2D. Quotations from Sacred History

(1) A Brief Discussion

Quotations can be considered as a parallel line form, even though they match scriptural passages from another book. Short parallel scriptural phrasings can also be considered as Hebraisms. In his exhaustive 1898 *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated*, E. W. Bullinger listed quotations as one of his figures, and said the following:

> The subject of scriptural quotations in the Bible is a large subject and many volumes have been written upon it, both in ancient and in recent times. . . . It is a fact that there are variations between the quotations and the Text quoted from. . . . Sometimes they are direct quotations; at other times, they are composite quotations of several passages joined in one; while others are mere allusions. Consequently, it is difficult for anyone to make a list or table of such quotations which shall agree with those made by others.
>
> The general fact seems to be that there are 189 separate passages quoted (the Lord Jesus Himself referred to 22 out of our 39 Old Testament books). In Matthew, there are references to 88 passages in 10 Old Testament books. In Mark to 37 passages in 10 books. In Luke to 58 passages in 8 books. In John to 40 passages in 6 books.
>
> Deuteronomy and Isaiah, the two books most assailed by the Higher Critics, are referred to more often than any other Old Testament books.
>
> In Romans, there are 74 references. Corinthians, 54. Galatians, 16. Ephesians, 10. Hebrews, 85.
>
> In all, out of 260 chapters in the New Testament, there are 832 quotations, or references, or allusions to the Old Testament Scriptures.
>
> Every Old Testament book is referred to with the exception of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and Canticles.
>
> (Source: Bullinger 1898/1968:778-779)

Quotations are numerous in the Book of Mormon. Indeed, as Hugh Nibley wrote in the Church News in 1961 (July 29, pp. 10, 15):

> Any biblical scholar knows that it would be extremely suspicious if a book purporting to be the product of a society of pious emigrants from Jerusalem in ancient times did not quote the Bible. No lengthy religious writing of the Hebrews could conceivably be genuine if it was not full of scriptural quotations.

But why does the wording of these quotations match the KJV Bible? Nibley writes:

> As to the "passages lifted bodily from the King James Version," we first ask, "How else does one quote scripture if not bodily?" And why should anyone quoting the Bible to American readers of 1830 not follow the only version of the Bible known to them?

Actually, the Bible passages quoted in the Book of Mormon often differ from the King James Version, but where the latter is correct there is every reason why it should be followed. When Jesus and the Apostles and, for that matter, the Angel Gabriel quote the scriptures in the New Testament, do they recite from some mysterious Urtext? Do they quote the prophets of old in the ultimate original? Do they give their own inspired translations? No, they do not. They quote the Septuagint, a Greek version of the Old Testament prepared in the third century B.C. Why so? Because that happened to be the received standard version of the Bible accepted by the readers of the Greek New Testament. When "holy men of God" quote the scriptures, it is always in the received standard version of the people they are addressing.

We do not claim the King James Version of the Septuagint to be the original scriptures—in fact, nobody on earth today knows where the original scriptures are or what they say. Inspired men in every age have been content to accept the received version of the people among whom they labored, with the Spirit giving correction where correction was necessary.

Since the Book of Mormon is a translation, "with all its faults," into English for English-speaking people whose fathers for generations had known no other scriptures but the standard English Bible, it would be both pointless and confusing to present the scriptures to them in any other form, so far as their teachings were correct. (*The Prophetic Book of Mormon: The Collected Works of Hugh Nibley*: Volume 8 The Book of Mormon. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Company, and Provo: FARMS, 1989, p. 215)

Since the time of Bullinger (1898) and Nibley (1961), and as the computer age has moved forward, many more of these "intertextual" passages have come to light. We not only should expect this increased awareness, but in keeping with their role as figures of speech, we should also expect that these parallelisms add to the message of both the Book of Mormon and the Bible.

In their 2007 *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* that has become a standard for Bible scholars, the editors G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson address some perspectives that might be of use to Book of Mormon students seeking understanding from parallel Bible quotations and phrasing. They write:

All O[ld] T[estament] citations in the N[ew] T[estament] are analyzed as well as all probable allusions. . . . The editors have encouraged each contributor to keep in mind six separate questions where the NT cites or clearly alludes to the OT . . . :

1. What is the NT context of the citation or allusion? . . .
2. What is the OT context from which the quotation or allusion is drawn? . . .
3. How is the OT quotation or source handled in the literature of . . . early Judaism? . . .
4. What textual facts must be borne in mind as one seeks to understand a particular use of the OT? . . .
5. What is the nature of the connection as the NT writer sees it? . . .
6. To what theological use does the NT writer put the OT quotation or allusion? . . .
(Introduction, pp. xxiii-xxv)

Sadly, modern-day detractors of the Book of Mormon do not think this way. They do not focus on these scriptural parallelisms as a teaching form. They would rather focus on the "fact" that many of these lines and phrases are seemingly non-chronological or "anachronistic." In other words, in the Book of Mormon there are parallels to biblical scripture not written until many years later.

In view of these attacks on the validity of the Book of Mormon text, I would like to offer a few very brief perspectives on what might be missing in the focus and understanding of those who dismiss these phrases as "plagiarism."

As I did in the Introduction to Volumes 1—3, I have chosen from the very beginning verses of the very first chapter of Alma. **In Alma 1:15 we find the phrase: "between the heavens and the earth**." That phrase is also found in 2 Samuel 18:9 ("between the heaven and the earth"). Before we dismiss this as plagiarism, I would like to follow the admonition of the bible scholars G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, and ask, "What is the context of these citations, and is there any connection?" And, "If there is a connection, can I gain any theological insight from it?"

