



Type: Report

---

## The Isaiah Variants in the Book of Mormon

Author(s): John A. Tvedtnes

Published: Provo, UT; Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies,  
1981

---

**Abstract:** No abstract available.



Foundation for Ancient Research & Mormon Studies

TVE-81

John A. Tvedtnes  
**The Isaiah Variants in  
the Book of Mormon**

STUDY AID

BX  
8622.06  
.T899j  
1981

P.O. Box 7113 • University Station • Provo, UT 84602 • (801) 373-5111 or 1-800-327-6715

© 1981 Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies

**Fair Use Copying Notice:** These pages may be reproduced and used, without alteration, addition, or deletion, for any nonpecuniary or nonpublishing purpose without permission.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

John A. Tvedtnes was born in Mandan, ND and moved to Utah with his parents and brother as a child. He converted to the LDS Church just before his ninth birthday. His interest in the scriptures had already been sparked during that same year when he first read the Bible. Following service as a stake and full-time missionary, he married Regine J. Chabanis of St. Etienne, France. They are the parents of six children.

To date, John has four degrees from the Univ. of Utah and is completing his doctorate through the Hebrew Univ. in Jerusalem. All of the degrees center around the ancient Near East and much of his academic work (including an MA) deals with the Hebrew language.

John taught Hebrew at the Univ. of Utah, 1968-71; during which time the university published one of his books, *A Manual of Hebrew Phonology*. He has authored two other books, one of which, *The Church of the Old Testament*, has become popular in LDS circles in its second edition.

A noted lecturer and author of dozens of articles, John lived with his wife and children in Jerusalem for 8½ years before returning to the USA in December 1979. While in Israel, he taught for the Brigham Young Univ. and also served for six years in the presidency of the Jerusalem Branch.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. ISAIAH QUOTES IN THE BOOK OF MORMON	6
3. THE VARIANTS	20
4. CLASSIFYING THE VARIANTS	96
5. THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH QUESTION	129
6. CONCLUSIONS	136



## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

Latter-day Saints have long noted that, in the Isaiah passages quoted in the Book of Mormon, there are some variations from the text of the King James Bible. Nevertheless, the general tenor of these passages is the KJV language. This has given rise to speculation as to why, if there are to be variations at all, the language should be so much like that already available in a translation which is (and was already in 1830) an archaic dialect of English.

The explanation most often given - and which appear to be the most likely - is that the prophet Joseph Smith, while translating the plates, decided to put the Biblical passages into the King James language because it was the Bible most commonly used by his contemporaries. Where there were real differences in the Nephite quotes, however, he made changes. Critics have accused him of plagiarizing the Bible. But it is probable that he would have been equally criticized had his translation not borne a resemblance to the King James Bible.

Few scholars have attempted to study the Book of Mormon Isaiah variants. The most notable among those who have worked on the question are Professors Sidney B. Sperry (deceased) and Hugh Nibley (retired), both of the Brigham Young University. It is this lack which, in part, prompted me to prepare the material contained in this volume. Another factor was the need to decide how the Isaiah passages of the Book of Mormon should be rendered when translated into Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Obviously, they should read somewhat like the traditional Hebrew text. But some changes would have to be made, based upon the variants. It was, therefore, necessary to determine the exact nature of the variants themselves, in an intensive and exhaustive study.

As each of the variants was studied, it became clear that, in some instances, the Book of Mormon text could be said to be more "authentic" than that of the standard Massoretic Hebrew text from which the KJV derives. The opposite was true in other cases. And there were many examples wherein the validity of neither the Book of Mormon (Brass Plates original) or the Massoretic text (MT) could be demonstrated.

One should not think that, because some of the evidence does not favor the Book of Mormon, that it is evidence that the book is fraudulent. Indeed, there are many variants in the Isaiah texts as found in different ancient versions used for comparison in this study. One is not justified in deciding which of many variants is "correct" or "original" in many cases. Only the author himself could tell us that, in the absence of revelation from God on the matter.

The Book of Mormon authors themselves admit that there may be errors in the text. They had no monopoly on perfection, and indeed did not believe in perfection on the human level. We cannot know how true to the original text of Isaiah the Brass Plates (BP) which Lehi possessed were. They may have contained errors. Or the Nephite scribes may have copied some of them in error. Thus, errors in the Isaiah passages of the Book of Mormon, though unfavorable to the authenticity of the Isaiah quotes, are not evidence against the book itself. A summary of variants - favoring, disfavoring and neutral as regards the Book of Mormon (BM) text - will be presented at the conclusion of this work.

