⁰ Aegeson, “Genesis in the Deutero-Pauline Epistles,” in Menken and Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament*, 118-122.

and Ether 8:25 as inspiring secret oaths in human beings, this time more explicitly about murder and darkness. It is also important to note how Satan is described as “transform[ing] himself nigh unto an angel of light.” This exact terminology to describe Satan is found in 2 Cor. 11:14, which means that the author of 2 Ne. 9:9 was influenced by an interpretive tradition that understood the serpent of Gen. 3, the fallen king of Isa. 14, and Satan of 2 Cor. 11:14 to all be one and the same being.

Mosiah 16:3 is likewise similar to Hel. 6:26 and Ether 8:25. In this verse it is said that because humans are “carnal and devlish” the devil has “power over them.” The devil is “that old serpent that did beguile our first parents...” and because of this they fell and became “carnal, sensual, and devlish”⁵⁴¹ Although this is not in the context of secret oaths, like the other texts, it is still very similar to the previous three verses. For example, the structure and terminology are similar in each of the four:

Hel. 6:26 – ...that same being who did entice our first parents...

Ether 8:25 – ...that same liar which beguiled our first parents...

2 Ne. 9:9 – ...that being who beguiled our first parents...

Mosiah 16:3 – ...that old serpent that did beguile our first parents...

Each of these four verses—from strikingly different parts of the BM—all interpret Gen. 3:13 the same way, use the same structure and almost the exact same terminology, and all but one use this verse in the context of secret oaths. It is important to note that, at least according to the text, these verses range from the time of Mosiah down to Moroni, roughly from several generations after the arrival in the Americas until about 400 BCE. That is an incredibly long period of time to have such an early and static interpretation of Gen. 3:13, particularly in a way that interprets the serpent in the form these verses do. The form of the interpretation agrees with later developments in Christian thought.

⁵⁴¹ This phrase comes from James 3:15, and also reflects 18th and 19th century terminology in interpreting that verse.

Gen. 3:19

19 By the sweat of your brow shall you get bread to eat, until you return to the ground—For from it you were taken. For dust you are, and to dust you shall return.

Gunkel argued that v. 19 was “an extremely pessimistic view of human life and specifically of farming.”⁵⁴² I agree with Westermann that to acknowledge the real difficulties involved in work and farming is not to be pessimistic, but is instead a “sober realism.”⁵⁴³ After a life of work man must return to the ground that he was created from, and that he spent his life working on.

Ancient Sources

The LXX again follows the MT here, and the SP makes the last mention of the dust in the verse possessive. Rather than returning to dust in general, the man is told that, “to your dust you shall return.”⁵⁴⁴ Targum Neofiti adds almost another verse after v. 19, bringing in the belief of resurrection and judgment. After the man returns to the dust he is told that, “from the dust you are to arise again to give an account and a reckoning of all that you have done.”⁵⁴⁵ This same expansion is also found in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, where we also find that the “sweat of your brow” has been changed to the “labor of your hand.”⁵⁴⁶

Ps. 146:4 is similar to Gen. 3:19 in that when man dies, or his breath leaves him, “he returns to the dust.” In a very similar way, Eccl. 3:20 says that, “They all come from dust, and they all return to dust.”⁵⁴⁷ This idea is also mentioned in Job 10:9 and 34:14-15. In 10:9 it is made clear that Job was made from clay and he asks, “Will You then turn me back into dust?” 34:14-15 reference the spirit and breath being taken back, man “expiring,” and then returning

⁵⁴² Gunkel, *Genesis*, 22.

⁵⁴³ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 265.

⁵⁴⁴ Tsedaka, *The Israelite Samaritan Version*, 10.

⁵⁴⁵ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 62.

⁵⁴⁶ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 28.

⁵⁴⁷ Thomas Kruger, *Qobeleth*, 80. The connection of this verse and Gen. 3:19 is made by Kruger on page 93.

to dust. Sir. 17:1 likewise mentions humans being made from earth and then returning to earth at death. Sir. 40:11 mentions how “All that is from earth returns to earth,”⁵⁴⁸ but the connection to Gen. 3:19 is not as strong of a connection as the other verses previously noted. Tob. 3:6 is similar to the previous verses in that Tobit mentions how his spirit can be taken from him so that he can die and become dust. 2 En. 32:1a expands on the expulsion narrative from Genesis, and the deity tells Adam that he is “earth, and into the earth once again you will go, out of which I took you.”⁵⁴⁹ SibOr 1:58 appears to be the only verse that does not focus on Gen. 3:19b for the dust imagery. It mentions how Adam would have to work by his sweat for his food. Each of these verses seems to be aware of the same tradition found in, if not the text of, Gen. 3:19.⁵⁵⁰

1QH^a also references Gen. 3:19 in several places. 1QH^a XX₂₆₋₂₇ states that “26 The creature of clay must return to the dust at the end of his days...[and must revert] to the dust 27 from which he had been taken. What will the dust reply?”⁵⁵¹ In 1QH^a XVIII₄ the narrator notes how man is made from clay and “to dust he must return.”⁵⁵² Later on in the text, 1QH^a XXIII₂₄ (2 i 4) also notes how the deity took man, in this case the narrator or individual, from the dust and how man will return to the dust. There are several other examples of the use of Gen. 3:19 throughout 1QH^a,⁵⁵³ and it has been made clear that this text has used that verse in Gen. 3.

Book of Mormon

Jacob 2:21 alludes to the idea that “all flesh is of dust,” which is found in Gen. 2:7 and 3:19. Gen. 2:7 briefly mentions that the deity formed man out of the “dust,” whereas 3:19

⁵⁴⁸ Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 462.

⁵⁴⁹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 154.

⁵⁵⁰ Cf. also Ps.–Phoc. 107-108.

⁵⁵¹ Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 356.

⁵⁵² Garcia Martinez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, 350.

⁵⁵³ See also 1QH^a XVIII₁₂; XX₂₉₋₃₀ (XII₂₆₋₂₇); XX₃₄ (XII₃₁); XXII₈ (1₄); and XXII₃₀ (4₁₁).

focuses on the idea in a poetic form: “For dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” Although the allusion in Jacob 2:21 could be pointing back to either of these verses in the Eden narrative, the verse in chapter 3 has for a long time been an integral part of Christian thought on the Eden narrative, and life in general. It has often been used as part of the liturgy of Christian funerals, and so has had an important place in Christian thought about the life and death of individuals, giving it far greater access to an author’s mind than Gen. 2:7.

Gen. 3:22-24

22 And the LORD God said, “Now that the man has become like one of us, knowing good and bad, what if he should stretch out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever!” 23 So the LORD God banished him from the garden of Eden, to till the soil from which he was taken. 24 He drove the man out, and stationed east of the garden of Eden the cherubim and a fiery ever-turning sword, to guard the way to the tree of life.

It has been argued by many scholars since the work of K. Budde⁵⁵⁴ that in the expulsion narrative of vv. 22-24 we can see a clear doublet that shows text was added at a late stage in the composition of these verses.⁵⁵⁵ I agree with Jean-Louis Ska’s argument that *חלל* (“banish”) and *שרג* (“drive out”) are not synonyms, and that there are several examples throughout the HB that support reading vv. 22-24 as a unified text.⁵⁵⁶

Verse 22 shows that the serpent was not completely lying when it claims that the humans would become like divine beings if they ate from the tree of knowledge of good and bad.⁵⁵⁷ The deity must quickly make it impossible for them to now eat from the tree of life, meaning that they had eaten from it already before.⁵⁵⁸ The man (and presumably the woman) is banished

⁵⁵⁴ K. Budde, “Die biblische Urgeschichte” Gen. 1-12,5 (*Anhang: Die älteste Gestalt der biblischen Urgeschichte, versuchsweise wiederhergestellt, hebraischer text und uebersetzung*, Gießen, 1883). Cited in Jean-Louis Ska, “Genesis 2-3: Some Fundamental Questions,” in Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, eds., *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe, 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 24.

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 271-275.

⁵⁵⁶ Ska, “Genesis 2-3: Some Fundamental Questions,” 12-16.

⁵⁵⁷ Hamilton’s assessment of the intent and general characterization of the serpent is off base and too strong. He reads way too much into the text, and in the end provides a polemical and theologically driven reading than is necessary to understand the text. See Hamilton, *Genesis 1-17*, 189-191.

⁵⁵⁸ See Mettinger’s discussion of *לֹא* (“lest”) in Mettinger, *The Eden Narrative*, 20.

and then driven out of the garden. The cherubim are an integral part of the description of the garden of Eden, as is also seen in Ezek. 28:14.⁵⁵⁹

Ancient Sources

The LXX alters a few important things in vv. 22-24 (LXX vv. 23-25). The garden is called “the garden of Delight” and in v. 24 (LXX v. 25) the LXX says that the deity “caused him to dwell over against the garden of Delight,”⁵⁶⁰ where the MT only says that, “He drove the man out.” The SP, on the other hand, follows the MT throughout these three verses.

In vv. 22-24 as found in Targum Neofiti we come to the largest expansion on the MT in the Targums yet. Both vv. 22 and 24 have had a lot of material added to them. In v. 22 Targum Neofiti claims that the man is alone in the world as the deity is alone in the heavens. The translator apparently forgot the narrative prior to these verses that had Eve as a key character and companion to the man, unless he meant to suggest that the deity also has a female companion. The translator also claims that many nations would come from Adam, but importantly that Israel, although not explicitly mentioned, would be one of them and that they would be able to distinguish between good and evil. In a very priestly style it is said that because Adam did not follow the Law he was being banished from the garden.

In v. 24 the translator continues his priestly interpretation and describes the dwelling of the deity’s Shekinah as “between the two cherubim,”⁵⁶¹ similar to the description of the Holy of Holies as found in Ex. 25:22.⁵⁶² The text also claims that two thousand years prior to creation the deity created the Law. Eden was for the just and “Gehenna for the wicked.”⁵⁶³ The rest of the expansion describes these two opposing places for the righteous and the wicked

⁵⁵⁹ This point has been made in Ska, “Genesis 2-3: Some Fundamental Questions,” 16.

⁵⁶⁰ Sir Lancelot Brenton, *The Septuagint Version: Greek and English* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 5.

⁵⁶¹ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 64.

⁵⁶² Propp identifies this verse as P. See William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19-40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 310-311.

⁵⁶³ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 64.

as being prepared to be inhabited after mortality, for the righteous “because they had kept precepts of the Law in this world and fulfilled the commandments.”⁵⁶⁴ The fire and the turning sword are separated as punishments for the wicked. In Gehenna “darts of fire and burning coals for the wicked”⁵⁶⁵ are prepared for the wicked because they didn’t live the Law. For those who did live the Law it becomes like a tree of life.

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is similar to Targum Neofiti in that they both have large expansions to these verses. In v. 22 the deity is said to be speaking “to the angels who minister before him.”⁵⁶⁶ In v. 24, after Adam is banished from Eden, he “settled on Mount Moriah.”⁵⁶⁷ Targum Pseudo-Jonathan also does not include the two thousand years as found in Targum Neofiti, but the comparisons of Eden and Gehenna are very similar.

1 En. 25:4 alludes to Gen. 3:22-24 and the idea that because the man and woman were expelled from the garden, the tree of life (although not explicitly named, the motifs all fit the descriptions of the tree of life that were common in the second temple period) was off limits to humans “until the great judgment.”⁵⁶⁸ Only a few chapters later the Eden narrative and expulsion from the garden are directly alluded to in 1 En. 32:6. The angel Gabriel explains to Enoch that the tree of wisdom (i.e. tree of knowledge of good and bad) that he sees in the vision was the same tree that “your father of old and your mother of old, who were before you, ate and learned wisdom.”⁵⁶⁹ This allusion is unmistakably to the Genesis account, as it continues on by describing how their eyes were opened after eating from the tree, they knew

⁵⁶⁴ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 64.