The reference in 2 Samuel has to do with a man by the name of Absolom. Absalom was the third son of David, King of Israel. According to 2 Samuel 14:25-27 he was very handsome, and he also had a daughter that was very "fair." While at Jerusalem, Absalom built support for himself by speaking to those who came to King David for justice, saying "See, your claims are good and right, but there is no one deputed by the king to hear you (perhaps reflecting flaws in the judicial system). He continued, "If only I were the judge of the land! Then all who had a suit or cause might come to me, and I would give them justice." He made gestures of humility by kissing those who bowed before him instead of accepting supplication. He "stole the hearts of the people of Israel." (2 Samuel 15). Thus he became popular and powerful. After four years he declared himself king, raised a revolt at Hebron, the former capital, and slept with his father's concubines. [So what happened to his seeming humility, morality, and lack of interest in wealth or power?--- these things seem to go without elaboration in the account.]
All Israel and Judah flocked to him, and David, attended only by a few at that moment in time, found it expedient to flee. By subtle maneuvering, David was given time to prepare his own troops for a battle, which was fought in the Wood of Ephraim. There Absalom's army was completely routed. (2 Samuel 16:18). As Absalom was fleeing on a mule, his head got caught in the boughs of an oak tree and his strangulated body became suspended "between the heaven and earth." (2 Samuel 18:9) He was discovered there still alive by one of David's men. Contrary to David's order, his military commander killed Absalom with three darts through the heart, thus bringing to an end the life of someone who had challenged the power of the Lord's anointed leader. (Wikipedia).

In the Book of Mormon, a somewhat similar story is told. In Alma 1:2 we find that in the very first year of the reign of Alma (the Lord's anointed chief judge of the land) "there was a man brought before him to be judged. Without being given his name we are told that he "was large, and was noted for his much strength." He is finally identified as "Nehor" in Alma 1:15.

Interestingly, in Alma chapter 2 we will encounter a man named Amlici who is linked with "the order of Nehor." He also leads a rebellion against Alma (the Lord's anointed).

According to Hugh Nibley, to the Nephites at this time in their history, the Nehor philosophy becomes the perennial opposition, which opposition represents the majority of the population.

Nehor was a great orator, a powerful personality, a very persuasive speaker. He was a real evangelist, and he preached what he "termed to be the word of God" (Alma 1:3). He was not preaching atheism or anything like that. . . . His doctrine was a more relaxed religion: Nehor had gone about among the people, preaching to them that which he termed to be the word of God, bearing down against the church [against the strictness taught by the brethren]; declaring unto the people that every priest and teacher ought to become popular; and they ought not to labor with their hands, but that they ought to be supported by the people. And he also testified unto the people that all mankind should be saved at the last day, and that they need not fear nor tremble, but that they might lift up their heads and rejoice; for the Lord had created all men, and had also redeemed all men; and, in the end, all men should [be saved and] have eternal life [period!]. (Alma 1:3-4)

What is wrong with this upbeat, cheerful religion--this popular message? Well, it's the "period" [at the end] that is wrong. It says, "In the end, all men shall have eternal life"--and that's the whole story. Everyone is saved, and that is that. This short circuits and bypasses the whole plan of salvation which is that this is a time of probation here, accepting salvation the hard way. . . .

Should we lower our standards to gain converts? Well, that's the great thing. The great Catholic Church historian--not only of our time, but I think the greatest of them all--was Duchesne. He said that's exactly what happened. The church was able to expand and conquer after the fourth century because it just kept lowering its standards, lower and lower. Every time it lowered them, it could get more people in. Finally, everybody was willing to join because they didn't have any standards at all as far as morals were concerned. This is the thing that happened here with Nehor; he made himself very popular. (Hugh W. Nibley, <u>Teachings of the Book of Mormon</u>, Semester 2, pp. 216-217)

It is interesting that Nephi, an earlier Nephite prophet (the Lord's anointed) had warned of what might happen to any church that might uphold this Nehor philosophy. In 1 Nephi 22:23, the "popular" preaching and teaching is accompanied by some parallel attributes which might help one understand why such a philosophy as Nehor's was so potentially destructive. Nephi writes:

For the time speedily shall come that

[1] all churches which are built up to get gain, and

[2] all those who are built up to get power over the flesh, and

[3] those who are built up to become popular in the eyes of the world, and

[4] those who seek the lusts of the flesh and the things of the world, and to do all manner of iniquity; yea, in fine, all those who belong to the kingdom of the devil are they who need fear, and tremble, and quake; they are those who must be brought low in the dust; they are those who must be consumed as stubble; and this is according to the words of the prophet.

Another scriptural parallel to the term "popular" is found in Luke 6:26, "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! For so did their fathers to the false prophets."

As Nehor spread his message, many of the Nephites "began to support him and give him money" (Alma 1:5). Hugh Nibley writes:

> What is wrong with winning souls [and money] for Jesus? The answer is that it requires rhetoric. This type of missionary must be a crowd pleaser. Truth tellers are something else, as we learn from Samuel the Lamanite, Abinadi, and people like that. We wouldn't need prophets at all if they told us only what we wanted to hear. We wouldn't need the scriptures if they told us only what we wanted. ([Hugh W. Nibley, <u>Teachings of the Book of Mormon</u>, Semester 2, pp. 217-218)

According to Hugh Nibley, it is interesting that when referring to the actions of Nehor, Alma not only introduces the term "priestcraft"--"This is the first time that priestcraft has been introduced among this people" (Alma 1:12)--but that he seems to have a historical knowledge of it's destructive capabilities --"were priestcraft to be enforced among this people it would prove their entire destruction."

> Alma doesn't specifically say where he got this historical perspective; however, it is interesting to note that about the time of Lehi, in the twenty-sixth dynasty [of Egypt], priestcraft ruled the world. . . . Incidentally, the first high priest [of the twenty-first dynasty in Egypt] was called Korihor [the same name as Korihor the anti-Christ mentioned in Alma chapter 30] and his son was called Pianki [the same name as Paanchi, who contended for the judgment-seat at the time Kishkumen and his band (the Gadianton robbers) came into power--see Helaman 1-2] (Hugh W. Nibley, <u>Teachings of the Book of Mormon</u>, Semester 2, p. 219)

According to Tom Cherrington, the reader should note that this Nehor doctrine is exactly the same approach which Satan (Lucifer) took in the premortal existence saying:

> Behold, here am I, send me, I will be thy son, and I will redeem all mankind, that one soul shall not be lost . . . Wherefore, because that Satan rebelled against me, and sought to destroy the agency of man, which I, the Lord God, had given him, and also, that I should give unto him mine own power by the power of mine Only Begotten, I caused that he should be cast down. (Moses 4:1,3)