In preparing this research, I was struck, too, by the number of scribal and printer's errors contained in the Book of Mormon. Many of these were corrected after the first (1830) edition. A number, however, remain. It is to be hoped that, with the evidence presented herein, some of these errors might be corrected in subsequent editions of that sacred volume.

The first task in the undertaking of this project was to identify all of the Isaiah passages in the Book of Mormon. Since these are not all marked in the footnotes, it was necessary to read and reread the volume several times, having previously attempted to become acquainted with the KJV Isaiah. While infallibility cannot be claimed, it is nevertheless likely that we have been able to identify all of the Isaiah quotes in the Book of Mormon. The occurrences of these quotes can be outlined as follows:

1. The first Isaiah quote in the BM text is to be found in a discourse by the prophet Lehi; it is a paraphrase:

Isa. 40:3 (1 Ne. 10:8)

2. Two other paraphrases are contained in Nephi's great prophecy:

Isa. 52:7 (1 Ne. 13:37)

Isa. 29:14 (1 Ne. 14:7)

3. During Nephi's debate with his brethren over the construction of the ship, he cites another Isaiah passage, again in paraphrase:

Isa. 45:18 (1 Ne. 17:36)

4. After their arrival in the promised land, Nephi read from Isaiah (1 Ne. 19:22-24) the following passages:

Isa. 48-49 (1 Ne. 20-21)

5. When Nephi's brethren asked for an explanation of these passages (1 Ne. 22:1), he obliged. His explanation includes the following paraphrases of Isaiah:

Isa. 49:22 (1 Ne. 22:6)

Isa. 49:22-23 + 29:14 (1 Ne. 22:8)

Isa. 52:10 (1 Ne. 22:10-11)

In 1 Ne. 22:15, we see an idea also found in Isa. 47:14, though it is worded more like Mal. 4:1 (cf. also vs. 24 with Mal. 4:2).

Malachi, of course, did not write his book until two centuries after Lehi's time (this being why Jesus had to supply part of that book to the Nephites in 3 Ne. 24). Probably Malachi and Isaiah quote a common source now lost to us (cf. 2 Ne. 26:4-6)



6. In a lengthy discourse, Jacob reads (2 Ne. 6:4-6a) from the following Isaiah passages:

Isa. 49:22-23	(2 Ne. 6:6b-7)
Isa. 29:6 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 6:15)
Isa. 49:24-52:2 (much paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 6:16-8:25)
Isa. 55:1-2 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 9:50-51)

7. After recording Jacob's speech, Nephi decided to copy extensive excerpts from Isaiah (2 Ne. 11:1-2, 8), as follows:

Isa. 2-14	(2 Ne. 12-24)
-----------	---------------

8. Having recorded *in extenso* these passages from Isaiah, Nephi desired to explain them by his own prophetic words (2 Ne. 25:1-2, 5-7). His explanation incorporates the following Isaiah passages:

Isa. 11:11 + 29:14 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 25:17)
Isa. 29:3-5 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 26:15-16, 18; the idea in vs. 17 is from Isa. 29:11)
Isa. 55:1 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 26:25)
Isa. 29:6-10 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 27:2-5)
Isa. 29:4 + 11 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 27:6-9ff)
Isa. 29:11-12 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 27:15-19)
Isa. 29:13-24 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 27:25-35)
Isa. 29:13b + 15 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 28:9)
Isa. 29:13b (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 28:14b)
Isa. 29:21 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 28:16a)
Isa. 28:10 or 13 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 28:30a)
Isa. 9:12-13 (paraphrase; see also 5:25; 9:17, 21; 10:4; cf. 14:26-27; 23:11)	(2 Ne. 28:32)
Isa. 29:14 + 11:11 (paraphrase)	(2 Ne. 29:1; cf. 2 Ne. 25:11)
Isa. 11:4-9	(2 Ne. 30:9, 12-15)