⁵⁶⁵ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 64.

⁵⁶⁶ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 30.

⁵⁶⁷ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 30.

⁵⁶⁸ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 312. The connection between the two texts, particularly in the context of the tree being forbidden, is noted by Nickelsburg on page 314.

⁵⁶⁹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 320.

they were naked, and then how they were driven from the garden. There is no doubt this text is alluding to Gen. 3:22-24, along with other parts of the Eden narrative.

2 En. 22:10 focuses on the man becoming “like one of the glorious ones,”⁵⁷⁰ but that there was no difference in his appearance. Later in the book, 2 En. 42:4 describes how there are guards at the gates that are obviously counterparts to the cherubim of Gen. 3:24. In the Enochic text they are described as “angels of flame.”⁵⁷¹

The expulsion account of Gen. 3:22-24 is alluded to at the very beginning of *LAE Vita*, and there the man and woman are said to have made a tent and mourned seven days after the expulsion. The T Levi 18:10-11 is much further into the future, and describes a time when “the sword that has threatened since Adam”⁵⁷² will be removed, and the saints will be allowed to eat from the tree of life. The basic idea is that the actions of Gen. 3:22-24 will be overturned, and Eden will be open again.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 3:22-24 is the most accurately quoted text of all the verses of Gen. 2-4 that are found in the BM, and the same goes for all of the J verses together. I will briefly note the closeness of the quotations in Alma 12:21 and 42:2-3, 5. Both texts come very close to their source, but I will attempt to show that the author of Alma 42:2-3, 5 actually copied, word for word, out of a copy of the KJV for this pericope.

Alma 12:21 employs a citation formula in a question and answer format, “What does this Scripture mean, which saith that.” The text tacitly identifies its referent as authoritative “Scripture,” and quotes directly from Gen. 3:24 but mixes up the word order. In Gen. 3:24

⁵⁷⁰ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” 139.

⁵⁷¹ Andersen, “2 (Slavonic Apolcalypse of) Enoch,” 168.

⁵⁷² H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 795.

the relevant text says, “he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, Cherubims, and a flaming sword,” while Alma 12:21 has, “God placed Cherubims and a flaming sword on the east of the garden of Eden.”

The hypertext, in this case Alma, then quotes Gen. 3:22. This verse likewise has some alteration, although there is much that is similar. In Gen. 3:22 the relevant text says, “lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.” Alma 12:21 says, “lest our first parents should enter and partake of the fruit of the tree of life, and live forever.” Both employ the conjunction “lest” in order to describe the immediacy of stopping Adam from eating from the tree. The BM text is interpretive, describing the imagery found in Gen. 3:22-24 because nowhere is it explicitly stated that the cherubim are meant to keep Adam from entering, but rather from partaking. The idea that they could not enter is implied in v. 24 when it says that the cherubim were stationed to guard the way of the tree of life. Alma 12:21 also expands the source text to include Eve in its use of the phrase “first parents.”

The use of Gen. 3:22-24 in Alma 42:2-3, 5 follows the source text much closer than Alma 12:21. Alma 42:2 begins by quoting Gen. 3:23, altogether fifteen direct words. The same verse then quotes from Gen. 3:24 for a total of thirty-one words with some slight variation (e.g. “drew” is substituted for “drove”; “end” is added to describe the imagined barriers of the garden). Alma 42:3 then takes from both Gen. 3:5 and 22 to describe how the man had become like God, and then quotes from Gen. 3:22b for a total of twenty-one words, also with small variation (e.g. the inclusion of “should” between “lest he” and “put”; the combination of the two-word “for ever” into one word “forever”). Alma 42:3b then again quotes Gen. 3:24 for much of the same content, totaling six words, then Alma 42:5 quotes back to Gen. 3:22b for the same content as the previous verses and a total of thirteen words.

There are two options for understanding the amount of direct word for word borrowing from the KJV here in Alma 42:2-3, 5. Either the author of these verses had read Gen. 3:22-24 so often it was memorized and could easily be recited, which when compared to Alma 12:21 does not seem to be supported because the accuracy is so much greater here. Or, the author knew this passage well but wanted to make sure that the formal citation of these verses was accurate so a copy of the KJV was used to that end.

As already noted, Alma 12:21 does not lend support to the first option. Altogether Alma 42:2-3, 5 takes a staggering eighty-six words directly from Gen. 3:22-24, with the highest single unit quotation of thirty-one words and the next closest of twenty-one words. With this amount of precision in borrowing from the KJV one could reasonably expect greater precision in Alma 12:21 if the author had Gen. 3:22-24 memorized. I conclude that an actual copy of the KJV was used in producing Alma 42:2-3, 5 to ensure accuracy in the quotation.

While both of these texts have slight variation to the source text found in Gen. 3:22-24, both are quoting these verses in order to answer the questions that are relevant to the place in the narrative. The expansions to the KJV within the quotations remain limited because the purpose is to quote the source and then apply and expand on the text for the needs of the characters in the narrative context. In Alma 12:21 a “chief ruler” Antionah (v. 20) steps forward and quotes Gen. 3:22-24 in order to question Alma on the ideas about immortality he had been preaching. This allows Alma to then explain these verses to Antionah, and argue that the expulsion was based primarily on the assumption that if Adam had eaten the fruit of the tree of life after eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil he would have lived forever in a fallen state. The placement of the cherubim and the flaming sword was to ensure that there was a probationary state (i.e. mortality) that would allow time for Adam and Eve to repent before coming back to God’s presence and being judged and resurrected.

Alma 42:2-3, 5 contains almost the exact same lesson and theological argument as Alma 12:21, but this time Alma is teaching his son Corianton. The same kinds of arguments found in Alma 12:21 are found here, like the idea that Adam would have lived forever in a fallen state and would have had “no space for repentance.”⁵⁷³ This is in contrast to what is found in Gen. 3:22-24, and the wider pericope in general, because there is no indication in the text that the deity wanted humans to be immortal. On the contrary, as many commentators have pointed out before, the Yahwistic account of creation, like other ancient Near Eastern creation accounts, has a god that wants to exclude humans from immortality. In Alma the deity’s plan all along was to have the man and woman fall, allowing time in mortality to make things right before death, and then one day be resurrected to immortal life. The BM author claims that this plan “was laid from the foundation of the world,”⁵⁷⁴ borrowing terminology that occurs ten times in the NT.⁵⁷⁵

Summary

In this section I have analyzed the use of Gen. 3:1-6, 8, 13, 19, and 22-24 in the BM, as well as the HB, early Jewish and Christian sources, and each of the verses on their own. Gen. 3:1-6 influenced five BM passages,⁵⁷⁶ the majority of which were several verses long. These passages, like 2 Ne. 2:18b-19a for example, utilize a particularly Christian hermeneutic in their understanding of Gen. 3:1-6 in the portrayal of the serpent as Satan himself, blending texts with Gen. 3, like Isa. 14, in a way that Christian authors would do around the turn of era and

⁵⁷³ Alma 42:5.

⁵⁷⁴ Alma 12:25. See also 1 Ne. 10:18; 2 Ne. 9:18; 27:10; Mosiah 4:6, 7; 15:19; 18:13; Alma 12:30; 13:3, 5, 7; 18:39; 22:13; 42:26; Hel. 5:47; 3 Ne. 1:14; Ether 3:14; 4:14, 15, 19; and Mor. 8:12. The phrase is also used in other restoration scripture: D&C 29:46; 35:18; 128:18; Moses 6:54; 7:47. There are thousands of examples from the NT that could be pointed out and studied in detail to see the kind and amount of influence that the NT has had on the texts that were produced by Joseph Smith.

⁵⁷⁵ See Matt. 13:35; 25:34; Luke 11:50; John 17:24; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; 1 Pet. 1:20; Rev. 13:8; 17:8. This phrase does not appear in the OT of the KJV.

⁵⁷⁶ See 1 Ne. 8:10-13, 15-17, 23, 27-28, 30; 11:21; 15:36; 2 Ne. 2:18-20, 22-23, 25; Alma 12:31; 42:2-3, 5-7.

the first several centuries CE. These examples are in a form much later than that period and represent interpretations influenced by the KJV.

Gen. 3:8 influenced 3 Ne. 11:4 in depicting Jesus's descent from heaven to be with the Nephites in a way similar to the arrival of the deity in Gen. 3. the use of the phrase "they heard the voice" in this context signals an echo to the reader of this BM passage that is familiar with the Eden narrative.

2 Ne. 9:9 alluded to Gen. 3:13, but also blended in material from 2 Cor. 11:14 in its depiction of Satan, the one "who beguiled our first parents," as being able to transform "himself nigh unto an angel of light." He is also described as one who gets men to commit murders that are tied to "secret combinations," similar to what is found a year after the first publication of the BM in JS's revision of the Bible.⁵⁷⁷ This interpretation of Satan as serpent and beguiler is also found in Hel. 6:26-28 and Ether 8:25. Those verses are even closer to JS's revision of Gen. than 2 Ne. 9:9. Mosiah 16:3 is similar to the two verses as well, but this verse blends in a form of the phrase from James 3:15 used in the 18th and 19th centuries that switched out "earthly" for "carnal."

Jacob 2:21 alludes to Gen. 3:19 with the short statement that "all flesh is of dust." The idea that man comes from dust is found elsewhere in the Bible, but the verse in Jacob uses this idea in the context of creation.

Alma 42:2-3 and 5-7 has an extended quotation of Gen. 3:22-24 in several blocks, altogether adding up to 86 words from the source text. The translation of these Genesis verses is of course that of the KJV, and the text is somewhat out of order and repetitious in its quotation of the source material. I concluded in the analysis that the extensive word for word

⁵⁷⁷ This section was later designated as the Book of Moses.

quotation of this passage indicates that a copy of the KJV was taken out and used during the production of his section of the BM.

Gen. 3:22-24 was also used in Alma 12:21, where we find a very explicit quotation formula (“What does this Scripture mean, which saith...”). The quotation follows its source closely, although some grammatical changes were necessary to make it fit its context. The expulsion narrative is also found in 2 Ne. 2:19b, and that pericope is interpretive and expansionistic in its use of the Eden narrative and expulsion.

The use of Gen. 3 throughout the BM is some of the strongest evidence, at least in the material that uses the Yahwistic source of the Pentateuch, that a copy of the KJV was used in producing the BM. The version and form of Gen. 3, and potentially many other chapters from the KJV that the author of the BM was familiar with, can be located some time toward the end of the 18th century and beginning of the 19th.

4.1.5 *Genesis 4:1-16 in its Literary Context*

Gen. 4 begins with the man and his wife Eve having their first children. The woman’s statement in v. 1 is difficult to understand and has frustrated (or excited) interpreters for millennia. At the basic level of the text, Eve gives birth to her first child, Cain, and then has a second son named Abel. Abel keeps sheep and Cain tills the ground, and they both make an offering to the Lord of their respective property. For some reason (and another source of frustration for interpreters) the Lord accepts Abel’s offering and rejects Cain’s. The text does not explain why, but in the narrative the Lord sees how this makes Cain distressed. The Lord asks him in vv. 6-7, “Why are you distressed? And why is your face fallen? Surely, if you do right, there is uplift. But if you do not do right sin couches at the door; its urge is toward you, yet you can be its master.”

