Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon

Author(s): John W. Welch
Source: *Book of Mormon Authorship: New Light on Ancient Origins*
Editor(s): Noel B. Reynolds
Published: 1982
Page(s): 33-52

John W. Welch

Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon

John W. Welch, an attorney specializing in tax matters, joined the faculty of the J. Reuben Clark Law School in 1980. He is the author of several articles on literary structure in the Book of Mormon. President of the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies, he has contributed to BYU Studies and is co-author and general editor of the recently published book, Chiasmus in Antiquity. He received a B.A. in history and an M.A. in classical languages from Brigham Young University, where he was valedictorian and became a Woodrow Wilson Fellow. He went on to study at Oxford University, and received his J.D. from Duke University in 1975. His research into literary forms in ancient scriptures led him to the original discovery in 1967 of chiasmus in the Book of Mormon. Chiasmus, a rhetorical device used prevalently in the Bible and in other ancient literatures, was relegated to the intellectual subconsciousness of modern Western civilization until the mid-

nineteenth century. Since there is no evidence that anyone in America understood chiasmus in 1830 when the Book of Mormon was published, the remarkable presence of complex chiasms in the Book of Mormon testifies to the ancient origin of the text. It also amplifies the significance of central events and enhances interpretation of many scriptures.

From the day the Book of Mormon rolled off the press in 1830, those who gave it credence asserted that it obviously read like a Hebrew text. Those who were not so convinced insisted that it obviously read like anything but a Hebrew text.[1] Actually, all that became obvious was the failure of both believers and unbelievers to cite much specific evidence. However, numerous Hebrew characteristics of the Book of Mormon have been recognized in recent literature;[2] in addition to these we can now cite many specific passages which bear the distinct stamp of an ancient Hebraic literary form which scholars call *chiasmus.*

What Is Chiasmus?

Chiasmus appears to have begun as a structural form that later developed into an intriguing rhetorical device which has been used sporadically in prose and poetry for nearly three thousand years. Despite its long usage, awareness of the form in its extended instances remained, except in isolated cases, a part of the intellectual subconsciousness of modern Western Europe until frequent chiastic passages were discovered in the Bible. Since that time in the mid-nineteenth century, several reputable scholars, mostly theologians, have published on the subject. Their works indicate that, although chiasms appear in Greek, Latin, English, and other languages, the form was much more highly developed in Hebrew and dates to the oldest sections of the Hebrew Bible and beyond.

Chiasmus can be defined most simply as an inverted type of parallelism. Two lines of poetry are said to be parallel if the component elements of one line correspond directly to those of the other in a one-to-one relationship. There are numerous examples of direct parallelism in Proverbs, e.g.,

> A soft answer turneth away wrath:
> But grievous words stir up anger.
> (Proverbs 15:1)

If the second line of a parallelism is inverted, that is to say, if its last element is placed first and the first, last, then a chiasm is created, as, for example, in the following verse:

> For *my* thoughts are not *your* thoughts,
> Neither are *your* ways *my* ways, saith the Lord.
> (Isaiah 55:8)

And from the New Testament:

> He that *findeth* his life shall *lose* it:
> And he that *loseth* his life for my sake shall *find* it.
> (Matthew 10:39)

Formulating this graphically, the simple chiasm takes on the form of a χ:

The name *chiasmus*, derived from chi (χ), the twenty-second letter in the Greek alphabet, and the Greek *chiazein* ("to mark with a χ"), is thus descriptive of the form itself.

As a literary device, chiasmus has proved durable and useful because of its many applications. For example, Heraclitus, one of the earliest Greek philosophers, used chiasmus to accentuate his notion of eternal flux and opposition:

> Cold things grow warm,
> What is warm cools;
>
> the moist dries,
> the dry dampens. (Fragment 39)

Immortals are mortal,
mortals are immortal,

each living the others' death
and dying the others' life. (Fragment 67)

Several centuries later, Cicero effectively used chiastic lines as a rhetorical device for placing emphasis:

Matrem habemus, ignoramus patrem. (*Republic* 2:33)

Some English authors, perhaps influenced by their training in the classics, used chiasmus in poetry. In Pope's "Essay on Man" this short chiasm appears:

. . . flame lawless through the void,
Destroying others, by himself destroyed.
(2.65-66)

Even in our modern nursery rhymes and maxims, the natural rhythm and immediate appeal of chiastic lines is apparent. Thus, "Old King Cole was a merry old soul, and a merry old soul was he" is charming; and "He who fails to prepare, prepares to fail" sounds solid and convincing.