A significant point to ponder here is that this destructive Nehor/Satan philosophy not only would prove the "destruction" of the Lord's people here on earth, but it would have proved the "entire destruction" (Alma 1:12) of the people. How is this so? Simply put, the priestcraft philosophy would prove the entire destruction of the Lord's eternal plan--"the immortality and eternal life of man" (Moses 1:39). Had Satan's (Nehor's) plan been accepted in the premortal existence, it would have negated all the varying degrees of progression that had been attained up to that point in man's premortal existence. Thus, there would have been no "noble and great ones" because all the laws upon which they were judged to be "noble and great" would have been made void. There would have been no allowance for birthright blessings which would accompany man into his earthly existence. There would be no reward for righteousness on the highest level during earthly existence, for Satan would save everybody. But in order to do that, just like Nehor, he would have made himself popular by lowering the standards, thus negating the Lord's plan which had been in existence from the beginning. "To bring to pass the immortality and eternal life of man," is to raise man to the Lord's level of eternal life--to become like

God. Satan's plan would have destroyed the agency of man in premortal existence. It would have removed accountability by making it of no effect. It wasn't so much that Satan was going to force people to do good, it was that Satan was going to alter God's standards so that God's children would not have any accountability, which in effect is damnation. (Adapted from personal communication with Tom Cherrington)

Intriguingly, in the book of Ether in the Book of Mormon, we have a record (abridgment) of an ancient people that came from the "great tower" in the old world. Assuming that the "great tower" was what is termed "the tower of Babel," then this people ("the Jaredites") lived many hundred years before the Nephites. In their record we have reference to "Nehor" (Ether 7:4), but it is NOT to a specific person, but rather a land (apparently named after a person). Ether 7:4 describes how Corihor, a son king Kib, rebelled against his righteous father and "went over and dwelt in the land of Nehor." Interestingly, Corihor had sons and daughters that "became exceeding fair" and Corihor "drew away many people after him" (becoming popular). Verse 5 then states that Corihor "gathered together an army" and "he came up unto the land of Moron where the king dwelt" to battle. Corihor ruled for a time at the "city of Nehor" (7:9) but was eventually defeated.

Now related to this Jaredite name of "Corihor," we have an incident chronicled in chapter 30 of the Nephite record of Alma. Here we encounter a man by the name of "Korihor," who rebelled and began to preach against Christ (God's anointed). He taught that which was "pleasing unto the carnal mind" with "much success" until he brought a great curse upon himself by "perverting the ways of the Lord." He was rejected not only by the Nephites (God's people), but by those who had separated themselves from God's people. In a way, he was caught between the doctrines of heaven and the philosophies of earth.

This brings us back to the fate of Nehor mentioned in Alma 1:15, and the link between Nehor and Absalom. It says in Alma 1:15, "And it came to pass that they took him; and his name was Nehor, and they carried him upon the top of the hill Manti, and there he was caused, or rather did acknowledge, **between the heavens and the earth** that what he had taught to the people was contrary to the word of God; and there he suffered an ignominious death."

 According to Hugh Nibley,

the phrase "between the heavens and the earth" has a ritual connection with an ancient literary legend--the legend of Harut and Marut. In the days of Enoch the Watchers came to the earth and started corrupting men. They started taking the sacred ordinances and claiming them, but perverting them. They claimed that they had the right gospel. They gave a false slant and a false teaching to it, and justified all sorts of immorality. Therefore, Harut and Marut [the Watchers] were hanged on a high hill because the earth would not accept them. They were the first to betray the law of God to men. There was plenty of wickedness and murder, etc., but they were doing it in the name of the gospel and the priesthood. They introduced the temple ordinances but falsified them. There is quite a story about the Watchers here. . . . They were hanged between heaven and earth because the earth wouldn't receive them, just as it wouldn't receive Cain. Remember, the earth refused her strength to **Cain**. And heaven wouldn't receive them. So what can you do? You can just leave them hanging there because neither would

receive them. And they hang there until the Day of Judgment--that's the point. That's very widespread; everybody knows about the story of Harut and Marut suspended between heaven and earth because they were the first corrupters of the human race in the name of preaching religion. (Hugh W. Nibley, <u>Teachings of the Book of Mormon</u>, Semester 2, pp. 219-220)

And speaking of someone who actually chose to hang himself in a tree ("between heaven and earth"), we find the story of Judas Iscariot who betrayed the new "David." (see Matthew 26--27; Mark 14; Luke 22; John 13, 14, 18)

So by taking into account what has just been said, can we understand anything more about the motives of Absalom by comparing his fate to that of Nehor (or Lucifer, or Cain, or Judas, or Corihor, or Korihor, or even Harut and Marut)? Indeed, these become some very provocative questions. And while answers are not always so clear, at least the questions can now be raised!

Returning now to our original question, when we come across the phrase "between the heavens and the earth" in the Book of Mormon, do we quickly claim "plagiarism" and dismiss the book because these words also appear in 2 Samuel 18:9, or do we seek some deeper understanding of the scriptures? This leads me to repeat what I have said in the section on "Quotations" in the Introduction to Volumes 1--3. When Jesus Christ appeared to the people in the New World, he "expounded all the scriptures in one."

1 And now it came to pass that when Jesus had told these things he **expounded** them unto the multitude; and he did **expound all things** unto them, both great and small. (3 Nephi 26:1)

14 And now it came to pass that when Jesus had **expounded all the scriptures in one**, which they had written, he commanded them that they should teach the things which he had expounded unto them. (3 Nephi 23:14)

<u>If</u>   Jesus Christ is the chief author of the Book of Mormon,

<u>and   if</u>   Mormon and Moroni said that they were writing to the people of OUR day and time
                    (Moroni 1:4),

<u>and   if</u>   at the time of the translation of the Book of Mormon, "OUR scripture" was the King
                    James Version of the Bible;

<u>then</u>   would not Jesus (the chief author) also try to "expound all the scriptures in one" by
                    using the King James language throughout the Book of Mormon?

<u>And   if</u>   Jesus truly is the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End (Isaiah 41:4, 44:6,
                    48:12, Revelations 22:13)
<u>And   if</u>   Jesus Christ knows all things, or He can SEE the end from the beginning, (Isaiah 44:7-8,
                    45:21, 48:3,5, John 18:4, Exodus 18:1, 2 Samuel 14:20),

<u>then</u>   chronology becomes irrelevant, and the word "anachronistic" is meaningless.