It might be assumed that the only offering the Lord is willing to receive in this narrative is animal sacrifice, but it would be wrong to make this assumption, as the text does not actually say it. It might just as easily be assumed that the Lord liked Abel more than Cain, or that the form Cain made his offering in was not accepted rather than the offering itself, or that the Lord was just having a bad day. In any case, what we know from the text is that Cain's offering is rejected and this upsets him.

In v. 8 Cain and Abel are in a field together when Cain attacks and kills Abel. The Lord approaches Cain about the location of Abel, and it comes out that Cain killed him. Abel's blood had cried from the ground to the Lord. Cain is cursed and the ground is supposed to no longer provide food for him. He is supposed to become a wanderer on earth, which is ironic given that only a few verses later he is the first city builder.⁵⁷⁸ In vv. 13-14 Cain complains about his punishment, and that because of the punishment he claims that anyone who finds him will kill him. In another odd turn of events the Lord promises protection for Cain, and says that anyone who kills Cain, "sevenfold vengeance shall be taken on him" (v. 15). After the deity places a mark on Cain so that no one would kill him, he moves and settles in "the land of Nod, east of Eden" (v. 16).

4.1.6 *Gen. 4:1-16 Interpreted*

Gen. 4:1-2⁵⁷⁹

1 Now the man knew his wife Eve, and she conceived and bore Cain, saying, "I have gained a male child with the help of the LORD." 2 She then bore his brother Abel. Abel became a keeper of sheep, and Cain became a tiller of the soil.

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. Gen. 4:17.

⁵⁷⁹ Matt. 23:35; Jude 1:11; Heb. 11:4; Matt. 5:21-5; 1 Jn. 3:12; LAB 16:2; TBenj 7:4-5; Wis. 10:3; TIss 5:5.

Gen. 4:1 has been an incredibly difficult verse to translate, and therefore understand, since at least the earliest translations in the LXX and Targums.⁵⁸⁰ Even currently scholars debate exactly how the verse should be understood, and even then scholars have a difficult time understanding one another.⁵⁸¹ הַנִּקָּה means generally to “acquire” or “create,” and it can also mean “procreate.”⁵⁸² The more confusing part of the verse is the phrase תָּא הוֹהִי, which could be interpreted as a predicative accusative, which would mean that the woman is saying her child is הוֹהִי. The text is probably best explained by comparing the phrase to the Babylonian Atrahasis epic and its use of *itti Enkima*, a parallel of תָּא הוֹהִי.⁵⁸³ This would mean that Eve is exclaiming joy for her ability to create a child with the help of the deity.

Ancient Sources

The LXX follows the MT closely in Gen. 4:1-2,⁵⁸⁴ and the same goes for the SP. In Targum Neofiti v. 1 is slightly altered and v. 2 follow the MT. The translator of this Targum avoids anthropomorphism by changing Eve’s statement from “I have gained a male child with the help of the LORD” to “I have been given a son from before the Lord.”⁵⁸⁵

In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan both verses have been altered. The first verse has Eve conceiving her first child through “Sammael, the angel of the Lord.”⁵⁸⁶ According to Maher, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is the earliest text that explicitly says that Sammael is the father of

⁵⁸⁰ For a thorough discussion of these translations and the difficulties involved in interpretation and translation of Gen. 4:1, see M. W. Scarlata, *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, Vol. 573; New York: T&T Clark, 2012), 27-48.

⁵⁸¹ See David Bokovoy, “Did Eve Acquire, Create, or Procreate with Yahweh? A Grammatical and Contextual Reassessment of qnh in Genesis 4:1,” in *Vetus Testamentum* 63 (2013), 19-35; and Michael Heiser’s misreading of Bokovoy in his recent book *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2015), 188, nt. 10.

⁵⁸² Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 28-29.

⁵⁸³ Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, 29-30.

⁵⁸⁴ The chapter and verse designations are the same in the MT and LXX in Gen. 4.

⁵⁸⁵ McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible*, 64. MaNamara notes that the “paraphrase avoids anthropomorphism” in nt. 2 on the same page.

⁵⁸⁶ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 31.

Cain.⁵⁸⁷ There were several other texts prior to this Targum that approached Gen. 4:1-2 in light of Gen. 5:2, which says that Seth was made in the image of Adam. The same is not said about Cain, so it was thought that Cain must not be Adam's son. In v. 2 Adam is Abel's father, as well as a twin sister. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan is alluding to other traditions that tried to answer the question of how Cain and Abel were going to marry.⁵⁸⁸

L_{AB} 16:2 alludes to the birth of two sons to Adam, and Abel is alluded to in Matt. 23:35; Heb. 11:4, and Cain is alluded to in Jude 1:11; 1 John 3:12. Each of these verses describes more about both Abel and Cain than what we find in Gen. 4:1-2, but it is obvious that the materials are taken from Gen. 4.

Book of Mormon

These verses, along with much of at least chapters four and five, are alluded to in 2 Ne. 2:20, 23. Both of those verses are dependent on the idea that Adam and Eve are humanity's "first parents," and that they are the parents of "the family of all the earth" (v. 20). This assumption rests also on later approaches to understanding the age of the earth by utilizing the KJV as historical textbook, organizing chronologies of birth and death years of patriarchs and kings, and then coming up with answers based on the Bible about how old the earth was. These enterprises were popular in 17th century western writings, although their origins go earlier than that century. Both of the verses in 2 Ne. 2 do not mention specific children of Adam and Eve, but rather allude to the idea that all people in all the world originate from these two primordial ancestors.

2 Ne. 2:23 interprets the Eden narrative and the expulsion or fall as completely necessary for the ability to have children, joy, or do good. Because they would "have remained in the

⁵⁸⁷ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 31, nt. 2.

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 31, nt. 3.

same state in which they were after they were created,”⁵⁸⁹ it is assumed that in that state they could not have children, or do any good or bad, or be happy or miserable. In an ending to this pericope well known in Mormon circles, it is stated that, “Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy.”⁵⁹⁰ For the author of 2 Ne. 2 there was no question about the necessity of Adam’s fall, and in a very real way it was a fortunate fall because without it Adam and Eve never would have had children.

Gen. 4:10

10 Then He said, “What have you done? Hark, your brother’s blood cries out to Me from the ground!”

Westermann has said that, “this is one of the monumental sentences in the Bible.”⁵⁹¹ The fact that any murder cannot go unheard by at least one subject, the deity, excludes the possibility of getting away with murder at any point in time.⁵⁹² Westermann has also pointed out that in the primeval setting of Gen. 1-11 there was no need for a mediator to go down and announce punishment upon the accused. Naturally then, during the primeval setting, God goes to and talks directly with Cain in this verse. In the historical narratives of 2 Sam. 12 and 1 Kgs. 21 the intervention of a mediator can only happen through a mediator.⁵⁹³

Ancient Sources

The LXX follows the MT, and the SP does as well.⁵⁹⁴ Targum Neofiti expands on the MT, and rather than just Abel’s blood crying to heaven from the ground all of the lost generations that could have lived if Abel had not been killed all cry up for vengeance. This tradition is not

⁵⁸⁹ 2 Ne. 2:22.

⁵⁹⁰ 2 Ne. 2:25.

⁵⁹¹ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 305.

⁵⁹² Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 305.

⁵⁹³ Westermann, *Genesis 1-11*, 305.

⁵⁹⁴ Contra Tsedaka, *The Israelite Samaritan Version*, 11, who notes a difference between “blood is crying” (SP) and “bloods are crying” (MT). In most modern translations the MT is translated the same as Tsedaka’s translation of this verse in the SP.

found in Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. There, “the voice of the blood of the murder of [Cain’s] brother which has been swallowed up by the clay, cries out before me from the earth.”⁵⁹⁵ The notion that the blood cries from the ground is here interpreted back into the clay swallowing up the blood. The imagery is placed in an earlier setting.

1 En. 22:5-7 directly alludes to Gen. 4:10 and the description there of Abel’s blood crying out to the deity from the ground. In the Enochic passage, Enoch sees the spirit of a dead man making suit, and asks his angelic guide whose spirit is it that is sending a lamentation up to heaven. The angel tells Enoch, “this is the spirit that went forth from Abel, whom Cain his brother murdered. And Abel makes accusation against him until his seed perishes from the face of the earth, and his seed is obliterated from the seed of men.”⁵⁹⁶ This text is clearly alluding to, and expanding upon, the Genesis text. We do not find the idea that Abel’s cry up to heaven is a cry meant to destroy Cain’s seed on the earth in the Genesis text. On the contrary, it is surprising how easily Cain gets away with the murder, and even though he is told he is going to be a wanderer for the rest of his life, he becomes the first city builder later in Gen. 4.

TBenj 7:4-5 alludes to Cain, and how at two-hundred years old he began to have pain, and how he died by the time he was nine-hundred years old. Each hundred years he was given a new plague until his death as a part of a curse because he murdered his brother Abel. *LAB* 16:2 alludes to the birth of Cain and Abel, and how “the older rose up and killed the younger, and the earth quickly swallowed up his blood.”⁵⁹⁷ After this Cain is driven out and the earth is cursed. According to this text the deity tells the land not to swallow up blood anymore.

⁵⁹⁵ Maher, *The Aramaic Bible*, 33.

⁵⁹⁶ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 300.

⁵⁹⁷ D. J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 324.

Matt. 23:35 alludes to Gen. 4:10 and the fact that Abel was innocent when he was murdered by his brother Cain. The author of Hebrews alludes to Abel's blood crying only to compare it to Jesus's blood and state that the latter's blood "speaks better than Abel" (Heb. 12:24).⁵⁹⁸ 1 John 3:12 takes what is ambiguous in Gen. 4 and expounds on the reason for Cain's murdering of Abel. The author of 1 John argues that Cain murdered Abel because his deeds were evil and Abel's were righteous. Although it is not clear, it seems that since the only deeds Cain and Abel are known for (i.e. shepherding/farming; making an accepted offering/rejected offering), it would make sense that the author of 1 John viewed Cain's offering as somehow evil. Whatever it was that the author meant exactly, Cain murdered the righteous Abel because of his own personal evil deeds.

Book of Mormon

Gen. 4:10 is informally quoted once and alluded to once in the BM. 3 Ne. 9:11 quotes six words directly from Gen. 4:10 in order to show the wickedness of those who murdered the prophets that were sent to the Nephites in the previous books. This informal quotation serves to imply a connection between those prophets who had been sent to call the Nephites to repentance and are here equated with the righteous Abel. They had been murdered although they were innocent, similar to Cain and his murdering Abel. Abel's blood cries from the ground in Gen. 4:10 the same that the unnamed prophets' blood in 3 Ne. 9:11 cried from the ground.

Ether 8:24 alludes to Gen. 4:10 in a profound way. The secret oaths are a specific theme that appears in various places in the BM, but receive a lot of attention in the book of Ether. The allusion serves to solidify the connection between those who take secret oaths and murder

⁵⁹⁸ Harold W. Attridge, *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia Commentary Series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 372.

innocent people to the first man, according to the BM and the Book of Moses, who was introduced to the concept by Satan: Cain and his murder of Abel. Those innocents are equated with Abel, while those who take the secret oaths and commit murder are simply following in Cain's footsteps.

This connection does find some discontinuity with the biblical account, besides the fact that there are no secret oaths between Cain and Satan, as it is realized that the last time Cain is mentioned in the KJV he is the first city builder, naming his newly founded city after his son Enoch. In the BM those who enter into secret oaths end up destroying civilization as the Nephites know it. In this way, at least, they are not like Cain as found in the KJV.

General Allusions to Gen. 2-4

Ancient Sources

I am currently not aware of any texts that allude generally to Gen. 2-4. There are some texts that allude to creation and different aspects of creation, but one in particular is alluding to the Priestly creation account found in Gen. 1, not what is found in Gen. 2-3.⁵⁹⁹ I will briefly describe general allusions to Gen. 2-4 in the BM.