The reader, however, will notice that all these chiasms contain only two elements, whose order is then reversed. This is significant in differentiating the relatively simple chiasmus known for some time in the West from the much more complex chiasmus characteristic of Hebrew and other such ancient languages. Whereas in languages such as Greek, Latin, and English, chiasms are most often composed of two elements, in Hebrew there appears to be no limit to the number of terms or ideas that may commonly be employed. A chiasm may be expanded to include any number of terms written first in one order and then exactly in the reverse order, i.e.,

a-b-c-d- . . . -x-x- . . . -d-c-b-a.

Such structures might be several verses or even several chapters long. A simple illustration of this, with five elements in an inverted parallelism, is found in Psalm 3:7-8:[3]

Save me
O my God,
For thou hast smitten
All my enemies
On the cheek-bone
The teeth
Of the wicked
Thou hast broken.
To Yahweh
The salvation.

A second example comes from Isaiah 60:1-3:

Arise,
Shine,
For thy light is come,
And the glory
Of Yahweh
Upon thee is risen.
For behold, dimness shall cover the earth
And gross darkness the peoples.
But upon thee will arise
Yahweh
And his glory shall upon thee be seen
And nations shall come to thy light
And kings to the brightness
Of thy rising.

There are several good reasons why a literary form of this peculiar type was particularly attractive to the ancient Hebrews. First, chiasms are easy to memorize. The Hebrew tradition, unlike the written Greek tradition, was oral. Not only were manuscripts and scrolls scarce, but there were also few who could read them. Therefore, the tales of early Israel and the songs of her prophets were handed down through generations by word of mouth, and long passages of the Torah were committed to memory.[4] In their memorization and recitation, the ancients were surely aided by chiastic groupings and repetitions. Second, chiasmus was simply a vogue. Just as sixteenth-century English poets were fond of the sonnet, chiasmus seems to have been preferred by many of the ancient Hebrew writers of the Old Testament. Third, the form can be very pleasing aestheti-

cally because of its vast potential to coordinate abrupt juxta-
positions within a single unified literary system while focusing
simultaneously on a point of central concern. Furthermore, and
perhaps most significantly, chiasmus afforded a seriously
needed element of internal organization in ancient writing,
which did not have paragraphs, punctuation, capitalization,
and other such synthetic devices to demarcate the conclusion of
one idea and the commencement of the next. Ancient texts were
written in a steady stream of letters from the beginning of a
book to the end, sometimes even without spaces between the
words. Chiastic or other parallel forms, therefore, could serve
an important organizational function by indicating units of
thought or sections of text. Finally, ancient religious literature
frequently served liturgical purposes, and the structure of
chiastic writing may have made it suitable for use in certain
ritual settings requiring alternate recitations.

Chiasmus remained a common literary device in much of
ancient literature and was one which was expressly recognized,
for example, by the scholiasts in Alexandria in the second
century B.C. But the form, especially in its more elaborate mani-
festations, appears to have fallen into disuse and obscurity in
the first centuries after Christ, when many ancient institutions
from Greek, Roman, Jewish, and other civilizations underwent
great change, if not destruction, and when more familiar
modern manners of writing began to develop.