<u>If</u>   God or Jesus knows ALL things

<u>and</u>   if   Jesus wanted to speak in the scriptural "language" of OUR time,

<u>then</u>   could He not inspire Nephi, Mormon and Moroni to write in such a way, and inspire Joseph Smith to "translate" in such a way that the "language" of the King James Bible could be used in the Book of Mormon to help expound His teachings in ONE (see Ezekiel 37: 15-20)? What better method in the writing and translation of a concise "abridgment" such as the Book of Mormon than to insert key quotations of words and phrases that intentionally connect the "language" of the Book of Mormon with the "scripture" of our day? Some might call this "plagiarism," but when the extremely complex structure and setting of the Book of Mormon text is taken into consideration, I believe it constitutes an opportunity for us to learn more about the scriptures.

We have the choice of either rejecting this opportunity or accepting it. Hopefully we won't proclaim, as Nephi prophesied:

"And because my words shall hiss forth—many of the Gentiles shall say: A Bible! A Bible! We have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible." (2 Nephi 29:3)

As Moroni wrote:

I exhort you to remember these things; for the time speedily cometh that ye shall know that I lie not, for ye shall see me at the bar of God; and the Lord God will say unto you: Did I not declare my words unto you, which were written by this man, like as one crying from the dead, yea, even as one speaking out of the dust? (Moroni 10:27)

LDS authorities and scholars have been aware of the biblical quotations and language in the Book of Mormon from its publication in 1830.

In 1981, John Hilton and Kenneth Jenkins identified tens of thousands of parallel words and phrases common to both the Bible and the Book of Mormon. However, most were random and trivial with regard to content.

In 1986, the Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies published a 3-volume *Book of Mormon Critical Text*. In these volumes, hundreds of biblical phrases and quotations were footnoted. So now I believe that our ongoing intertextual focus should be to increase our understanding of what these parallel phrases teach us.

In 2019, Royal Skousen (with the collaboration of Stanford Carmack) would publish *The History of the Text of the Book of Mormon: Part Five—The King James Quotations in the Book of Mormon.* In this 431-large page-volume, various perspectives regarding biblical quotations found in the Book of

Mormon would be reviewed and analyzed. Questions such as the following are answered:

Question: "Are all the biblical quotations from the King James Bible?"
    Answer: Yes, except for 2 Nephi 12:16; "and upon all the ships of the sea" which comes from the Greek Septuagint rather than the Hebrew Masoretic text.

Question: "What edition of the King James Bible does the Book of Mormon cite from?
    Answer: The best guess would be an edition from the 1670s or later.

Question: "Are there any significant differences in the quotations in the Book of Mormon?
    Answer: "Yes, and some are not only quite surprising but are also supported by ancient textual sources.

Question: What influence do the words in italics in the King James Bible have on the quotations that appear in the Book of Mormon?
    Answer: "Overall, there is little evidenced for the role of italics." [p. 5-6]

Skousen writes:

All of this quoting from the King James Bible is problematic, but only if we assume that the Book of Mormon translation literally represents what was on the plates. . . . What this means is that the Book of Mormon is a creative and cultural translation of what was on the plates, not a literal one . . . Nonetheless, the text was revealed to Joseph Smith by means of his translation instrument, and he read it off word for word to his scribe. To our modern-day skeptical minds, this is indeed "a marvelous work and a wonder." [p. 6]

Taking into consideration all the variations in spelling, archaic meanings, archaic grammar, archaic phrases no longer in use, punctuation, capitalization, italics, etc., Skousen notes on page 15 that Stan Carmack "developed a systematic way to find stretches of identical words between the two texts," from the very longest (with 261 identical words) down to three words.

For the **longer quotes** (261 words down to 25 words), the resulting list filled about **24 pages**.

For the **shorter quotes** (24 words down to 3 words), the resulting list filled about **1,256 pages**.

Ultimately, Carmack was able to identify 36 locations in the Book of Mormon text that had at least one stretch of 16 identical words from the King James Bible if not more. The following is taken from a chart on pages 16-17 of those locations and how many different stretches of 16 identical words or more that were found in those locations.

(Quotations)

B of M Location /	Bible passage quoted	# of 16-word or longer stretches found	Longest stretch
[Volume 1]			
1 Nephi 20—21	Isaiah 48—49	31	108 words
1 Nephi 22:20	Acts 3:22-23	1	23 words
[Volume 2]			
2 Nephi 6:6-7	Isaiah 49:22-23	2	62 words
2 Nephi 6:16—8:25	Isaiah 49:24—52:2	20	97 words
2 Nephi 9:50	Isaiah 55:1	1	16 words
2 Nephi 12—24	Isaiah 2—14	110	236 words
2 Nephi 27:2-3	Isaiah 29:6-8	1	18 words
2 Nephi 27:25-35	Isaiah 29:13-24	8	65 words
2 Nephi 30:9	Isaiah 11:4	1	37 words
2 Nephi 30:11-15	Isaiah 11:5-9	2	77 words
[Volume 3]			
Mosiah 12:21-24	Isaiah 52:7-10	1	112 words
Mosiah 12:34-36	Exodus 20:2-4a	2	27 words
Mosiah 13:12-24	Exodus 20:4-17	4	87 words
Mosiah 14	Isaiah 53	6	129 words
Mosiah 15:29-31	Isaiah 52:8-10	1	73 words
[Volume 4a]			
NONE			
[Volume 4b]			
Alma 42:2	Genesis 3:23-24	1	16 words
Alma 42:3	Genesis 3:22, 24	1	17 words
[Volume 4c]			
NONE			
[Volume 5]			
NONE			
[Volume 6]			
3 Nephi 12—14; 15:1	Matthew 5—7	25	233 words
3 Nephi 15:17	John 10:16	1	30 words
3 Nephi 15:21	John 10:16	1	30 words
3 Nephi 16:15	Matthew 5:13	1	17 words
3 Nephi 16:18-20	Isaiah 52:8-10	1	77 words
3 Nephi 20:16-17	Micah 5:8-9	1	16 words
3 Nephi 20:19	Micah 4:13	1	36 words
3 Nephi 20:23-26	Acts 3:22-26	3	47 words
3 Nephi 20:32-35	Isaiah 52:8-10	1	25 words
3 Nephi 20:36-38	Isaiah 52:1-3	2	36 words
3 Nephi 20:41-45	Isaiah 52:11-15	3	55 words
3 Nephi 21:8	Isaiah 52:15	1	21 words
3 Nephi 21:12-18	Micah 5:8-14	4	44 words
3 Nephi 22	Isaiah 54	6	131 words
3 Nephi 24—25	Malachi 3—4	6	261 words

B of M Location /	Bible passage quoted	# of 16-word or longer stretches found	Longest stretch
[Volume 7]			
Mormon 9:22-24	Mark 16:15-18	1	67 words
Ether 4:18	Mark 16:16	1	17 words
Moroni 7:45	1 Corinthians 13:4-7	1	21 words
Moroni 7:48	1 John 3:2	1	18 words

Skousen goes on to analyze these quotations from a number of different perspectives.