9. The prophet Abinadi, in his defense before king Noah and his priests, cites Isaiah chapters 52-53 without attributing everything to Isaiah:
- |                         |                                       |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Isa. 52:7-10            | (Mos. 12:21-24)                       |
| Isa. 53 (all)           | (Mos. 14:1b-12; attributed in vs. 1a) |
| Isa. 53:10 (paraphrase) | (Mos. 15:10)                          |
| Isa. 52:7 (paraphrase)  | (Mos. 15:14-18)                       |
| Isa. 52:8-10            | (Mos. 15:29-31)                       |
10. Jesus, when he visited the descendants of Lehi after his resurrection, cited parts of Isaiah 52 and 54. On his first visit, he quoted:
- |              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Isa. 52:8-10 | (3 Ne. 16:18-20) |
|--------------|------------------|
- This he attributed to Isaiah (3 Ne. 16:17). Upon his return, he paraphrased these same verses, referring to them as "that which is written" (3 Ne. 20:36a). During that discourse, the following scriptures were paraphrased:
- |                         |                   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Isa. 52:8-10            | (3 Ne. 20:32-35)  |
| Isa. 52:1-3, 6-7, 11-15 | (3 Ne. 20:36b-46) |
| Isa. 52:15b             | (3 Ne. 21:8b)     |
- After quoting from Isaiah's contemporary, Micah 5:8-15 (3 Ne. 21:12-18, 21; cf. Isa. 5:29), he returned to paraphrase:
- |            |               |
|------------|---------------|
| Isa. 52:12 | (3 Ne. 21:29) |
|------------|---------------|
- This last vs. is then immediately followed by his introduction to the entire 54th chapter of Isaiah ("And then shall that which is written come to pass");
- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| Isa. 54 (all) | (3 Ne. 22:1b-17) |
|---------------|------------------|
11. Moroni, following Jesus' example, paraphrased from Isa. 52 and 54:
- |                  |               |
|------------------|---------------|
| Isa. 52:1 + 54:2 | (Moro. 10:31) |
|------------------|---------------|

Some of the implications of the distribution of these quotes will be discussed in an appendix.

#### FOOTNOTES:

1. One of the assignments given to me on the Book of Mormon Hebrew translation project was to work with the Biblical quotes in the Book of Mormon.

Chapter 2  
ISAIAH QUOTES IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

Not all of the Isaiah quotes in BM are at variance with those in KJV. Indeed, over 40% of the verses are identical with KJV. By my count, of the 478 times that Isaiah verses are cited in BM, 201 read as in KJV, while 207 are variants, 58 are paraphrases, and another 11 must be listed as variants and/or paraphrases.

In order to facility matching of KJV Isaiah verses to those cited in BM (and to compare different BM quotes of the same verses), the following listing will prove useful. It shows the Isaiah passages by KJV chapter and verse and then indicates where each is found in BM. A BM verse followed by \* designates a verse which varies from the KJV wording; if followed by #, it is a paraphrase; the symbol #\* indicates "paraphrase and/or variant," and usually marks verses where the nature of the difference cannot be adequately determined by methods used in this study.

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:1	2 Ne. 12:1
2	2*
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6*
7	7
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11*
12	12*
13	13*
14	14*
15	15

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:16	2 Ne. 12:16*
17	17
18	18
19	19*
20	20*
21	21*
22	22
3:1	2 Ne. 13:1*
2	2
3	3*
4	4
5	5
6	6*
7	7*
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11*
12	12*
13	13
14	14*
15	15*
16	16
17	17
18	18*
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
23	23*
24	24*
25	25
26	26*

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
4:1	2 Ne. 14:1
2	2*
3	3*
4	4
5	5
6	6
5:1	1 Ne. 15:1*
2	2
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6
7	7*
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11*
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19*
20	20
21	21*
22	22*
23	23*
24	24*
25	25
26	26
27	27
28	28a*
29	28b-29*
30	30*

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
6:1	2 Ne. 16:1
2	2*
3	3
4	4
5	5*
6	6*
7	7
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11
12	12*
13	13*
7:1	2 Ne. 17:1*
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6*
7	7
8	8*
9	9
10	10
11	11*
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17*
18	18
19	19
20	20*
21	21*
22	22*
23	23*

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
7:24	2 Ne. 17:24
25	25*
8:1	2 Ne. 18:1*
2	2
3	3
4	4*
5	5
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9
10	10*
11	11
12	12*
13	13
14	14
15	15
16	16
17	17
18	18
19	19*
20	20*
21	21
22	22*

KJV incorporates MT 8:23 into Chap. 9 as 9:1

and hence gives 21 vss. instead of MT 22 for Chap. 8.