The rediscovery of chiasmus in the Bible can be credited to
three theologians of the nineteenth century: Robert Lowth, John
Jebb, and John Forbes. Lowth, the Bishop of London, and Jebb,
the Bishop of Limerick, both wrote 300-page volumes
describing Hebraisms in the holy scriptures.[5] Although both
made initial observations of the chiastic form, their emphasis
was placed almost entirely on poetic imagery and direct paral-
lelism, and only Jebb paid much attention to *epanodos* (the
Greek term he used to describe inverted parallelism). In 1854,
however, John Forbes completed a much more extensive study,
The Symmetrical Structures of Scripture.[6] With the publication
of Forbes's book, it is possible to begin speaking of relatively
well-developed appreciation of chiastic forms in the Bible. Since

then numerous other writers have utilized a knowledge of the form in critical studies of the holy scriptures, indicating that it has been recognized as genuine and significant.[7]

CHIASMUS IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS

As the Old Testament represents the earliest extant Hebrew writings, it is the best evidence of the antiquity and general nature of chiasmus as developed by the Hebrews. Based on his detailed modern analysis of biblical chiasmus, Nils Lund has formulated seven rules of chiastic passages, three of which are most interesting for this study.[8] The first states that the center of the passage is always the turning point. The third notes that identical ideas will often be distributed so as to occur at the beginning, middle, and end of a chiasm, but nowhere else. The seventh claims that there is often a mixture of directly parallel and inverted parallel lines in the same unit. These characteristics are readily apparent in the following biblical passages:

Example 1

And all flesh *died* that moved upon the *earth,*
  Both birds,
    And cattle,
      And beasts,
        And every creeping thing that creepeth upon
          the earth,
       And every man:
        All in whose nostrils was the breath of the
          spirit of *life*
         Of all that was on the *dry land*
         Died;
        And was destroyed
       Every *living* thing
      That was upon the face of the *ground*
     Both man,
    And creeping things,
   (And beasts),
  And cattle,
 And birds of the heavens,
And they were *destroyed* from the *earth.*
        (Genesis 7:21-23)

Example 2

Seek ye me, and ye shall *live.*
   But seek not after *Bethel,*
      Nor enter into *Gilgal,*
        And pass not to Beer-sheba:
     For *Gilgal shall* shall surely go into captivity,
  And *Bethel* shall come to naught.
Seek Yahweh, and ye shall *live.* (Amos 5:4b-6a)

Example 3

Do ye indeed, O *gods,* speak *righteousness?*
Do ye *judge* uprightly, O ye sons of men?

  Nay, in the heart ye work *wickedness*
  Ye weigh out the *violence* of your hands in the earth.

    The wicked are estranged from the *womb*
    They go astray as soon as they are born, speaking
            lies.

    Their poison is like the poison of a *serpent*
    Like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear
    Which hearkeneth not to the voice of charmers,
    The most cunning binder of spells.

    O God,
      Break
        Their teeth in their mouth;
        The great teeth of the young lions
      Break out
    O Yahweh.

  They shall melt away like waters,
  They shall go away for them,
  Like tender grass which wilts away.
  Like a *snail* will melt as it goes along.

  Abortions of a *woman*
  That have not beheld the sun!

The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the
              vengeance
He shall wash his feet in the blood of the *wicked.*

And men shall say, surely there is a reward for the
              righteous
Surely there is a *God* that *judgeth* the earth. (Psalm 58)

Example 4

Therefore I speak to them in *parables:*
    Because they seeing *see* not; and hearing they *hear* not.
        In them is fulfilled the *prophecy* of Esaias which
            sayeth
            By hearing ye shall *hear* not; and seeing ye shall
                see not
            For this people's *heart* is waxed gross
                And their *ears* are dull of *hearing*
                    And their *eyes* they have closed
                        lest at any time they should *see*
                        With their *eyes*
                    And *hear* with their *ears,*
                And should understand with their *heart* and be
                    converted.
            Blessed are your eyes, for they *see* and your ears,
                for they *hear*
        Many *prophets* and righteous men
    Have longed to *see* what you see and *hear* what you
        hear and have not.
Hear ye therefore the *parable* of the sower.
                                    (Matthew 13:13-18)

CHIASMUS IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

We now turn to the question of chiasmus in the Book of Mormon. The first chapter of the book claims that it was written in "the language of the Egyptians" but according to "the learning of the Jews" (1 Nephi 1:2); that is, it was written with Egyptian characters and elements but in Hebraic style. If the Book of Mormon truly is a direct translation of a text formulated in accordance with ancient Hebrew learning, chiasmus might well be present as an integral part of its literary style. If so, an understanding of chiasmus should be helpful in interpreting and understanding the design of the total book.