So now I believe that our ongoing intertextual focus should be to increase our understanding of what these parallel phrases teach us.

With this in mind, I think our next perspective is set forth by Steve Moyise in his Introduction to his book, *The Old Testament in the New* (2001). He writes:

[The Apostle] Paul is keen to demonstrate that the gospel he preaches is the same as that preached by the early disciples [see 1 Cor. 15:3-4]. . . In other words, Christianity did not spring out of a vacuum but is in direct continuity with the religion enshrined in what Christians now call the Old Testament. [p. 1]

Moreover, Moyise adds:

The task of the interpreter [is] NOT to discern what the text meant in the past but what it means today. As the author of Hebrews put it: "Long ago God spoke to our ancestors in many and various ways by the prophets, but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son" (Hebrews 1:1). [p. 4]

Thus if Jesus Christ, the Son of God is the source of All scripture, then it falls within His wisdom to decide how that scripture (the text of the Book of Mormon) comes to us in these latter-days.

As a preface to Jan Martin's detailed historical analysis of the early 1500s debate between Sir Thomas More and William Tyndale about the importance of the proper language used in the Bible— Tyndale had just translated the New Testament into English, which was against Church policy and tradition— she lays out a number of reasons (citing their sources) that have been put forth for all of the biblical expressions found in the Book of Mormon:

1   "One theory is that the seventeenth-century language established the validity and theological credibility of the Book of Mormon with its nineteenth-century readers because the teachings found therein evoked a familiar sound."
2   "A second approach argues that by Joseph Smith's day, King James language was perceived as 'scriptural,' making its presence in the Book of Mormon necessary if the book was to be accepted by readers as the word of God."
3   "A third explanation for why the Book of Mormon reads like the King James Version of the Bible (KJV) insists that the translator, Joseph Smith, had been so profoundly influenced by the King James language prior to his translation efforts that it had become integral to his mode of expression."

Martin then explains: "As interesting as these arguments may be to some . . . they still reduce the seventeenth-century language to a mode of expression that has little value to the modern reader." Martin then focuses on what the Book of Mormon itself claims for its composition:

> The Book of Mormon indeed asserts a substantial reason for its seventeenth-century prose. In 1 Nephi 13, the principal character and storyteller, Nephi, the son of Lehi, learns that the Book of Mormon will serve two important theological functions. First, it will establish truths already contained in the Bible, and, second, it will restore truths taken or lost from it (1 Nephi 13:39-40)

Martin then relates the relevance of her analysis of the historical debate: "One of the reasons [Thomas] More initiated the debate with [William] Tyndale was because he understood that

> **Theology cannot be separated from the language used to express it.**
> **Some words carry significant implications for authority, doctrine, and practice**."

Ironically, it would be the King James Bible, built upon the translation by Tyndale (who gave his life for the cause), and the subsequent Book of Mormon, built on the language of the King James Bible, that would carry the weight of these statements.

Jan Martin concludes with the following:

> The seventeenth-century language in the Book of Mormon should not be perceived solely as a means of smoothing the way for the volume's acceptance in the nineteenth century, nor should it be viewed as an unnecessary or irritating relic that has long lost its usefulness. Rather, from the Book of Mormon's own perspective, the seventeenth-century language is an indispensable tool that allows the Book of Mormon to clarify and establish the truths in the King James Bible. (Jan J. Martin, "The Theological Value of the King James Language in the Book of Mormon," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies*, vol. 27 (2018): 88-124.

To the above I might add the statement of J. Reuben Clark, Jr., a counselor to President Heber J. Grant, President George Albert Smith, and President David O. McKay in the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. In the first chapter of his over 470-page book of documented reasoning ("Notes") as to "Why The King James Version," he gives the following warning:

> The effect of the position of the Extreme Textualists as set forth in their Revisions of the Bible, is to weaken if not destroy the Messiahship of Jesus. Incidents recorded in the King James Version have been omitted from the Revised Version; substantial parts of whole chapters—e.g., the last verses of Mark have been omitted; doctrines and teachings have been changed; doubts have been cast on fundamental expressions declaring the divinity and personality of Jesus the Christ; faith-destroying questions have been raised by marginal notes and by the text itself; the personality of Jesus in its Christian concept has, in effect, been challenged.

> That Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God; that he made the atonement for the Fall of Adam; that he was the First Fruits of the Resurrection and that his resurrection was a reality; that he was in fact the Savior of mankind, are all basic to the Restored Gospel. The Latter-day

Saints cannot in any way sanction even the slightest derogation of these principles. The Prophet has put his stamp of approval upon all this as contained in the New Testament of the King James translation.

These *Notes* are designed to show that the King James Version is the best record to these ends that has yet been revealed through the Bible. (J. Reuben Clark, *Why the King James Version*, SLC: Deseret Book Company, 1956.)

I would echo J. Reuben Clark's warning about content and also about the phrasing of King James English compared to all of the translations that have come forth since he published his writings. For me, and while not diminishing the importance of content, the phrasing of the King James Version is extremely important for the Book of Mormon student who is trying to connect the language of the teachings of the Bible and the Book of Mormon, which is also written in the style of King James English.

Multiple websites on the Internet provide information on the various modern translations of the Bible. Very briefly, the most common English translations that have been published are the following (derivation is implied by color coding and alignment):

King James Version KJV (1611)
King James Version KJV (1769)
                 English Revised Version ERV (1881-85)
                 American Standard Version   ASV (1901)
                          Revised Standard Version   RSV (1946-52)
                 New American Standard Bible   NASB (1963-71)
                          Living Bible   LB (1967-71)
                       New English Bible   NEB (1970)
                       New International Version NIV (1973-78)
New King James Version NKJV (1979-82)
                          New Living Translation   NLT (1996)
                        English Standard Version   ESV (2001)

In a recent article by Daniel O. McClellan, a scripture translation supervisor for the LDS Church and a doctoral candidate in theology, regarding the affinity of the Church for the King James Version, he writes: "its role in framing the Restoration wove it deeply into the very fabric of Latter-day Saint ideology, which granted it de facto priority of place."