Book of Mormon

There are nineteen passages in the BM that allude to general content in Gen. 2-4 without including terms or phrases that tie to specific verses. The majority of these are allusions to creation, some are allusions to Adam, Cain, or Abel, while others allude more specifically to the fall or curse of Adam, or a written text that describes history "from the creation of the world." Many of these texts blend elements from the Eden narrative with other parts of the KJV, in particular the priestly account of creation in Gen. 1, the narrative about the Tower of Babel in Gen. 11, or several phrases and ideas that are found in specific NT books. Altogether

⁵⁹⁹ Cf. SibOr 3:20-28. This text describes how the creation was made by a word.

there are seventeen texts that allude in some way to Gen. 2-4. I will briefly summarize how they allude to Gen. 2-4.

In 2 Ne. 2:13-14 the creation is alluded to twice. Lehi is giving a farewell address to his family, and although I have shown previously that 2 Ne. 2 borrows heavily from the Eden narrative, it would be wrong to assume that the author was alluding exclusively to the Yahwistic creation account here. It has also been found in my previous analysis that the BM texts have the ability to use a J text, or any other text for that matter, and then immediately afterward use a text from the NT, sometimes Isaiah, or another section of the KJV.

In 2 Ne. 2:13-14 opposites are compared in order to argue that there is a God, that he has created the earth, and there is a line between righteousness and sin that is drawn by law. In the process of comparing opposites in v. 13 the author concludes that there are two types of things that have been created: “to act [or] to be acted upon.” For the author, the fact that there is a law, and by following that law you receive happiness and by going against it you receive misery, points to the idea that there is a God and that he created earth.

This exact approach to understanding creation is also found in 2 Ne. 11:7, where it is argued that “if there be no Christ, there be no God; and if there be no God, we are not, for there could have been no creation.—But there is a God, and he is Christ; and he cometh in the fulness of his own time.”⁶⁰⁰ these are the only verses that attempt a philosophical approach to understanding the creation and its implications for belief in God and the state of man.

There are three places in the BM where the creation is mentioned as being a part of the scriptural record of the Nephites. In 2 Ne. 6:3 the author mentions that he has counseled his audience “concerning all things which are written, from the creation of the world.” In Alma 22:12-13 the author describes how Aaron taught a Lamanite king from the scriptures, and how

⁶⁰⁰ For the last phrase see Gal. 4:4.

“he began from the creation of Adam, reading the Scriptures unto the king.” The pericope also uses elements from the priestly account of creation,⁶⁰¹ and mentions again the creation of Adam but this time includes the fall, the “plan of redemption,” and in similar terms as other places in the BM states that this “was prepared from the foundation of the world.”⁶⁰²

The last verse that refers to a text that includes an account of creation is Ether 1:3-4. These verses introduce the book of Ether and Moroni as redactor. Moroni states that he has edited the text and left out “the first part of this record,” (v. 3) because it is similar to what was “had among the Jews,” i.e. the Brass Plates or the OT. The version that Moroni alludes to includes the creation of the world and Adam, from then to the Tower of Babel. The author does not mention the Eden narrative or the expulsion specifically, but he does allude generally to a text that includes Gen. 1-11.

The majority of the remaining texts allude to Adam, the creation of Adam, or Adam and the fall. The remaining text that does not allude to Adam alludes to Cain. I will briefly summarize these below.

Adam is alluded to ten times in the BM. Of the ten, one alludes generally to Adam’s creation (Mor. 10:3), two to the family of Adam (i.e. humanity; 2 Ne. 9:21; Mormon 3:20), six to the fall of Adam (Mosiah 3:19; 4:7, 9; Alma 18:36; Hel. 14:16; Mormon 9:12; and Mor. 8:8), and one that alludes to “the days of Adam” (Alma 40:18).

The last allusion to Gen. 2-4 is to Cain in the context of secret oaths in Ether 8:15. Although it is not in the text of Genesis itself, Ether 8:15 is aware of an interpretation of Gen. 4 that has Satan tempt Cain to kill Abel, making an oath with Cain, “a murderer from the

⁶⁰¹ In Alma 22:12 it states “...God created man after his own image.”

⁶⁰² For this latter phrase see Matt. 13:35; 25:34; Luke 11:50; Heb. 4:3; Rev. 13:8; 17:8. It appears nowhere in the OT of the KJV.

beginning.”⁶⁰³ This is found in JS’s revision of the KJV, particularly in the beginning section that later became known as the Book of Moses.

Summary

In the previous analysis I have looked at the use of Gen. 4:1-2 and 10 in the BM, early Jewish and Christian literature, and the three verses in their own context. Adam and Eve are again portrayed as “first parents” in 2 Ne. 2:20, 23. The interpretation of the beginning of Gen. 4, and the historical books found after the Pentateuch in the KJV, gave rise to interpretations of the age of the earth and of Adam and Eve being the father and mother of “all the earth.”⁶⁰⁴ The pericope in 2 Ne. 2 continues on to stress the idea that Adam and Eve could not have children in Eden, bolstering the importance of the beginning verses of Gen. 4. Without the ability to have children and be outside of Eden meant that they could not be happy or miserable, or do good or bad. This kind of interpretation is not found in the literature of antiquity, where some of the debate in relation to the first verses of Gen. 4 revolved around the question of whether Cain was Adam’s or Sammael’s (i.e. Satan’s) son.

In 3 Ne. 9:11 the idea of blood crying up to heaven from the ground is used to describe all of the slain prophets that had previously been sent to the Nephite people. Ether 8:24 utilizes this same kind of imagery, but in the context of people who entered into “secret combinations” which seem to always end in death and murder. This tradition is found only in the BM and the Book of Moses, and nowhere else in the HB or early Jewish and Christian interpretations, which indicates (along with evidence of developments of the interpretation of Eden in the 17th-19th centuries) that this tradition is late.⁶⁰⁵ I pointed out in my analysis that

⁶⁰³ See also Hel. 6:27, where this is made even more explicit. The phrase “a murderer from the beginning” is derived specifically from John 8:44 (KJV).

⁶⁰⁴ 2 Ne. 2:20.

⁶⁰⁵ Contra Reynolds, who argues that this was a very early and ancient tradition that has now been lost. See Reynolds, “The Brass Plates Version of Genesis.”

the idea that those who enter into “secret combinations” end up destroying civilizations does not find support in the Genesis account. The BM and Book of Moses both assume that Cain entered into a “secret combination” with Satan, but he was the first city in the Bible, building a city named after his son Enoch.⁶⁰⁶

5. Conclusion

In this thesis I have attempted to do three separate things in order to examine and analyze the influence that the KJV of the J source had over the production of the BM. In Part I I reviewed prior literature on intertextuality in Biblical Studies and on the BM, coming to specific criteria that would not only help in discovering influence but more particularly in how to understand and label that influence. In Part II I provided a full list of the connections I discovered in the course of my study between the full text of the earliest manuscripts of the BM and the KJV translation of the J source, as well as labeling each individual connection a specific kind of relationship. These identifications made Part III possible, where I narrowed the focus of my analysis in order to look closely at how Gen. 2-4 was used in the BM.

In the course of the study several items were discovered that were at first not expected. In particular, the use of the J source in the BM is based specifically on the KJV, and, contrary to almost all previous research on the Pentateuch in the BM, it is not a single source of the DH that the BM author is reliant on. Rather, the BM often blends material from the P account of creation, or from various places in the NT with phrases and motifs from J. It was also shown how the use of some of these NT sources indicates that the interpretation of these Genesis passages is post-KJV, in that the phrases from the NT that influenced the interpretation of J

⁶⁰⁶ It is possible that this city was the source of the idea for the City of Enoch found in the Book of Moses, the early sections of JS’s revision of the Bible.

in the BM are found in a form that originates in the post-KJV European and American religious experience.

These pieces of evidence lead to the conclusion that the version of the Pentateuch that the author of the BM is familiar with is the KJV. The evidence also showed that this occurred in a context where the KJV language was being updated in discourses outside of the text itself. The author of the BM was familiar with these revisions (e.g. “carnal, sensual, and devilish” of James 3:15) and included them in the language that was used to interpret Gen. 2-4 in the production of the BM.

These conclusions, taken together with the evidence of the block quotations of Isaiah, Malachi, Matthew, and Micah, provide strong evidence for the dependence of the BM on the KJV on the compositional level. Although I was only able to provide evidence of this in a few texts that are dependent on Gen. 2-4, it is suggestive that further research could be undertaken throughout the entire text of the BM that would discover similar results.

It is hoped that this study will be a catalyst for further research, and that the fruits of my analysis will be both accepted and challenged in future work. Very little has been done to look at the use of the Bible in the BM outside of the block quotations previously noted. The little that has been done outside of this has been inadequate and lacks in methodology. This is unfortunate for several reasons, but particularly because the use of this prior authoritative literature can say so much about the context that produced the BM. This also means that the BM cannot be fully understood, because scholars are unaware of a vast amount of connections that help to explain awkward forms and statements in the BM text.

I hope that future academic research on the topic of the Bible in the BM can escape the failings of the past several decades when this kind of study was beholden to a false dichotomy where if one claimed influence from the KJV or the NT then one was simply labeled a critic

or anti-Mormon, or if another discounted one's arguments they were simply an apologist. Understanding the development of the BM and ideas and traditions behind it is much more important than personality conflicts or debates that revolve around one's devotional life.

In the context of academic inquiry, the arguments, and evidence that those arguments are based on, are what matter, and in the BM's use of the Bible there is a growing quantity of empirical evidence of what form of the bible was used. Although intertextual studies are admittedly subjective by nature on the exegetical level, they should be grounded in text-critical evidence. It is my hope that this study will invite further discussion and research on the important topic of the use and influence of the bible, specifically the significant impact that KJV had, on the BM.

Appendix A: The J Source of the

Pentateuch

Gen. 2-4*⁶⁰⁷
 5:29⁶⁰⁸
 6:1-4⁶⁰⁹
 6:4⁶¹⁰
 6-9*⁶¹¹
 8:2b-3a, 6, 8-12, 13b, 20-22⁶¹²
 10:8-19, 24-30(?)^{*613}
 11:1-9⁶¹⁴
 12-13⁶¹⁵

14:22-24⁶¹⁶
 16⁶¹⁷
 18-19⁶¹⁸
 21:1⁶¹⁹
 22:20-24⁶²⁰
 24⁶²¹
 25:1-4,⁶²² 21-34⁶²³
 26⁶²⁴
 27⁶²⁵
 28:13-15,⁶²⁶ 20-21⁶²⁷
 29-31^{*628}
 32:4-33:16^{*629}
 34^{*630}

⁶⁰⁷ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 68. For 3:4, 6, and 7 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113. For ch. 3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115. For 4:12, 15 Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118. For 4:26 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116.

⁶⁰⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 68; Is there more in ch. 5?

⁶⁰⁹ Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 206.

⁶¹⁰ Joel S. Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 129.

⁶¹¹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 68. The * means that not every verse of the section is included as J, but the majority is.

⁶¹² Friedman, *Ibid.* For v. 20 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116.

⁶¹³ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 68, “the Table of Nations”; and ABD II, 948.

⁶¹⁴ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 68. For v. 4 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115.

⁶¹⁵ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 69. For 12:1-3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 27. For 12:2 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115-116. For 12:3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113. For 12:10-20 see Baden, *J E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 29, nt. 61. For ch. 12 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116. For 13:14-17 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 112-113. For 13:1, 14-17 see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 203-204.

⁶¹⁶ Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 36.