If chiasmus can be convincingly identified in the Book of Mormon, it will testify of the book's ancient origin. No one in America, let alone in western New York, fully understood chiasmus in 1830. Joseph Smith had been dead ten full years before John Forbes's book was published in Scotland. Even many prominent Bible scholars today know little about chiastic

forms beyond the name and a few passages where they might be found. The possibility of Joseph Smith's noticing the form accidentally is also remote, since most biblical passages containing inverted word orders have been rearranged into natural word orders in the King James translation. Even had he known of the form, he would still have had the overwhelming task of writing original, artistic chiastic sentences. Try writing a sonnet or a multi-termed chiasm yourself: your appreciation of these forms will turn to awe. If the Book of Mormon is found to contain true chiastic forms in an ancient style, then is not the book's own repeated claim to be the product of an ancient culture veritably substantiated?

An understanding of chiasmus will also greatly enhance interpretation of Book of Mormon scriptures. If the ancient authors of the Book of Mormon consciously set particular elements parallel to each other, then these elements must be considered together in order to be fully understood in their complete context. Moreover, the thoughts which appear at the center of a chiastic passage must always be given special attention, and any antithetical ideas introduced at the turning point must be contrasted with their properly corresponding ideas. Knowledge of chiasmus will clarify questions of structure within shorter passages and of unity within whole books.[9] For example, why Nephi divided his writings into two books, instead of leaving them all in one, will be explained by chiasmus. Stylistic devices, especially the frequent repetitions which have often been seen as ignorant and redundant, will be appreciated in the light in which they originally shone.

Chiasms may appear anywhere in the Book of Mormon, although they primarily typify the style of only three of the numerous authors—Nephi, Benjamin, and Alma the Younger. These writers use chiasms in practically every possible context, from passages of straight narration or argumentation to others of beautiful poetic eloquence. The following examples speak for themselves and require little further explanation.

Example 1

The *Jews*
  shall have the *words*
    of the *Nephites,*
    and the *Nephites*
  shall have the *words*
of the *Jews;*

and the *Nephites* and the *Jews*
  shall have the *words*
    of the lost tribes of *Israel;*
    and the lost tribes of *Israel*
  shall have the *words* of
the *Nephites* and the *Jews.*

(2 Nephi 29:13)

Example 2

But men drink damnation to their own souls except
  they *humble* themselves
    and become as little *children,*
      and believe that salvation . . . is . . . in and through
        the *atoning blood of Christ, the*
        Lord . . .
     For the *natural man*
      is an enemy to *God,*
        and *has been* from the fall of Adam,
        and *will be,* forever and ever,
      unless he yields 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* . . .

(Mosiah 3:18-19)

Example 3

Whosoever shall not take upon him the *name of Christ*
  must be *called* by some other name;
    therefore, he findeth himself on the *left hand of*
      God.
      And I would that ye should *remember* also, that
        this is the name . . .
        that never should be *blotted out,*
          except it be through *transgression;*
           therefore,
          take heed that ye do not *transgress,*
        that the name be not *blotted out* of your
          hearts. . . .
      I would that ye should *remember* to retain the
        name . . .
    that ye are not found on the *left hand of God,*
  but that ye hear and know the voice by which ye shall
    be *called,*
and also, the *name* by which he shall call you.
        (Mosiah 5:10-12)

Needless to say, the word order in these last two examples is especially striking. These passages are just two small parts of the very complex chiastic structure of King Benjamin's entire speech.[10] His use of chiasmus is not illogical: at the time that he delivered this famous speech, he was acting in a traditional coronation and would naturally be using the most traditional and convincing rhetoric at his command. Benjamin's thoughts had been carefully prepared beforehand and had even been "written and sent forth among those that were not under the sound of his voice" (Mosiah 2:8). This degree of painstaking deliberation in writing was the rule, rather than the exception, among the Book of Mormon prophets. In cases such as these, chiasmus is used to give emphasis to points of special importance.

Example 4

And they said unto me: We have not; for the Lord
        maketh no such thing *known unto us.*
  Behold, I said unto them: How is it that ye do not
      keep the *commandments* of the Lord?