McClellan acknowledges that "the clearest turning point toward articulation of a formal preference for the KJV came with President J. Reuben Clark's 1956 book, *Why the King James Version?* " However, he adds: "the contemporary Church's position is best represented by the First Presidency's 1992 statement . . . which suggests that the KJV's integration into the linguistic and doctrinal foundations of the Restoration is the primary consideration:

"The Lord has revealed clearly the doctrines of the gospel in these latter-days. The most reliable way to measure the accuracy of any biblical passage is not by comparing different texts, but by comparison with the Book of Mormon and modern-day revelations. While other Bible versions

may be easier to read than the King James Version, in doctrinal matters latter-day revelation supports the King James Version in preference to other English translations." (Ezra Taft Benson, Gordon B. Hinckley, and Thomas S. Monson, "First Presidency Statement on the King James Version of the Bible," *Ensign*, August 1992, p. 80.)

Thus McClellan writes: "the KJV is really under no serious threat of displacement," yet he acknowledges that worldwide membership and multiple language translations do raise challenges to the application of this policy.

(Source: Daniel O. McClellan, "'As Far as IT Is Translated Correctly': Bible Translation and the Church," Religious Educator: Perspectives on the Restored Gospel vol. 20 no. 2 (2019): 53-84. Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, BYU, 2019.)

Some final thoughts about the content of KJV Bible are worthy of consideration, as they reflect on the Book of Mormon. At the conclusion of *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods & Results*, 2006, the author Paul D. Wegner writes on pages 298-299:

> If we believe that the Bible is authoritative and provides guidance for our lives, then we need to be sure of what the text says. Textual criticism is therefore crucial. . . . Textual criticism provides the evidence necessary to compare the many and comparatively recently discovered fragments and manuscripts to determine the most reliable reading of a text.

But Wegner then qualifies the above statement:

> It is important to keep in perspective the fact that only a very small part of the text is in question—approximately 10 percent of the Old Testament and 7 percent of the New Testament. Of these, most variants make little difference to the meaning of any passage. . . . This does not diminish the importance of textual criticism, for there are some variants that do change the meaning significantly.

On page 300, Wegner writes concerning "The State of Affairs Today":

> Since the nineteenth century when the historical-critical method came into full bloom the accuracy of the Bible has come under constant attack. Manuscripts or fragments . . . can help answer questions regarding the accuracy of the Bible so that we can have a renewed confidence that the biblical text we have today is indeed accurate. But textual criticism cannot answer such questions as, Did the events of the Bible actually take place? Did Moses lead Israel out of Egypt and write the Pentateuch? . . . There is no better way to end this look at textual criticism than as we began, with the quote from Sir Frederic G. Kenyon:
>
> > It is reassuring at the end to find that the general result of all these discoveries and all this study is to strengthen the proof of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and our conviction that we have in our hands, in substantial integrity, the veritable Word of God (Frederic G. Kenyon, *The Story of the Bible*, 1967, p. 113.)

(3) **A Brief and Partial List of Biblical Phrases in Alma chapters 1—16**

In order to give the reader some idea of the intertextual correspondences between the Bible and the Book of Mormon, I have prepared the following list of quoted verses. Most of the references have been taken from the 1986 *Book of Mormon Critical Text*. Because of the length of the list, I have chosen only those coming from Alma chapter 1.

Alma chapter 1
Alma 1:1   "having gone the way of all the earth"
                Compare Joshua 23:14 "going the way of all the earth"
                Compare 1 Kings 2:2
Alma 1:1   "having warred a good warfare"
                Compare 1 Timothy 1:18 "war a good warfare"
                Compare 2 Timothy 4:7 "have fought a good fight
                Compare 1 Timothy 6:12
Alma 1:3   "they aught not to labor with their own hands"
                Compare 1 Corinthians 4:12 "And labour, working with our own hands"
Alma 1:4   "they need not fear nor tremble"
                Compare Deuteronomy 20:3 "fear not, and do not tremble"
                Compare Psalm 55:5
                Compare Jeremiah 33:9
                Compare Dan 5:19
                Compare Dan 6:26
                Compare Mark 5:33
                Compare 1 Corinthians 2:3
                Compare 2 Corinthians 7:15
                Compare Ephesians 6:5
                Compare Phillippians 2:12
Alma 1:6   "he began to be lifted up in the pride of his heart"
                Compare 2 Chronicles 32:25-26 "for his heart was lifted up . . . for the pride of his heart"
Alma 1:8   "Now the name of the man was"
                Compare 1 Samuel 25:3 "Now the name of the man was"
Alma 1:9   "drew his sword and began to smite him"
                Compare Matthew 26:51 "and drew his sword, and struck . . . and smote off"
Alma 1:9   "being stricken with many years"
                Compare Joshua 13:1
                Compare 1 Kings 1:1 "old and stricken in years"
                Compare Genesis 18:11
                Compare Genesis 24:1
                Compare Joshua 23:1-2
                Compare Luke 1:17, 18
Alma 1:13   "thou hast shed the blood of a righteous man"
                Compare 1 Samuel 25:31 "thou hast shed blood"
Alma 1:13 "his blood would come upon us for vengeance"
                Compare Ezra 9:13 "is come upon us for our evil deeds"
                Compare Ezekiel 3:18-20
                Compare Ezekiel 33:4-6
                Compare Matthew 23:35