9:1	2 Ne. 19:1*
2	2
3	3*
4	4*
5	5*
6	6*
7	7*
8	8
9	9*
10	10



9:11	2 Ne. 19:11
12	12*
	2 Ne. 28:32a#
13	2 Ne. 19:13
	2 Ne. 28:32a#
14	2 Ne. 19:14*
15	15*
16	16
17	17*
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21*
10:1	2 Ne. 20:1
2	2
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6*
7	7*
8	8
9	9
10	10*
11	11
12	12
13	13*
14	14
15	15*
16	16
17	17*
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21*
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
10:27	2 Ne. 20:27
28	28
29	29*
30	30*
31	31
32	32
33	33
34	34
11:1	2 Ne. 21:1
2	2
3	3
4	4
	2 Ne. 30:9#
5	2 Ne. 21:5
	30:11
6	2 Ne. 21:6*
	30:12*
7	2 Ne. 21:7
	30:13
8	2 Ne. 21:8*
	30:14*
9	2 Ne. 21:9
	30:15
10	2 Ne. 21:10
11	2 Ne. 21:11
	25:17#
	29:1#
12	2 Ne. 21:12
13	13*
14	14
15	15
16	16*
12:1	2 Ne. 22:1
2	2*
3	3
4	4
5	5
6	6

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
13:1	2 Ne. 23:1
2	2
3	3*
4	4*
5	5*
6	6
7	7
8	8*
9	9
10	10
11	11*
12	12
13	13
14	14*
15	15*
16	16
17	17*
18	18*
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22*
14:1	2 Ne. 24:1
2	2*
3	3*
4	4*
5	5*
6	6
7	7
8	8*
9	9
10	10
11	11*
12	12*
13	13*

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
14:14	2 Ne. 24:14
15	15
16	16*
17	17*
18	18*
19	19*
20	20
21	21*
22	22
23	23
24	24
25	25
26	26
27	27*
28	28
29	29
30	30
31	31
32	32*
28:10 or 13	2 Ne. 28:30a#
29:3	2 Ne. 26:15b#
4	2 Ne. 26:15c-16# 27:6-9ff#
5	2 Ne. 26:18#
6	2 Ne. 6:15# 27:2#
7	2 Ne. 27:3a#
8	2 Ne. 27:3b#
9	2 Ne. 27:4#
10	2 Ne. 27:5#
11	2 Ne. 27:6-9ff# 15b-18#
12	2 Ne. 27:19#
13	2 Ne. 27:25# 28:9# 28:14b#

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
29:14	1 Ne. 14:7# 22:8#
	2 Ne. 25:17# 27:26# 29:1#
15	2 Ne. 27:27a# 28:9#
16	2 Ne. 27:27b#
17	2 Ne. 27:28#
18	2 Ne. 27:29
19	2 Ne. 27:30#
20	2 Ne. 27:31#
21	2 Ne. 27:32# 28:16a#
22	2 Ne. 27:33
23	2 Ne. 27:34
24	2 Ne. 27:35
40:3	2 Ne. 10:8#
45:18	1 Ne. 17:36#
48:1	1 Ne. 20:1*
2	2*
3	3*
4	4*
5	5*
6	6*
7	7*
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11*
12	12*
13	13*
14	14*
15	15*
16	16*
17	17*
18	18
19	..

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
48:20	1 Ne. 20:20*
21	21*
22	22*
49:1	1 Ne. 21:1*
2	2
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6*
7	7*
8	8*
9	9*
10	10*
11	11
12	12*
13	13*
14	14*
15	15*
16	16
17	17
18	18*
19	19
20	20*
21	21*
22	1 Ne. 21:22 22:6# 22:8#
23	1 Ne. 21:23* 2 Ne. 6:7*
24	1 Ne. 21:24* 2 Ne. 6:16*
25	1 Ne. 21:25 2 Ne. 6:17#
26	1 Ne. 21:26* 2 Ne. 6:18*

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
50:1	2 Ne. 7:1#
2	2*
3	3
4	4#
5	5*
6	6
7	7
8	8#*
9	9#*
10	10* (#?)
11	11*
51:1	2 Ne. 8:1* (#?)
2	2*
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6
7	7* (#?)
8	8
9	9#*
10	10*
11	11#*
12	12#*
13	13
14	14
15	15*
16	16*
17	17*
18	18*
19	19*
20	20* (#?)
21	21*
22	22*
23	23*