⁶¹⁷ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 69. For vv. 4-14 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

⁶¹⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 70; and Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116. For 18:18 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113. For 18:17-19 see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 19, nt. 61. For 18:19 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115, 119. For 19:11 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118. For 19:30-38 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

⁶¹⁹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 70.

⁶²⁰ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 70.

⁶²¹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 70-71; and Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114, 117. For v. 27 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196-197, nt. 42.

⁶²² Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

⁶²³ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 71. For vv. 21-26 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114. Cf. Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 117.

⁶²⁴ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 71; and Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116. For vv. 3-4, see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 112. For v. 4 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113. For v. 5 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115. For vv. 2, 12, 24, 28-29 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114. Cf. Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 117.

⁶²⁵ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 71; and Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114. For v. 1 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113. For vv. 42-45 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 195, nt. 21.

⁶²⁶ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 71. For vv. 13-14 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 112. For v. 14 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113, 196, nt. 34. For v. 15 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118.

⁶²⁷ Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118.

⁶²⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 72. For ch. 30 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116. For chs. 29-30 cf. Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 117. For 30:15 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 36. For 31:3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118.

⁶²⁹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 72; cf. Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 117. For 33:3, 16 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118. For 33:11 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

⁶³⁰ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 72; and Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 116. For vv. 5 and 7 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 36. For v. 9 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118. For v. 30 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

	35:21-22a ⁶³¹		33:1-3, 7, 12-23 ⁶⁵²
	37:6-7, 9-10, 19-20, 23, 25-27, 28b, ⁶³² 31-35 ⁶³³		34:2-16, 27(Check Baden?)
	38-39 ⁶³⁴		34:6-7 ⁶⁵³
	42-47 ⁶³⁵	Num.	10:29-36(Check Baden?)
	49 ⁶³⁶		11:1-11, 13, 16, 18,-24, 31-34 ⁶⁵⁴
	50:1-11, 19-22 ⁶³⁷		13-14 ⁶⁵⁵
Ex.	1:6, 9-12 ⁶³⁸		21:16-20 ⁶⁵⁶
	2:11-23a	Deut.	33 ⁶⁵⁷
	3:2-4a, 5, 6b-8, 16-20 ⁶³⁹		34:1-4*, 5*, 6 ⁶⁵⁸
	4:1-16, 19-31 ⁶⁴⁰		
	5:1-6:1 ⁶⁴¹		
	7-10* ⁶⁴²		
	11:4-8 ⁶⁴³		
	12:29-34, 39 ⁶⁴⁴		
	13:21-22 ⁶⁴⁵		
	14:5-7, 10-14, 19-21, 24-25, 27, 30- 31 ⁶⁴⁶		
	15:22a, 23-26 ⁶⁴⁷		
	16:4-5, 26-30 ⁶⁴⁸		
	17:1-7 ⁶⁴⁹		
	19:11 ⁶⁵⁰		
	24:1-2, 9-11 ⁶⁵¹		

⁶³¹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 72.

⁶³² For v. 28b see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196-197, nt. 42.

⁶³³ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 38, 72. For v. 7 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 36.

⁶³⁴ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 73.

⁶³⁵ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 73. For 45:4-13 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196-197, nt. 42. For 46:31-34 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 114.

⁶³⁶ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 73.

⁶³⁷ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 74. For 50:20 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196-197, nt. 42.

⁶³⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 74.

⁶³⁹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 74-75. For v. 6 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113.

⁶⁴⁰ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 75.

⁶⁴¹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 75.

⁶⁴² Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 75.

⁶⁴³ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 76.

⁶⁴⁴ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 76.

⁶⁴⁵ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 76.

⁶⁴⁶ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 203-205. For vv. 11-12 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 197, nt. 49.

⁶⁴⁷ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 76-77. For v. 26 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115.

⁶⁴⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 77. For v. 28 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 115.

⁶⁴⁹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 77. For v. 3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 118 and 197, nt. 49.

⁶⁵⁰ Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113.

⁶⁵¹ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 77. For v. 10 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113.

⁶⁵² Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 78. For v. 1 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 27-28, 112, and 167, nt. 4. For v. 23 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 113.

⁶⁵³ Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 129.

⁶⁵⁴ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 92-94. For vv. 4-6, 13, 18-24a, see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 108. For vv. 4-6 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 197, nt. 49.

⁶⁵⁵ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 79. For 13:17b-20, 22-24, 26*-31 see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 117. For 13:22 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 200, nt. 23. For 14:1b, 11-25, 39-45 see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 117. For 14:11-19 see Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 129. For 14:43 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 119.

⁶⁵⁶ Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*, 137. For v. 20 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 35.

⁶⁵⁷ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 81.

⁶⁵⁸ Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch*, 81. For v. 1 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 33. For vv. 1-3 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 196, nt. 35. For vv. 1-4 see Baden, *The Promise to the Patriarchs*, 112-113.

Bibliography

- A Layman, "The Secret Out!" in *The Reformer* Vol. IX, No. 106 (Philadelphia, 1828), 146.
- Aageson, James, "Paul's Use of Scripture: A Comparative Study of Biblical Interpretation in Early Palestinian Judaism and the New Testament with Special Reference to Romans 9-11" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oxford, 1984).
- "Scripture and Structure in the Development of the Argument in Romans 9-11," *CBQ* 48 (1986), 288-289.
 - "Typology, Correspondence, and the Application of Scripture in Romans 9-11," *JSNT* 31 (1987), 51-72.
 - "Genesis in the Deutero-Pauline Epistles," in Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (Library of New Testament Studies, 466; London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 99-116.
- Alexander, P., "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 273-315.
- Alfaro, María Jesus Martinez, "Intertextuality: Origins and Development of the Concept," in *Atlantis* 18 (1-2) 1996, 268-285.
- Altick, Richard D. and John J. Fenstermaker, *The Art of Literary Research* (4th rev. ed.; New York: W. W. Norton, 1993).
- Alter, Robert, "American Literary Style and the Presence of the King James Bible," in *New England Review*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (2009-2010), 60-75.
- Andersen, F. I., "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 91-221.
- Anderson, H., "4 Maccabees," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 531-564.
- Anonymous, *The Christian Economy: Translated from the Original Greek of An Old Manuscript found in the Island of Patmos, where St. John wrote the Book of Revelation* (Philadelphia: M. Carey, 1808).
- Anonymous, *Extracts from Ancient and Modern Authors, arranged so as to form a history or description of Man, in his natural, moral, and spiritual character: embracing nearly all the most important subjects of the Christian Religion* (London: E. Bridgewater, 1828).
- Astruc, Jean, *Conjectures sur les memoires originaux: Don't il paroît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genese* (Repr., Paris: Editions Noeseis, 1999; Brussels: Friex, 1753).
- Attridge, H. W., *Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquities Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Montana: Scholars Press, 1976).
- *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia Commentary Series; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989).
- Baden, Joel S., *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (The Anchor Yale Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).
- *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Barlow, Philip, *Mormons and the Bible: The Place of the Latter-day Saints in American Religion* (Updated Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Barr, James, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- Barrett, C. K., "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New," in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, eds., *Cambridge History of the Bible* (Cambridge University Press, 1963), 1:377-411.

- Bauckham, Richard, "Resurrection as Giving Back the Dead: A Traditional Image of Resurrection in the Pseudepigrapha and the Apocalypse of John," in Charlesworth and Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 269-291.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., "A 'Scriptural' Citation in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992), 95-98..
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. and Lidija Novakovic, "Miscellaneous Rules, 4Q265," in Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation: Volume 3, Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck and Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 253-269.
- Beal, Timothy, "Intertextuality," in Danna Nolan Fewell, ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 22-23.
- Beattie, D. R. G., and M. J. McNamara, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Beentjes, Pancratius C., "Discovering a New Path of Intertextuality: Inverted Quotations and their Dynamics," in L. J. de Regt, et al, eds., *Literary Structure and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. and Eisenbrauns, 1996), 30-50.
 – "Inverted Quotations in the Bible: A Neglected Stylistic Pattern," *Bib* 63 (1982), 506-523.
- Beetham, Christopher A., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians* (Biblical Interpretation Series, Vol. 96; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).
- Ben-Porat, Z., "The Poetics of Allusion—a Text Linking Device—in Different Media of Communication (Literature versus Advertising and Journalism)," in S. Chatman, et al, eds., *A Semiotic Landscape: Proceedings of the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies: Milan, June 1974* (Approaches to Semiotics, 29; The Hague: Mouton, 1979), 588-593.
 – "The Poetics of Literary Allusion," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976), 105-128.
- Berlin, Adele and Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Jewish Study Bible* (Second Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- Bernstein, Moshe J., and Shlomo A. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 61-87.
 – "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim," *DSD* 1 (1994), 30-70.
- Berrin, Shani, "Qumran Pesharim," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 110-133.
- Beuken, W. A. M., "Does Trito-Isaiah Reject the Temple? An Intertextual Inquiry into Isa. 66:1-6," in S. Draisma, ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honor of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen: Kok, 1989), 53-66.
- Bishop, Gary L., "The Tradition of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon" (Unpublished Master's Thesis; Provo: Brigham Young University, 1974).
- Black, Matthew, "The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament in the New," *SJT* 39 (1986), 1-17.

- Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006).
- Bokovoy, David E., "Did Eve Acquire, Create, or Procreate with Yahweh? A Grammatical and Contextual Reassessment of qnh in Gen. 4:1," *Vetus Testamentum* 63 (2013), 19-35.
- Bowley, James E., "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God's Anointed," in Peter Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001).
- Brady, Monica, "Biblical Interpretation in the 'Pseudo-Ezekiel' Fragments (4Q383-391) from Cave Four," in ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 88-109.
- Bratcher, Robert G., ed., *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (United Bible Societies, 1967).
- Brawley, Robert L., *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).
- Brenton, Sir Lancelot, *The Septuagint Version: Greek and English* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970).
- Brewer, David I., *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C.E.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992).
- Brin, G., "Concerning Some of the Uses of the Bible in the *Temple Scroll*," *RevQ* 12 (1987), 519-528.
- Brodie, L. T., "Jacob's Travail (Jer. 30:1-13) and Jacob's Struggle (Gen. 32:22-32): A Test Case for Measuring the Influence of the Book of Jeremiah on the Present Text of Genesis," *JSOT* 15 (1981), 31-60.
- Brooke, George J., "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures," Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 134-157.
- *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlor in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
 - "Qumran *Pesher*: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," in *RevQ* 10 (1981), 484-503.
 - "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7.13b-8:1a) and Messianic Expectation," in *ZAW* 92 (1980), 397-404.
 - "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" in Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring, eds., *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 85-100.
- Brownlee, William, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea," *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76.
- "The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in M. Delcor, ed., *Qumran, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 183-193.
- Bruce, F. F., *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959).
- "Biblical Exposition at Qumran," in R. T. France and D. Wenham, eds., *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in Midrash and Historiography* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), iii, 77-98.
 - "The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation," *OTS* 17 (1972), 37-52.
- Budde, K., "Die biblische Urgeschichte" Gen. 1-12,5 (*Anhang: Die älteste Gestalt der biblischen Urgeschichte, versuchsweise wiederhergestellt, hebraischer text und uebersetzung*, Gießen, 1883).
- Burchard, C., "Joseph and Aseneth," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 177-247.
- Burrows, Millar, *The Literary Relations of Ezekiel* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1925).