Alma 1:15   "between the heavens and the earth"
          Compare 2 Samuel 18:9 "between the heaven and the earth" (Absalom hung on tree)
Alma 1:20   "they were not proud in their eyes"
          Compare Isaiah 5:21
          Compare Nehemiah 6:16
          Compare Proverbs 30:12 "that are pure in their own eyes"
Alma 1:20 "without money and without price"
          Compare Isaiah 55:1 "without money and without price"
          Compare Revelation 21:6
          Compare Revelation 22:17
Alma 1:23 "in the second year of the reign of"
          Compare Daniel 2:1 "And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar"
Alma 1:24   "their names were blotted out and they were remembered no more"
          Compare Psalm 109:13,15 "let their name be blotted out . . . cut off the memory of them"
          Compare Exodus 32:32-33
          Compare Deuteronomy 9:14
          Compare Deuteronomy 29:20
          Compare 2 Kings 14:27
          Compare Psalm 69:28
Alma 1:25 "those that did stand fast in the faith"
          Compare 1 Corinthians 16:13 "stand fast in the faith"
Alma 1:25 "they were stedfast and immoveable"
          Compare 1 Corinthians 15;58 "stedfast, unmoveable"
Alma 1:26 "the people also left their labours to hear the word of God"
          Compare Luke 5:1
          Compare Acts 13:7,44 "to hear the word of God"
Alma 1:29 "having abundance of all things"
          Compare Deuteronomy 28:47 "abundance of all things"
Alma 1:29 "abundance of grain and of gold and of silver and of precious things"
          Compare Daniel 11:43 "treasures of gold and of silver, and . . . all the precious things"
          Compare 2 Chronicles 21:3
          Compare Ezra 1:11
          Compare Daniel 5:4
          Compare Daniel 11:8
          Compare 2 Timothy 2:20
          Compare Revelation 18:12
Alma 1:29 "silk and fine twined linen"
          Compare Exodus 26:31,36
          Compare Exodus 27:16
          Compare Exodus 28:6,8
          Compare Exodus 36:35,37
          Compare Exodus 38:18
          Compare Exodus 39:2,5,8 "and fine twined linen"
Alma 1:30 "that was hungry or that was athirst"
          Compare 1 Corinthians 4:11 "hunger, and thirst, and are naked"
          Compare Tobit 4:16
          Compare Ecclesiastes 7:32,35
          Compare Matthew 25:35-40
          Compare James 2:15-16

Alma 1:30 "set their hearts upon riches"
         Compare Hosea 4:8 "and they set their heart on"
         Compare 2 Chronicles 11:16 "set their hearts to"
Alma 1:30 "both bond and free, both male and female""
         Compare Galatians 3:28 "there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor
                                female"
Alma 1:30 "having no respects to persons"
         Compare proverbs 24:23 "it is not good to have respect of persons in judgment"
         Compare 1 Peter 1:17 "without respect of persons"
         Compare Deuteronomy 1:17
         Compare Deuteronomy 16:19
         Compare Proverbs 28:21
         Compare Matthew 22:16
Alma 1:32 "bablings" (P, 1830 →1879)
         Compare 16ll KJV: 1 Timothy 6:20
         Compare 16ll KJV: 2 Timothy 2:16
    "babblings" (1911, 1920, 1981)
         Compare modern KJV 1 Timothy 6:20
         Compare modern KJV 2 Timothy 2:16'
         Compare modern KJV Proverbs 23:29
Alma 1:32 "envyings and strife"
         Compare 2 Corinthians 12:20 "envyings . . . strifes"
         Compare 1 Timothy 6:4 "envy, strife"
         Compare 1 Corinthians 3:3
         Compare James 3:14,16
Alma 1:32 "whoredoms and murdering"
         Compare Revelation 22:15 "whoremongers, and murderers"
         Compare Revelation 21:8 "and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and
                            idolaters, and all liars"

        (Sources: Bullinger, 1898, p. 778-779, *Book of Mormon Critical Text*, 3 vols. Provo: FARMS, 1986. Personal
        search, also the footnotes in the LDS Book of Mormon which refer to both the Old, Testament, New
        Testament, Doctrine & Covenants, Pearl of Great Price, as well as the words of other Book of Mormon
        prophets.)

Note* For a chronological list of pertinent articles on quotations in the Book of Mormon, see my
"Sources" Volume: Part C.

Some Notes on Psalms in the Book of Mormon

        Anciently, the Psalms were the text of Israelite temple services.   A team of scholars at Book of
Mormon Central write:

The idea that the Nephite authors of the Book of Mormon may have had access to and utilized the Psalms in their writings has become a topic of interest among LDS scholars in recent years. . . . Here at Book of Mormon Central we have done what is likely the most extensive study of the use of the Psalms in the Book of Mormon. We first used a computer program to find matches between phrases in the book of Psalms and the Book of Mormon. Then, we carefully looked at each match, and used an established method to determine which phrase was actually a Psalms quotation, and which was just a coincidence. The results of this research show that there are at least sixty good examples of the use of phrases from the Psalms in the Book of Mormon . . . :

"delivered my soul from … hell" — Alma 5:6; Psalm 86:13
"mercy … long-suffering" — Alma 5:6; Psalm 86:15
"chains/sorrows of hell" — Alma 5:7, 9, 10; Psalm 18:5
"break" … "bands" … "death" — Alma 5:7; Psalm 107:14 (also Psalm 18:4-5; Psalm 116:3)
"clean hands and a pure heart" — Alma 5:19; Psalm 24:4
"in the paths of righteousness" — Alma 7:19; Psalm 23:3
"wrath … enter into … rest" — Alma 12:35, 37; Psalm 95:8, 11
"today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart" — Alma 12:36; Psalm 95:7–8
"after the order of Melchizedek/his son" — Alma 13:1, 2, 9; Psalm 110:4
"enter into my rest" — Alma 13:6; Psalm 95:11
"pains of hell" — Alma 14:6; Psalm 18:4-5; Psalm 116:3

Source: Book of Mormon Central, "Why Are Certain Biblical Psalms Used by Book of Mormon Authors?," KnoWhy #439 (June 7, 2018).

According to research done by John Hilton III (see"Old Testament Psalms in the Book of Mormon," in *Ascending the Mountain of the Lord: Temple Praise, and Worship in the Old Testament* (2013 Sperry Symposium), 2013, p. 291-311):

Scholars disagree on which psalms are preexilic and which are postexilic. In the Jewish Study Bible, we find this statement: "Dating the psalms is notoriously difficult, partly because they contain few explicit references to specific historical events or personages . . . While many modern scholars believe that at least some, perhaps even many of the psalms are from the preexilic period (before 586 BCE), none can be dated on linguistic grounds to the tenth century BCE, the period of David. There is little consensus on the dating of pre-exilic psalms, or even on which psalms are pre-exilic." (Michael Fishbane, Adele Berlin, and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., Jewish Study Bible (New York: Oxford University, 2004), 1282). . . .