How is it that ye will *perish,*
  because of the *hardness of your hearts?*
    Do ye not remember the things which the *Lord*
      hath said?
    —If ye will not *harden your hearts,*
  and ask me in *faith,* believing that ye shall receive,
  with diligence in keeping my *commandments,*
surely these things shall be *made known unto you.*
(1 Nephi 15:9-11)

A chiasm may also appear as a logical device, for its completeness rounds out a thought forcefully and ties in all loose ends tightly. Nephi so successfully used the foregoing line of reasoning against his rebellious brothers that, as he later recorded the events of his family's lengthy journey to the New World, he could still recall his unanswerable rebuttal. The turning point of the argument is a piercing question: "Do ye not remember the things which the Lord hath said?" The same thought, concerning that which the Lord has said or will say, appropriately appears at the extremes as well as in the middle of this chiasm. Notice also that the first half of the chiasm contains the words of Nephi, while the second half is built from the words of the Lord, comprising a deft shift at the center. What better debate partner could Nephi have in his parallelism than the Lord? The only key terms in the passage which are parallel but not identical are *perish* and *ask in faith.* Perhaps Nephi uses them to contrast the living strength of true faith with the fear of death which accompanies any traveler through the wilderness.

Example 5

A   Behold, the Lord hath created the *earth* that it
            should be inhabited;
  and he hath created his children that they should
            possess it.

    B   And he raiseth up
                        a righteous
                        nation,
        and destroyeth
                        the nations
                        of the wicked.

B '   And he leadeth away
            the righteous
                              into precious lands,
            and the wicked
        he destroyeth,
                              and curseth the land
                                  unto them for their
                                  sakes.

A '   He ruleth high in the heavens,
            for it is his throne,
        and this *earth*
            is his footstool.
                    (1 Nephi 17:36-39)

This passage is an intricate gem. It masterfully combines direct parallelisms with inverted parallelisms. Parts A and A ' each contain two directly parallel thoughts, in A the Lord's creation of the earth and the creation of his children, and in A ' the Lord's throne and his footstool. It is interesting that the word *earth* appears in both A and A '. Parts B and B ' are built of four poetical lines, each containing three parts. In both B and B ', two of the three parts are inverted when they reappear the second time, i.e.,

    righteous / nation
    nations / of the wicked

    he leadeth away / the righteous
    the wicked / he destroyeth

Furthermore, these inverted parts come at the end of the lines in B but at the beginning of the lines in B '. This leaves the words *raiseth up* and *destroyeth* at the beginning of B and *precious lands* and *curseth the land* at the end of B ' in direct parallel form. Thus another chiasm is formed between the directly parallel portions of B and B ' and the inverted portions of B and B ', i.e.,

            B   inverted   direct
            B ' direct   inverted

For extra measure the first line in B and the first line in B'
express the same idea, the blessing of the righteous, while the
second line in B and the second line in B' both express the idea
of being punished. So in the midst of inverted parallelisms, the
direct parallelism is also skillfully maintained.

Example 6

A   1 And, notwithstanding we believe in Christ, we
keep the *law of Moses,*
    2 and look forward with *steadfastness unto
Christ,*
      3 until the *law* shall be *fulfilled.*
       4 For, for this *end was the law given;*

     B   wherefore the *law* hath become *dead unto us,*
and we are made *alive in Christ* because of
our faith;
yet we keep the *law* because of the command-
ments.

       C   And we talk of Christ,
we rejoice in Christ,
we preach of Christ,
we *prophesy* of Christ,

       C' and we write according to our
prophecies,
that our children may know
to what source they may look
for a remission of their sins.