<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
52:1	2 Ne. 8:24 3 Ne. 20:36# Moro. 10:31a#
2	2 Ne. 8:25* 3 Ne. 20:37* Moro. 10:31b#
3	3 Ne. 20:38*
6	3 Ne. 20:39#*
7	1 Ne. 13:37b# Mos. 12:21 15:14-18# 3 Ne. 20:40#
8	Mos. 12:22 15:29* 3 Ne. 16:18 20:32-33#
9	Mos. 12:23 15:30 3 Ne. 16:19 20:34#
10	1 Ne. 22:10-11# Mos. 12:24 15:31 3 Ne. 16:20* 20:35#
11	3 Ne. 20:41# 21:29a#
12	3 Ne. 20:42#* 21:19#*
13	3 Ne. 20:43
14	3 Ne. 20:44
15	3 Ne. 20:45*
15b	3 Ne. 21:8b*
53:1	Mos. 14:1b
2	2*
3	3*
4	4*
5	5
6	6*
7	Mos. 14:7 15:6b#

<u>Isa.</u>	<u>BM</u>
53:8	Mos. 14:8 15:8a#
9	Mos. 14:9*
10	Mos. 14:10 15:8b#
11	Mos. 14:11*
12	12*
54:1	3 Ne. 22:1b
2	2
3	3
4	4*
5	5*
6	6
7	7
8	8
9	9*
10	Mos. 15:10# 3 Ne. 22:10*
11	3 Ne. 22:11
12	12
13	13
14	14
15	15*
16	16
17	17
55:1	2 Ne. 9:50# 26:25b#
2	2 Ne. 9:51#

### Chapter 3

#### THE VARIANTS

In the following pages, each of the variants of the Isaiah quotes found in the Book of Mormon text will be analyzed. Some of the paraphrases are also discussed, though without much detail.

In preparing this analysis, the following steps were taken:

- (1) Each variant was checked against the 1830 first edition of the Book of Mormon (1830), as well as against the King James Version (KJV) of the Bible.
- (2) Each variant was checked against the Hebrew text from which KJV derives, i.e., the Massoretic Text (MT), the oldest copies of which date to the 8th century AD. Attention was paid not only to that which was written (Heb. *Ketib*), but also to the traditional oral variation (*Qere*) where applicable, as well as to variations in the different MT manuscripts.
- (3) Each variant was then checked against the two Isaiah scrolls found at Qumran, on the shores of the Dead Sea, over three decades ago (labelled IQIsa and IQIsb), as well as some smaller fragments of Isaiah also found with the Dead Sea Scrolls.
- (4) Each variant was further checked against early translations of the Bible from the Hebrew, as follows:
  - (a) Septuagint (LXX) - the Greek translation made in the 3rd century BC.
  - (b) Vulgate (V) - the Latin translation made by St. Jerome in the 5th century AD. (In some instances, there was even recourse to the Old Latin version - OL - of the 2nd century AD.)

(c) Targumim (T) - Aramaic translations from the 1st-2nd centuries AD.

(d) Peshitta (P) - Syriac translation. Being Aramaic, (c) and (d) are written in a language related to Hebrew and therefore extremely valuable in such a comparison.

(5) Some of the Isaiah passages which concerned us are cited in the New Testament and by early Church Fathers, all in Greek. All of the New Testament quotes were checked. But the quotes from the Church Fathers were cited only when scholars who have dealt with the Isaiah material have mentioned them in published studies on the subject.

In spite of what is obviously a great deal of exhaustive research, there is much more which could be done, and hence we leave the door open to all who wish to pursue the matter further. For example, the only variants which were investigated were those which were obvious from a comparison of the English texts of the Book of Mormon and the KJV Bible. No attempt was made to examine variants between the different versions in instances where BM did not differ from KJV. This would no doubt be a fruitful area for future research. It would unquestionably lead the researcher to note - as I have done - that the BM (or even the Brass Plates of Laban - BP) version of Isaiah is not necessarily "authentic" in the sense that it transmits the wording of the original, but, rather, that it represents just one of many versions which existed around the time of Lehi and later.

In the following commentary on each of the variants, it will be noted that there appear, at the end of the explanations, letters of the alphabet, in parentheses. These designate certain categories of variants which are then discussed in Chapter 4.

The material listed below is arranged by order of the chapter of the book of Isaiah.