One interesting facet of allusions to Psalms is the fact that many psalms are NOT alluded to in the Book of Mormon. There may be a variety of reasons for this fact, including the idea that some psalms may have been considered to be less important by Nephite prophets. A similar phenomenon occurs in the New Testament.

Some Notes on Isaiah in the Book of Mormon

       Of special notice, large sections of the book of Isaiah have seemingly been quoted directly from the King James Bible in the Book of Mormon. Much has been written about these verses of Isaiah (see my Sources: Part C), but I will try to convey what I feel are some pertinent thoughts on the matter. In her 191-page 2001 Master's Thesis, Carol Ellertson writes the following:

       Book of Mormon Isaiah was removed from the biblical textual evolutionary process that was taking place in Palestine ca. 600 B.C. Where does it fit into this process as put forth by scholars? . . . This thesis evaluates the textual variants between Book of Mormon Isaiah and Isaiah in the Septuagint, the Masoretic Text, and Qumran's Isaiah scrolls. Of the 433 verses of Isaiah in the Book of Mormon, 216 (50%) contain 370 variants. 119 of these are related to italicized words in the King James Version. 76 variants appear to agree with the Septuagint, 28 agree with Isaiah at Qumran, 52 are supported by the Masoretic text, and 150 variants are non-aligned. . . . This fits the criteria of an "independent" or "non-aligned text." [p. vi]

On page 51 she writes on John Tvedtnes' 1981 findings:

John Tvedtnes has done a thorough analysis of the Isaiah variants in the Book of Mormon. His comparisons are done with Isaiah scrolls "a" and "b" from cave one [Qumran], The Septuagint, The Masoretic Text, the Latin Vulgate, Targumim (Aramaic translations), Peshitta (a Syriac translation), and the Book of Mormon. His conclusions are as follows:

1   There is sufficient evidence to conclude that the Isaiah text cited in the Book of Mormon was ancient and exhibited characteristics of the Hebrew language which were sometimes lost in subsequent hand-copied versions which ultimately became our King James translation.

2   The evidence for the authenticity of antiquity of the Book of Mormon version of Isaiah – particularly when supported by internal textual evidence . . . should be seen as evidence also for the authenticity of the Book of Mormon itself. (John Tvedtnes, *The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon*, reprint, study aid from FARMS, Provo: 1981.)

My research will be similar to John Tvedtnes', except I will present each variant in tables with Hebrew and Greek equivalents from M, LXX and Q. . . . Tvedtnes overlooked 26 variants presented in my analysis.

On page 42 Ellertson reviews Royal Skousen's 1998 research findings:

Royal Skousen also analyzes Isaiah in the Book of Mormon as compared to the King James Version. He reports eight findings:
    First Finding: The base text for the Isaiah quotations in the Book of Mormon is indeed the King James Version of the Bible.
    Second Finding: The original manuscript for the biblical quotes show that the text was dictated by Joseph Smith; no physical copy was given to Oliver Cowdery to copy from.

Third Finding: The original Book of Mormon chapter divisions of Isaiah quotations follow a larger thematic grouping, not the interruptive chapter system found in the King James Bible.

Fourth Finding: The original Book of Mormon text is closer to the King James Version.

Fifth Finding: The majority of the differences between the Book of Mormon text and the Isaiah text are not associated with italicized words in the King James Version.

Sixth Finding: Corrections in the original manuscript give very little evidence for the hypothesis that Joseph Smith altered the text while he supposedly read it off from a King James Bible.

Seventh Finding: The few Isaiah passages that have been quoted more than once in the Book of Mormon may provide evidence for helping to restore the original reading.

Eighth Finding: Joseph Smith's "New Translation" of the Bible used the 1830 edition of the Book of Mormon as a source for changing some of the corresponding biblical text in Isaiah. (Royal Skousen, "Textual Variants in the Isaiah Quotations in the Book of Mormon," in *Isaiah in the Book of Mormon*. Provo: FARMS, 1998, p. 369-390.)

Skousen is at somewhat of a disadvantage because he does not read Hebrew and therefore cannot determine to what degree the Hebrew behind the King James version is altered in each variant.

Ellertson concludes her written analysis (before her 91 pages of charting) with the following on pages 85-86:

No original texts [of Isaiah] do or can exist. . . . Considered an acceptable practice, all texts changed significantly within one or two generations. . . . [Eminent biblical scholar Emanuel] Tov's theories of textual transmission, his theories of text types, his theories on textual variance are all borne out in Book of Mormon Isaiah.

In addition to the charting and analysis of each textual variant, and significant to the structure of the text, on page 178 Ellertson presents the "Book of Mormon Variants That Restore Poetic Parallel Patterns in Isaiah." She lists the following:

Isaiah 2:5 (2 Ne. 12:25)	Isaiah 5:28 (2 Ne. 15:28)	Isaiah 48:14 (1 Ne. 20:14)
Isaiah 2:6 (2 Ne. 12:6)	Isaiah 7:15 (2 Ne. 17:15)	Isaiah 48:15 (1 Ne. 20:15)
Isaiah 2:9 (2 Ne. 12:9)	Isaiah 7:18 (2 Ne. 17:18)	Isaiah 48:16 (1 Ne. 20:16)
Isaiah 2:12 (2 Ne. 12:12)	Isaiah 9:18 (2 Ne. 19:18)	Isaiah 48:17 (1 Ne. 20:17)
Isaiah 2:13 (2 Ne. 12:13)	Isaiah 13:14 (2 Ne. 23:14)	Isaiah 49:1 (1 Ne. 21:1)
Isaiah 2:14 (2 Ne. 12:14)	Isaiah 29:6 (2 Ne. 27:2)	Isaiah 50:1 (2 Ne. 7:1)
Isaiah 3:1 (2 Ne. 13:1)	Isaiah 48:1 (1 Ne. 20:1)	Isaiah 50:9 (2 Ne. 7:9)
Isaiah 3:18 (2 Ne. 13:18)	Isaiah 48:2 (1 Ne. 20:2)	Isaiah 54:15 (3 Ne. 22:15)
Isaiah 5:5 (2 Ne. 15:5)	Isaiah 48:5 (1 Ne. 20:5)	
Isaiah 5:9 (2 Ne. 15:9)	Isaiah 48:11 (1 Ne. 20:11)	