    B' Wherefore, we speak concerning the *law*
that our children may know the *deadness of
the law;*
and . . . may look forward unto that *life*
which is *in Christ,*

  A'   4 and know for what *end the law was
given.*
      3 And after the *law* is *fulfilled*
    2 *in Christ,* that they need not *harden* their
hearts against him
  1 when the *law* ought to be done away.
(2 Nephi 25:24-27)

Example 7

A   The meaning of the *word restoration* is to bring
     back again

    B   evil for evil,
          or carnal for carnal,
          or devilish for devilish—

w_1w_2 *good* for that which is *good;*

    x_1x_2 *righteous* for that which is *righteous*·

        y_1y_2 *just* for that which is *just;*

            z_1z_2 *merciful* for that which is *merciful.*
                        Therefore, my son, see that you
                        are

          z'_2 *merciful* unto your brethren;

        y'_2 deal *justly,*

      x'_2 judge *righteously,*

    w'_2 and do *good* continually;

                        and if ye do all these things then
                        shall ye receive your reward; yea,

        z'_1 ye shall have *mercy* restored unto
                        you again;

      y'_1 ye shall have *justice* restored unto you
                        again;

    x'_1 ye shall have a *righteous* judgement
                        restored unto you again;

  w'_1 and ye shall have *good* rewarded unto you
              again.

    B′   For that which ye do send out
          shall return unto you again,
          and be restored;

A′   therefore, the *word restoration* more fully
     condemneth the sinner, and justifieth him not at all.
                        (Alma 41:13-15)

The twist here is clever: after listing four pairs of terms, Alma pairs two lists of four terms and reverses their order at the same time. Or to use a chiasm to describe this chiasm: Alma writes a list of pairs and then a pair of lists. The chiasmus here reaches yet a further level, since the first nominatives in the list of pairs (w_1, x_1, y_1, and z_1) and the last list in the pair of lists (w'_1, x'_1, y'_1 and z'_1) both describe the reward to be received, while the second nominatives (w_2, x_2, y_2 and z_2) and the first of the separate lists (w'_2, x'_2, y'_2, and z'_2) describe the attributes necessary to obtain those rewards. In all seriousness, a great play on words.

By far the most subtle use of chiasmus is its role in the structural design of longer passages and books. The book of Mosiah, for example, utilizes a chiastic structure in its underlying organization, at the expense of chronological order.[11] Like the book of Mosiah, the book of 1 Nephi, King Benjamin's speech, and Alma chapter 36 also use a chiastic framework as a foundation. Of this group, only Alma 36 is sufficiently brief for effective illustration here of the way in which complex chiasmus can be employed in a longer passage to emphasize a central theme.[12] In this chapter Alma recounts to his son Helaman the story of his conversion. Contrary to what one might be led to believe from Alma's earlier account of his conversion (Mosiah 27:10-31), the supernatural events associated with his conversion were not of primary importance to him as he remembered them in his more mature years. The structure of the chapter shows that Alma's conversion centered instead upon a spiritual confrontation in which Alma turned to Jesus Christ for deliverance from his sins:

Example 8

My son, give ear to my words (1)
  Keep the commandments and ye shall prosper in the
           land (1)
    Do as I have done (2)
      Captivity of our fathers—their bondage (2)
      He surely did deliver them (2)
     Trust in God (3)

Support in trials, troubles and afflictions (3)
I know this not of myself but of God (4)
Born of God (5)

Alma seeks to harm the church (6)
Limbs paralyzed (10)
Fear of the presence of God (14)
Pains of a damned soul (16)
Alma remembers one Jesus Christ (17)
Christ will atone for the sins of the
world (17)
Alma calls upon Jesus Christ (18)
Joy as exceeding as the pain (20)
Longing to be with God (22)
Use of limbs returns (23)
Alma seeks to bring souls unto God (24)

Born of God (26)
My knowledge is of God (26)
Supported under trials, troubles, and
afflictions (27)
Trust in him (27)
He will deliver me (27)
Egypt—captivity (28-29)
Know as I do know (30)
Keep the commandments and ye shall prosper in the
land (30)
This is according to his word (30)
(Alma 36)

Given our twentieth-century understanding of chiastic writings and their historical occurrences, this one chapter is strong evidence that the Book of Mormon was not written in the nineteenth century.