- Bushman, Richard L., *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Vintage Books, 2005).
- Callender, Jr., Dexter E., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human* (Harvard Semitic Studies, 48; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000).
- Campbell, Alexander, *Delusions: An Analysis of the Book of Mormon; with an Examination of its Internal and External Evidences, and a Refutation of its Pretences to Divine Authority* (Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 1832).
- “Delusions,” in *The Millennial Harbinger* Vol. II, No. 2 (Monday, February 7th, 1831), 85-96.
- Campbell, Jonathan G., *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 228; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995).
- Campbell, Antony F., and Mark A. O’Brien, *Rethinking the Pentateuch: Prolegomena to the Theology of Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005).
- Carr, David M., *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Carson, D.A., and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Caspari, C. P., *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Buch Jesaia und zur Geschichte des jesaianischen Zeit* (Berlin: L. Oehmigke’s Verlag, 1848).
- *Über Micha den Morasthiten und seine prophetische Schrift: Ein monographischer Beitrag zur Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Schriftthums und zur Auslegung des Buches Micha* (Christiania: P. T. Malling, 1852).
 - “Jesajanische Studien. I. Jeremia ein Zeuge für die Aechtheit von Jes. c. 34 und mithin auch für die Aechtheit von Jes. c. 33, c. 40-66, c. 13-14, 23 und c. 21, 1-10,” *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 4 (1843), 1-73.
- Cassuto, Umberto, “On the Formal and Stylistic Relationship between Deutero-Isaiah and other Biblical Writers,” in Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies. I. Bible* (trans. I. Abrahams; repr.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1973), 141-177.
- Charlesworth, James H. and Craig A. Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).
- Charlesworth, James H., “In the Crucible: The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Interpretation,” in Charlesworth and Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 20-43.
- “Biblical Interpretation: The Crucible of the Pseudepigrapha,” in T. Baarda, et al, eds., *Text and Testimonies: Essays in Honour of A. F. J. Klijn* (Kampen: Kok, 1988).
 - ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 Vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985).
 - ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Volume 3, Damascus Document II, Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents* (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck and Westminster John Knox Press, 2006).
 - *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol Became Christianized* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).
- Cheon, S., *Exodus in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSSup, 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Chester, Andrew, “Citing the Old Testament,” in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, eds., *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 141-169.
- Cheyne, T. K., *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London: A. & C. Black, 1895).

- Christensen, D. L., *Transformations of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy: Studies in the Oracles against the Nations* (HDR, 3; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).
- Ciampa, Roy, E., *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (Wissenschaft Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).
- Clayton, Jay and Eric Rothstein, eds., *Influence and Intertextuality in Literary History* (Maddison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991).
- Clements, R. E., "Beyond Tradition-Criticism: Deutero-Isaianic Development of First Isaiah's Themes," *JSOT* 31 (1985), 95-113.
- Collins, John J., and Robert A. Kugler, eds., *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000).
- "Interpretations of the Creation of Humanity in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 29-43.
 - "Sibylline Oracles," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 317-472.
- Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (transl. James W. Leitch; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).
- Coogan, Michael D., *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures* (Second Edition; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Crawford, Sidnie W., *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2008).
- Crook, M. B., "Did Amos and Micah Know Isaiah 9:2-7 and 11:1-9?" *JBL* 73 (1954), 144-151.
- Cross, Jr., Frank Moore, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 99-134.
- *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History and Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973).
- Cryer, Frederick H., "Genesis in Qumran," in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 98-112.
- Cryer, Frederick H., and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 98-112.
- David, Nora, et al, eds., *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Vol. 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012).
- Davies, W. D., "Reflections About the Use of the Old Testament in the New in its Historical Context," *JQR* 74 (1983), 105-136.
- Dawson, John David, "Ancient Alexandrian Interpretation of Scripture," (Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University, 1988).
- de Moor, Johannes C, ed., *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Oudtestamentische Studien, Deel XL; Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- "The Duality in God and Man: Gen. 1:26-27 as P's Interpretation of the Yahwistic Creation Account," in Johannes C. de Moor, ed., *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Oudtestamentische Studien, Deel XL; Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Delitzsch, Friedrich, *Babel and Bible: Three Lectures on the Significance of Assyriological Research for Religion* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1906).
- Dimant, Devorah and Reinhard G. Kratz, eds., *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 439; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013).

- ed., *Scripture and Interpretation: Qumran Texts that Rework the Bible* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 449; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2014).
 - *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 90; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
 - “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in Martin J. Mulder and Harry Sysling, eds., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988 [repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004]), 379-419.
- Donaldson, T. L., “Parallels: Use, Misuse, and Limitations,” in *The Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983), 193-210.
- Donker, Gerald J., “The Text of the Apostolos in Athanasius of Alexandria” (PhD Dissertation, Macquarie University, 2009).
- Doran, Robert, *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012).
- Dozeman, Thomas B., “Inner-Biblical Interpretation of Yahweh’s Gracious and Compassionate Character,” *JBL* 108 (1989), 207-223.
- Dozeman, Thomas B., et al, eds., *Pentateuch, Hexateuch, or Enneateuch?: Identifying Literary Works in Genesis through Kings* (SBL Ancient Israel and Its Literature, Num. 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).
- Dozeman, Thomas B., et al, eds., *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).
- Draisma, S., ed., *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honor of Bas van Iersel* (Kampen: Kok, 1989).
- Duhm, Bernhard, *Das Buch Jesaia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892).
- Eakins, J. K., “Ezekiel’s Influence on the Exilic Isaiah” (ThD thesis, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1971).
- Edgar, S. L., “Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament,” *NTS* 9 (192-1963), 55-62.
- Efird, James M., *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of William Franklin Stinespring* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1972).
- Eissfeldt, Otto, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (3rd edition; Tübingen: Mohr, 1964).
- Eldridge, Victor, “The Influence of Jeremiah on Isaiah 40-55,” (ThD dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978).
- Ellis, E. Earle, “Midrash, Targum, and New Testament Quotations,” in E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox, eds., *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1969), 61-69.
- “Midrash Pesher in Pauline Hermeneutics,” in *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (WUNT 18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1978), 173-181.
 - *Pauls’ Use of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981).
 - *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT, 54; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991).
- Ellis, Peter F., *The Yahwist: The Bible’s First Theologian* (Notre Dame: Fides Publishers, Inc., 1968).
- Elmore, A. E., *Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address: Echoes of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2009).
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS, 18; Washington, D. C.; Catholic Biblical Association, 1987).

- Epstein, I., ed. *The Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (trans. M. Simon and I. Slotki; Hindhead, Surrey: Soncino, 1948).
- Eslinger, Lyle, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category," in *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992), 47-58.
- "Hosea 12:5a and Genesis 32:29: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," *JSOT* 18 (1980), 91-99.
- Evans, Craig A., "Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography," in Charlesworth and Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 170-201.
- "Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure," in Peter Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 149-158.
 - and James A. Sanders, eds., *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993).
 - "On Isaiah's Use of Israel's Sacred Tradition," *BZ* 30 (1986), 92-99.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders, eds., *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup, 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Ewald, Heinrich, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (2 Vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1840-1841).
- Faulring, Scott H., Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews, eds., *Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts* (Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2004).
- Fekkes, Jan, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Development* (JSNTSup 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).
- Feldman, Ariel, *The Rewritten Joshua Scrolls from Qumran: Texts, Translations, and Commentary* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 438; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2013).
- Feldman, Louis H., *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, Vol. 58; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998).
- "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in *Mikra: Text, Translation & Reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988 [repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004]), 455-518.
- Fewell, Danna N., ed., *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible* (Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992).
- Fiensy, D. A. and D. R. Darnell, "Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 671-697.
- Fishbane, Michael, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).
- "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," in Geoffrey H. Hartman and Sanford Budick, eds., *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 19-37.
 - "The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition," in Johannes C. de Moor, ed., *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (Oudtestamentische Studien, Deel XL; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 15-30.
 - "The Qumran-Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," in Avigdor Shinan, ed., *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 97-114.

- “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in Martin J. Mulder, ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation & Reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988 [repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004]).
 - “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” *JBL* 99 (1980), 343-361.
- Fisk, Bruce N., *Do You Not Remember?: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup, 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
- Fitzmyer, S.J., Joseph A., *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (Sources for Biblical Study 5; Missoula: SBL and Scholars’ Press, 1974).
- “4QTestimonia and the New Testament,” *TS* 18 (1957), 513-537.
- Flint, Peter, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001).
- “The Prophet David at Qumran, in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 158-167.
- Fox, Michael V., “The Identification of Quotations in Biblical Literature,” in *ZAW* 92 (1980), 416-431.
- Fraade, Steven D., “Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993), 46-69.
- Frederick, Nicholas J., “Line Within Line: An Intertextual Analysis of Mormon Scripture and the Prologue of the Gospel of John” (Unpublished PhD Dissertation; Claremont Graduate University, 2013).
- “Evaluating the Interaction between the New Testament and the Book of Mormon: A Proposed Methodology,” in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 24 (2015), 1-30.
- Friedman, Richard E., *The Exile and Biblical Narrative: The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, Num. 22; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).
- ed., *The Creation of Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text* (Near Eastern Studies, 22; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981).
- Garcia Martinez, Florentino, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Second Edition; Leiden: E. J. Brill and William B. Eerdmans, 1996).
- Gardiner, John, *Essays, Literary, Political, and Economical* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: D. Wilson, Craig’s Close, 1803).
- Gardner, Brant A., *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon* (6 vols.; Draper: Greg Kofford Books, 2007).
- Gaylord, Jr., H. E. “3 (Greek Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Vol. One*, 653-679.
- Gesenius, W., *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Kommentar über den Jesaia* (3 vols.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1821).
- Giere, S. D., *A New Glimpse of Day One: Intertextuality, History of Interpretation, and Genesis 1.1-5* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009).
- Gill, John, *A Body of Doctrinal and Practical Divinity; or, A System of Practical Truths. Deduced from the Sacred Scriptures* (Long: Whittingham and Rowland, 1815).
- Gilmour, Michael J., *Tangled Up in the Bible: Bob Dylan and Scripture* (New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group, 2004).
- Girdlestone, R. B., *Synonyms of the Old Testament: Their Bearing on Christian Doctrine* (2nd edition; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956 [1897]).

- *Deuterographs: Duplicate Passages in the Old Testament. Their Bearing on the Text and Compilation of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1894).
- Givens, Terryl L., *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture that Launched a New World Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Goodman, Martin, et al, eds., *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham* (Themes in Biblical Narrative, Jewish and Christian Traditions, Vol. 13; Leiden: Brill, 2010).
- Gordis, Robert, “Quotations as a Literary Usage in Biblical, Oriental, and Rabbinic Literature” in *HUCA* 22 (1949), 157-219.
- Gunkel, Hermann, *Genesis* (transl. Mark E. Biddle; Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997).
- Hamilton, Victor P., *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 1-17* (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1990).
- Han, Paul, *Swimming in the Sea of Scripture: Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians 4.7-13.13* (Library of New Testament Studies, 519; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014).
- Hanson, A. T., *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1980).
- Hardy, Grant, *Understanding the Book of Mormon: A Reader’s Guide* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Harrington, Daniel J., “The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters, Part 2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press and Scholars Press, 1986), 239-247.
 - “Future Research,” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters, Part 2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press and Scholars Press, 1986), 253-255.
 - “The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*,” *CBQ* 33 (1971), 1-11.
 - “Pseudo-Philo,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 297-377.
- Hartman, Geoffrey H., and Sanford Budick, eds., *Midrash and Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).
- Hawker, Robert, *The Poor Man’s Concordance and Dictionary to the Sacred Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament: arranged in alphabetical order, and containing, in addition to the usual literal explanation of words, short doctrinal and practical essays upon certain points of the truths of God* (London: Ebenezer Palmer, 1828).
- Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Heiser, Michael, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2015).
- Hengel, Martin, “The Scriptures and their Interpretation in Second Temple Judaism,” in D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context* (JSOTSup 166; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 158-175.
 - “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, eds., *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 380-395.
- Henze, Matthias, “The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Literature: A Response to Gabriele Boccaccini,” in Gabriele Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007), 290-298.

- ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005).
 - “Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran,” in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005).
- Hibbard, J. Todd, *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24-27* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2 Reihe, 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- Hilton, John L., “On Verifying Wordprint Studies: Book of Mormon Authorship,” in *BYU Studies* 30, no. 3 (1990), 1-17.
- “Wordprints and the Book of Mormon,” in John W. Welch, ed., *Reexploring the Book of Mormon* (Provo: FARMS, 1992), 221-226.
- Hilton, John L. and Ken Jenkins, “All Book of Mormon References by Author and Literary Form: A Full Listing of Book of Mormon References by Author and Literary Form” (FARMS Preliminary Reports; Provo: FARMS, 1983).
- Hilton, III, John, “Textual Similarities in the Words of Abinadi and Alma’s Counsel to Corianton,” in *BYU Studies Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2012), 39-60.
- “Old Testament Psalms in the Book of Mormon,” in David R. Seely, Jeffrey R. Chadwick, and Matthew J. Grey, eds., *Ascending the Mountain of the Lord: Temple, Praise, and Worship in the Old Testament* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and the Religious Studies Center, BYU, 2013), 291-311.
- Horgan, Maurya, *Pescharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (CBQMS, 8; Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979).
- “The Bible Explained (Prophecies),” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 247-253.
- Horton, F. L., Jr., “Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature,” *RevQ* 7 (1971), 505-514.
- Howe, Eber D., *Autobiography and Recollections of a Pioneer Printer: Together with Sketches of the War of 1812 on the Niagara Frontier* (Painesville, OH: Telegraph Steam Printing House, 1878).
- *Mormonism Unveiled: Or, A Faithful Account of that Singular Imposition and Delusion, from its Rise to the Present Time. With Sketches of the Characters of its Propagators, and a Full Detail of the Manner in which the Famous Golden Bible was Brought Before the World. To which are added, Inquiries into the Probability that the Historical Part of the Said Bible was Written by One Solomon Spaulding, More than Twenty Years Ago, and by him Intended to have Been Published as a Romance* (Painesville: Printed and Published by the Author, 1834).
- Hughes, Julie A., *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. LIX; Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Hunt, Gilbert J., *The Late War, between the United States and Great Britain, from June 1812, to February 1815. Written in the Ancient Historical Style* (New York: David Longworth, 1816).
- Horgan, Maurya P., *Pescharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQ Monograph Series 8; Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979).
- “The Bible Explained (Prophecies),” in Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters, Part 2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press and Scholars Press, 1986), 247-253.
- Howard, George, “The ‘Aberrant’ Text of Philo’s Quotations Reconsidered,” *HUCA* 44 (1973), 197-207.
- Introvigne, Massimo, “The Book of Mormon Wars: A Non-Mormon Perspective,” in *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 5 (2), 1-25.

- Irwin, William, "Against Intertextuality," in *Philosophy and Literature* 28, Num. 2 (October, 2004), 227-242.
- Jenkins, Kenneth, "Common Phrases Between the King James Version and the Book of Mormon" (3 vols.; Provo: FARMS, 1983).
- Jenks, Alan W., *The Elobist and North Israelite Traditions* (SBL Monograph Series, Vol. 22; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977).
- Johnson, M. D., "Life of Adam and Eve," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 249-295.
- Jones, Douglas, "The Traditio of the Oracles of Isaiah of Jerusalem," *ZAW* 67 (1955), 226-246.
- Kaiser, Jr. Walter C., *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985).
- Katz, P., *Philo's Bible* (Cambridge University Press, 1950).
- Kee, Howard C., "Appropriating the History of God's People: A Survey of Interpretations of the History of Israel in the Pseudepigrapha, Apocrypha and the New Testament," in Charlesworth and Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 44-64.
- "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 775-828.
- Kister, Menahem, "Biblical Phrases and Hidden Biblical Interpretations and Pesharim," in *FYR*, 27-39.
- Knight, Douglas, ed., *Julius Wellhausen and His Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, *Semeia* 25 (Chico: Society of Biblical Literature, 1982).
- Knohl, Israel, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
- Knoppers, Gary N., *Two Nations Under God: The Deuteronomistic History of Solomon and the Dual Monarchies* (2 Vols.; Harvard Semitic Monographs, 52-53; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993-1994).
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Study Edition; Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Kristeva, Julia, "Word, Dialogue and Novel," in T. Moi, ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 34-61.
- *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art* (ed. L. S. Roudiez; Oxford: Blackwell, 1980).
- Krüger, Thomas, *Qobeleth: A Commentary* (transl. O. C. Dean, Jr.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004).
- Kugel, James L. and Rowan Greer, *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Library of Early Christianity, 3; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986).
- Küper, Augustus, *Jeremias librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1837).
- Lange, Armin, "The Text of Jeremiah in the *War Scroll* from Qumran," in Nora David, et al, eds., *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Vol. 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 95-116.
- Lange, Armin and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements, Vol. 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).
- Le Deaut, R., "Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation," *BTB* 4 (1974), 243-289.

- Levinson, Bernard M., *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- “*The Right Chorale*”: *Studies in Biblical Law and Interpretation* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011).
 - *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).
- Lightfoot, J. L., *The Sibylline Oracles: With Introduction, Translation, & Commentary on the First and Second Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
- Lim, Timothy H., *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).
- “The Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism, and Biblical Interpretation,” in John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler, eds., *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000), 57-73.
 - “The Chronology of the Flood in a Qumran Text (4Q252),” *JJS* 43 (1992), 288-298.
- Lincicum, David, “Genesis in Paul,” in Maarten J. J. Menken and Steve Moyise, eds., *Genesis in the New Testament* (Library of New Testament Studies, 466; London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 99-116.
- Litwak, Kenneth, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2005).
- Lohfink, Norbert, *Qobeleth: A Continental Commentary* (transl. Sean McEvenue; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).
- Longenecker, Richard, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).
- Lundquist, John M. and Stephen D. Ricks, eds., *By Study and Also by Faith, Volume 2: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday 27 March 1990* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990).
- MacDonald, Dennis R., *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).
- ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001).
- Macrae, G., “Apocalypse of Adam,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 707-719.
- Madsen, Brigham D., ed., *Studies of the Book of Mormon* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1985).
- Madsen, Truman G., *Defender of the Faith: The B. H. Roberts Story* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1980).
- Maher, Michael, *The Aramaic Bible, Volume 1B: Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992).
- Malan, F. S., “The Use of the Old Testament in 1 Corinthians,” in *The Relationship Between the Old and New Testament: Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the New Testament Society of South Africa, July 1-3, 1980* (Neotestamentica, 14; Bloemfontaine; N. T. Society of South Africa, 1981), 134-170.
- Mallen, Peter, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (Library of New Testament Studies 367; New York: T & T Clark, 2008).
- Manek, J., “Composite Quotations in the New Testament and their Purpose,” *Communio Viatorum* 13 (1970), 181-188.
- Marquardt, H. Michael, *The Use of the Bible in the Book of Mormon and Early Nineteenth Century Events Reflected in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1979).

- Mayes, A. D. H., *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1983).
- McKenzir, Steven L., *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, Num. 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984).
- McLean, Bradley H., *Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture in Early Christian and Jewish Writings through 180 C.E.* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992).
- McNamara, Martin, *The Aramaic Bible, Volume 1A: Tarum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992).
- Menken, Maarten J. J., *Genesis in the New Testament* (Library of New Testament, 466; London: T&T Clark, 2012).
- Metcalf, Brent L., ed., *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993).
- Metso, Sarianna, "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule," in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 217-231.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D., *The Eden Narrative: A Literary and Religio-historical Study of Genesis 2-3* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007).
- Metzger, Bruce M., "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and in the Mishnah," in *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, Christian* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 52-63.
- Miller, Adam S., ed., *An Experiment Upon the Word: Reading Alma 32* (Provo: Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, 2014)
- Miller, J. W., *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Prosareden Jeremias* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955).
- Miller, Merrill, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971), 29-82.
- "The Function of Isa. 61:1-2 in 11QMelchizedek," *JBL* 88 (1969), 467-469.
- Mink, Hans A., "The Use of Scripture in the *Temple Scroll* and the Status of the Scroll as Law," *SJOT* 1 (1987), 20-50.
- Moi, T., ed., *The Kristeva Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).
- Murray-Jones, C. R. A., "Paradise Revisited (2 Cor. 12:12): The Jewish Mystical Background of Paul's Apostolate," ps. 1, "The Jewish Sources," and 2, "Paul's Heavenly Ascent and its Significance," *HTR* 86/2 (1993), 177-217 and 265-292.
- Moritz, Thorsten, *A Profound Mystery: The Use of the Old Testament in Ephesians* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. LXXXV; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996).
- Mulder, Martin J., and Harry Sysling, eds., *Mikra: Text, Translation & Reinterpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988 [repr. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004]).
- Mullen, Roderic L., *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem* (SBL The New Testament in the Greek Fathers, Texts and Analyses, Number 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).
- Najman, Hindy, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, Vol. 77; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).
- Neusner, Jacob, *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham: University Press of America, 1987).
- *The Torah in the Talmud: A Taxonomy of the Uses of Scripture in the Talmud* (2 Vols.; Studies in the History of Judaism, Num. 69-70; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- *What is Midrash?* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

- Nibley, Hugh, *The Prophetic Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1989).
 – *Since Cumorah* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1988).
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., “Reading the Hebrew Scriptures in the First Century: Christian Interpretations in Their Jewish Context,” in *Word and World* 3 (1983), 38-50.
 – “Tobit, Genesis, and the Odyssey: A Complex Web of Intertextuality,” in MacDonald, ed., *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, 41-55.
- Nicholson, Ernest, *The Pentateuch in the Twentieth Century: The Legacy of Julius Wellhausen* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Noth, Martin, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Translated by Bernhard W. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972).
 – “The Re-Presentation” of the Old Testament in Proclamation,” in C. Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation* (London: SCM Press, 1963), 76-88.
- Nurmela, Risto, *The Mouth of the Lord Has Spoken: Inner-Biblical Allusions in Second and Third Isaiah* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham: University Press of America, 2006).
- Nyman, Monte S., *Isaiah and the Prophets: Inspired Voices from the Old Testament* (Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1984).
- O’Day, Gail, “Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: A Study in Intertextuality,” *JBL* 109/2 (1990), 259-267.
- Ostler, Blake T., “The Book of Mormon as a Modern Expansion of an Ancient Source,” in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 20, No. 1 (Spring 1987), 66-123.
- Paul, Shalom, “Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah,” in P. Peli, ed., *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies (1969)* (5 vols.; Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1972), I:102-120.
- Patte, Daniel, *Early Jewish Hermeneutics in Palestine* (SBLDS, 22; Montana: Scholars Press, 1975).
- Peckham, Brian, *The Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Porter, Stanley E., “The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology,” in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, eds., *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup, 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79-96.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Craig A. Evans, *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Propp, William H. C., *Exodus 19-40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 2A; New York: Doubleday, 2006).
- Ragaf, Hilel, “The Origin of the Religious Sect of Mormons,” *Vorwärts* (26 April, 1953).
- Rasmussen, Ellis T., “Textual Parallels to the Doctrine and Covenants and Book of Commandments as found in the Bible” (Unpublished Master’s Thesis; Provo: Brigham Young University, 1951).
- Rendtorff, Rolf, *The Problem of the Process of Transmission in the Pentateuch* (transl. John J. Scullion; JSOTSup, 89; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1977).
- Reynolds, Noel B., “The Brass Plates Version of Genesis,” in John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks, eds., *By Study and Also By Faith, Volume 2: Essays in Honor of Hugh W. Nibley on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday 27 March 1990* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990), 136-173.
- Richmond, A.M., Rev. Legh, *A Selection from the Writings of the Reformers and Early Protestant Divines of the Church of England* (London: Published by John Hatchard, 1817).
- Ricks, Stephen D. and John W. Welch, eds., *The Allegory of the Olive Tree: The Olive, the Bible, and Jacob 5* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1994).