This chapter is as extensive and precise as any chiastic passage I am aware of in ancient literature. Besides having practical structural value, chiasmus has a distinct charm and beauty in a passage such as this. The first ten verses and the last eight form an artistic frame around the central motif which contrasts the agony of conversion with the joy of conversion. In the center Alma makes this contrast explicit, when he says in verse 20, "my soul was filled with joy as exceeding as was my pain." No literary device could make this contrast more force-

fully than chiasmus. Moreover, chiasmus allows Alma to place the very turning point of his entire life exactly at the turning point of this chapter: Christ, because of the effects of the future atonement, belongs at the center of both. Compared with the abrupt antithetic parallelisms found in the recounting of this incident recorded in Mosiah 27, the chiasmus in Alma 36 is monumental and meaningful. The chiastic structure amplifies the significance of Alma's conversion and the centrality of spiritual realities around which it turned.

CONCLUSION

The intent of this article is to introduce one concept of formal analysis into Book of Mormon studies. The form which has been examined is chiasmus, a basic element of ancient literature, particularly that of the ancient Hebrews. Although all knowledge of this form lay dormant for centuries, it was rediscovered and reexplored in the nineteenth century when formal criticism began to emerge. But by the time the concept of chiasmus received currency or recognition, the Book of Mormon had long been in print. Since the Book of Mormon contains numerous chiasms, it thus becomes logical to consider the book a product of the ancient world and to judge its literary qualities accordingly. The book reviewed in this way is moving; it deserves to be read more carefully.

NOTES

1. See Parley P. Pratt, *A Voice of Warning* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1920), p. 105 (the first edition of this book was published in 1837); and Bruce Kinney, *Mormonism, the Islam of America* (New York: F. H. Revell, 1912), p. 60.

2. Hugh Nibley has researched Hebrew and Near Eastern aspects of the Book of Mormon in detail; his previous works dealing with the subject include *Lehi in the Desert and The World of the Jaredites* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1952), *An Approach to the Book of Mormon*, 2d ed. (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1964), and *Since Cumorah: The Book of Mormon in the Modern World* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co., 1967).

3. Many chiasms have not survived the King James translation although they may be crystal clear in the Hebrew. To the extent the following examples

vary from the King James Version, they are verbatim translations from the Hebrew or Greek.

4. Paul Gaechter, *Die literarische Kunst im Matthäus-Evangelium* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965), p. 6.

5. Robert Lowth, *De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae,* translated by G. Gregory, new edition with notes by Calvin E. Stowe (Andover, Mass., 1829); and John Jebb, *Sacred Literature* (London, 1820). See also Thomas Boys, *Tactica Sacra* (London, 1824) and *Key to the Book of Psalms* (London, 1825).

6. John Forbes, *The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1854).

7. An extensive bibliography of scholarly works utilizing chiasmus can be found in John W. Welch, ed., *Chiasmus in Antiquity* (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981).

8. Nils Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), pp. 40-41. To these rules, I would add the following principles for use in testing for chiasmus: (1) chiasmus should be relatively self-evident, encompassing a complete literary unit within the text, and not forced upon a partial passage artificially; (2) it generally does not occur where other organizing schemes are primary (i.e., "Hickory, Dickory, Dock" is not chiastic because it is a limerick); (3) it should take into account every predominant word or thought in the unit, and similarly should not rely upon insignificant or dispensable parts of speech; and (4) in the absence of a very well-defined crossing effect or inversion at a center point which is also the central or turning point in the meaning of the passage, only the most obvious patterns should be called chiastic.

9. The first edition of the Book of Mormon was printed in standard paragraph form without verses. Arbitrary chapter divisions appear in the 1830 edition (1 Nephi with seven, 2 Nephi with fifteen, etc.). The current chapter divisions and separation into verses were made by Orson Pratt in 1879. Therefore, one need not be concerned to take chapter and verse into account when studying the structure of a passage.

10. Discussed in detail in my thesis, "A Study Relating Chiasmus in the Book of Mormon to Chiasmus in the Old Testament, Ugaritic Epics, Homer and Selected Greek and Latin Authors" (M.A. thesis, Brigham Young University, 1970), pp. 135-50.

11. Ibid., pp. 150-51, 170.

12. Such a detailed analysis of a twenty-two-chapter book, 1 Nephi, is attempted by Noel B. Reynolds in chapter 3 of this volume.