- Roberts, A. and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: II. Fathers of the Second Century* (10 vols.; trans. M. Dods; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979).
- Roberts, Bleddyn J., "Bible Exegesis and Fulfilment in Qumran," in P. R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars, eds., *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to D. W. Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 195-207.
- Roberts, B. H., *New Witnesses for God: III The Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: The Deseret News, 1909).
- Römer, Thomas, ed., *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, CXLVII; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000).
- Rosner, Brian S., *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7* (Arbeiten Zur Geschichte Des Antiken Judentums Und Des Urchristentums, XXII; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994).
- Rubinkiewicz, R. "Apocalypse of Abraham," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 681-719.
- Sanders, J. A., "Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament," *JR* 39 (1959), 232-244.
 – "The Old Testament in *11QMelchizedek*," *JANESCU* 5 (1973), 373-382.
- Sarna, Nahum, "Ps. 89: A Study of Inner Biblical Exegesis," in A. Altmann, ed., *Biblical and Other Studies* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 29-46.
 – "The Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in Jewish Tradition," in C. Thomas and M. Wyschogrod, ed., *Understanding Scripture: Explorations of Jewish and Christian Traditions of Interpretation* (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 9-20.
- Scarlata, M. W., *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies, Vol. 573; New York: T&T Clark, 2012).
- Schultz, Richard J., *The Search for Quotation: Verbal Parallels in the Prophets* (JSOTSup 180; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Scott, James M., "Korah and Qumran," in Peter Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 182-202.
- Seely, David R., Jeffrey R. Chadwick, and Matthew J. Grey, eds., *Ascending the Mountain of the Lord: Temple, Praise, and Worship in the Old Testament* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and the Religious Studies Center, BYU, 2013).
- Segal, Michael, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 10-28.
 – Segal, Michael, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, 17; Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Shalev, Eran, "'Written in the Style of Antiquity': Pseudo-Biblicism and the Early American Republic, 1770-1830," in *Church History*, Vol. 79, Issue 4 (December, 2010), 800-826.
 – *American Zion: The Old Testament as a Political Text from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).
- Shectman, Sarah, and Joel S. Baden, *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Band 95; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2009).
- Shires, Henry M., *Finding the Old Testament in the New* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974).
- Siddons, Mrs., *The Story of Our First Parents, selected from Milton's Paradise Lost: for the use of young persons* (London: John Murray, 1822).

- Silva, Moises, "The New Testament Use of the Old: Text-Form and Authority," in D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, eds., *Scripture and Truth* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983).
- "Old Testament in Paul," in G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin, eds., *Dictionary of Paul and his Letters* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 630-642.
- Ska, Jean-Louis, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006).
- "Genesis 2-3: Some Fundamental Questions," in Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, eds., *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2-3) and Its Reception History* (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe, 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 1-27.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (The Anchor Bible Commentary, vol. 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987).
- Skousen, Royal, *Analysis of Textual Variants of the Book of Mormon, Part One: 1 Nephi 1–2 Nephi 10* (Provo: The Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, Brigham Young University, 2014).
- Smith, III, Joseph, *Saints Herald* (Plano, Iowa), Oct. 1, 1879, 289-290.
- Smith, Julie M., "So Shall My Word Be: Reading Alma 32 Through Isaiah 55," in Adam S. Miller, ed., *An Experiment Upon the Word: Reading Alma 32* (Provo: Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, 2014), 71-86.
- "A Double Portion: An Intertextual Reading of Hannah (1 Samuel 1-2) and Mark's Greek Woman (Mark 7:24-30)" (Unpublished presentation at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, 2015). <http://paulredux.blogspot.com/2015/04/the-intertextuality-in-new-testament.html> (Last accessed 1/18/2016).
- Smith, D. Moody, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in James B. Eird, ed., *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972), 3-65.
- Smith, Morton, "Pseudepigraphy in the Israelite Literary Tradition," in Kurt von Fritz, *Pseudepigrapha I: Pseudopythagorica—Lettres de Platon Litterature pseudepigraphique juive* (Geneve, Fondation Hardt, 1972), 191-227.
- Smutz, Lois Jean, "Textual Parallels to the Doctrine and Covenants (Sections 65 to 133) as Found in the Bible" (Unpublished Master's Thesis; Provo: Brigham Young University, 1971).
- Sommer, Benjamin D., *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- "Exegesis, Allusion and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger," in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 46, Fasc. 4 (Oct., 1996), 479-489.
- Sorenson, John, "The 'Brass Plates' and Biblical Scholarship," in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 10, No. 4 (Autumn, 1977), 31-39.
- Spawn, Kevin L., "As it is Written" and Other Citation Formulae in the Old Testament: Their Use, Development, Syntax, and Significance (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 311; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002).
- Speiser, E. A., *Genesis: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible, vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1962).
- Spencer, Joseph, *An Other Testament: On Typology* (Salem: Salt Press, 2012).
- Sperry, Sidney B., *Book of Mormon Compendium* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1968).
- *Answers to Book of Mormon Questions* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1967).
 - *Our Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Stevens & Wallis, Inc., 1948).

- “The Text of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon” (Unpublished Master’s Thesis; Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1926).
- Stanley, Christopher D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation technique in the Pauline Epistles and contemporary literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- Stave, Shirley A., ed., *Toni Morrison and the Bible: Contested Intertextualities* (African American Literature and Culture: Expanding and Exploding Boundaries; New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2006).
- Stone, M. E., “Greek Apocalypse of Ezra,” in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1*, 561-579.
- Stordalen, T., *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology, 25; Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
- Stratton, Beverly J., *Out of Eden: Reading, Rhetoric, and Ideology in Genesis 2-3* (JSOTSup 208; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- Strazicich, John, *Joel’s Use of Scripture and Scripture’s Use of Joel: Appropriation and Resignification in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity* (Biblical Interpretation Series, Vol. 82; Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Strickman, H. Norman and Arthur M. Silver, eds., *Ibn Ezra’s Commentary on the Pentateuch (Bereshit)* (New York: Menorah Publishing Company, Inc., 1988).
- Swanson, Dwight D., *The Temple Scroll: The Methodology of 11QT* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. XIV; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).
- Taylor, Thomas, *Sixteen Lectures upon the Epistles to the Seven Churches of Asia, recorded in the Second and Third Chapters of Revelations* (Bristol: R. Edwards, 1800).
- Theocharous, Myrto, *Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets: Studies in Hosea, Amos, and Micah* (Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 570; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013).
- Thompson, Thomas L., “4QTestimonia and Bible Composition: A Copenhagen Lego Hypothesis,” in Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson, eds., *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 261-276.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H., ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985).
- Tsedaka, Benjamin, *The Israelite Samaritan Version of the Torah: First English Translation with the Masoretic Version* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013).
- Tomson, Peter J., *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles* (Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1990).
- Townsend, Colby, “Behold, Other Scriptures I would that ye should write’: Malachi in the Book of Mormon,” unpublished. See https://www.academia.edu/8726590/Behold_Other_Scriptures_I_Would_that_ye_Should_Write_Malachi_in_the_Book_of_Mormon (Last accessed 4/26/2016).
- Tvedtnes, John A., “Borrowings from the Parable of Zenos,” in Stephen D. Ricks and John W. Welch, eds., *The Allegory of the Olive Tree: The Olive, the Bible, and Jacob 5* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1994), 373-426.
 - *Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon* (FARMS Preliminary Reports; Provo: FARMS, 1981).
 - “Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon,” in Monte S. Nyman, ed., *Isaiah and the Prophets: Inspired Voices from the Old Testament* (Provo: BYU Religious Studies Center, 1984), 165-177.

- Van Seters, John, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 1992).
- VanderKam, James C., "Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees," in Charlesworth and Evans, eds., *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup. 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 96-125.
- *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQ Monograph Series 16; Washington DC; The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984).
 - *The Book of Jubilees* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vol. 511; Scriptorum Aethiopicum, Tomus 88; Lovani: Peeters, 1989).
 - *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001).
 - "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in Peter Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 129-148.
 - "Sinai Revisited," in Matthias Henze, ed., *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005).
- Vermes, Geza, "Interpretation, History of: At Qumran and in the Targums," in Keith Crim, ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 438-443.
- "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting," in Geza Vermes, ed., *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 37-49.
 - *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975).
 - "Biblical Interpretation of Qumran," *EI* 20 (1989), 184-191.
 - "Biblical Proofs in Qumran Literature," *JSS* 34 (1989), 493-508.
- Vest, H. Grant, "The Problem of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," (unpublished Master's Thesis; Brigham Young University, 1938).
- Vogel, Dan and Brent Lee Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002).
- von Heijne, Camilla Helena, *The Messenger of the Lord in Early Jewish Interpretation of Genesis* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 412; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010).
- von Weissenberg, Hanne, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. 82; Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- von Weissenberg, Hanne, et al, eds., *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Band 419; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011).
- Waard, J. de, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, Vol. IV; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).
- Wagner, J. Ross, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in <Concert> in the Letter to the Romans* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. CI; Leiden: Brill, 2002).
- Wall, Robert W., "The Intertextuality of Scripture: The Example of Rahab (James 2:25)," in Peter Flint, ed., *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 217-236.
- Wallace, Howard N., *The Eden Narrative* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 32; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

- Walters, Wesley P., *The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1990).
- Waters, Guy P., *The End of Deuteronomy in the Epistles of Paul* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.Reihe, 221; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).
- Watt, G. D. and J. V. Long, eds., *Journal of Discourses* Vol. IX (Liverpool: George Q. Cannon, 1862).
- Welch, John W., ed., *Reexploring the Book of Mormon* (Provo: FARMS, 1992).
- Wellhausen, Julius, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (with a reprint of the article *Israel* from the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*; Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973).
- Westermann, Claus, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* (Transl. John J. Scullion, S. J.; Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1984).
- Whybray, R. N., *The Making of the Pentateuch: A Methodological Study* (JSOTSup 53; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987).
- Wilcox, Max, "On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson, eds., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 231-243.
- Willey, Patricia T., *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah* (SBL Dissertation Series 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).
- Wright, David P., *Inventing God's Law: How the Covenant Code of the Bible Used and Revised the Laws of Hammurabi* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- "‘In Plain Terms that We May Understand’: Joseph Smith’s Transformation of Hebrews in Alma 12-13," in Brent Metcalfe, ed., *New Approaches to the Book of Mormon: Explorations in Critical Methodology* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1993), 165-229.
 - "Joseph Smith’s Interpretation of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon," in *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* Vol. 31, No. 4 (Winter 1998), 181-206.
 - "Isaiah in the Book of Mormon: Or Joseph Smith in Isaiah," in Dan Vogel and Brent Lee Metcalfe, eds., *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 157-234.
- Wright, David P., et al, eds., *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995).
- Wright, R. B., "Psalms of Solomon," in Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 2*, 639-670.
- Zimmerli, Walther, "Der ‘neue Exodus’ in der Verkündigung der beiden grossen Exilspropheten," in Zimmerli, *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, Theologische Bücherei 19 (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963), 192-204.
- Zink, J. L., "Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha" (Ph.D. Dissertation, Duke University, 1963).