2:2 = 2 Ne. 12:2

BM has "when" instead of KJV's italicized "*that*" before "the mountain". Joseph Smith frequently deleted such italicized words or changed them, knowing that these italics designated, in the KJV, words which did not exist in the Hebrew text. (I.e., what Hebrew sometimes expresses by syntax must be expressed in English by words; the KJV translators therefore added such words - in italics - where they felt the necessity for them, in order to give sense to the English translation.) In this particular case, both KJV and BM are valid renditions of MT. The future tense "to be" (Heb. *yihyeh*) is not expressed in LXX, P or V. Without it, MT would have to read like BM (S has the verb, however). This vs. has its parallel in Mic. 4:1 (Micah and Isaiah were contemporaries), where, however, the verb and adjective change places in the Hebrew text. (B)

2:4 = 2 Ne. 12:4

The scribe spelled KJV's "plow" as "plough" in 1830, but this was returned to its KJV form in subsequent editions of BM. (M)

2:5 = 2 Ne. 12:5

At the end of the vs., BM adds: "yea, come, for ye have all gone astray, every one to his wicked ways." This additional phrase is also found in Isa. 53:6 and is hence the kind of thing that Isaiah would be expected to say. There is evidence to indicate that MT deleted this portion by haplography because of its resemblance to words around it. The phrase added in BM would begin with the Heb. *b'w ky* ("come, for..."). The first of these resembles the next-to-last word in vs. 5 (*b'wr*, "in the light of"), while the second is identical to the initial word of vs. 6. An early Hebrew scribe can therefore be credited with this accidental deletion in the MT text. (C)(Cf. H)

2:6 = 2 Ne. 12:6

After the first word ("Therefore"), BM adds "O Lord". It does not occur in the versions. It is likely that MT has, in this instance, lost an abbreviation from an earlier Hebrew text (there are many such examples in the MT text, as any competent Hebraist can attest).

The abbreviation may have been *k"y*, to be read as *ky Yhwh* ("Therefore, O Lord"), but taken by MT to be merely *ky*. Or, as in other cases known from the Hebrew Bible, the divine name may have been abbreviated (*ky y"*) and the single letter lost by haplography because the scribe had already written it with the first word and therefore deleted its second occurrence. (This would have been even easier to do in the early days when there were no spaces between written words.) The haplography may also have occurred because the name *Yhwh* occurs as the last word in vs. 5 (with the deletion of the material found in BM). That there was indeed an abbreviation at this point is evidenced also by LXX, which adds "Jacob" (or, as in some mss., "Israel") after the initial word of the verse. Since both of these names (Jacob and Israel) begin with the Hebrew *y*, as does the name of the Lord, the error in the texts could only have been made had there been an abbreviation. (C)

2:8 = 2 Ne. 12:8

KJV "Their land also is" (= 1830, RLDS)

BM "Their land is also"

No change in meaning is seen here. The change in word order follows Joseph Smith's practice of sometimes changing passages to conform to more modern American usage and is therefore not a question of translation at all. (O)

2:9 = 2 Ne. 12:9

KJV "And the mean man boweth down, and the great man humbleth

BM "And the mean man boweth not down, and the great man humbleth

KJV himself, therefore..."

BM himself not, therefore...

The KJV idea is supported by vs. 11 and 17 and also by 5:15. There is no question of bowing or being humble in prayer. Rather, God will humiliate mankind. Note that the first "not" is not to be found in the 1830 BM. Probably the second was added by scribal error. Later, a new edition noted the discrepancy and rather than delete the note added another in the

earlier part of the verse. RLDS follows BM in both. (L)

2:10 = 2 Ne. 12:10

For Isa. 2:10-12, cf. Job 40:11-13. BM adds at the beginning "O ye wicked ones." This is without support. Interestingly, IQIsa deletes the last part of vs. 9 ("therefore, forgive him not") and all of vs. 10. This is probably because the idea expressed in vs. 9 is expounded in greater detail in vs. 11. Vs. 10, in this light, looks like a borrowing from vss. 19 and 21. If so, then this borrowing was made before Lehi took the brass plates to the New World. (K)

KJV: "...for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his

BM: "...for the fear of the Lord and the glory of his

KJV: majesty."

BM: majesty shall smite thee."

The Hebrew behind the KJV "for" is not the conjunction (as it reads in BM), but, rather, the compound preposition *mipp<sup>e</sup>nēy*, lit., "from the face of". However, it also means "because of" and hence the KJV "for". If it were followed by a clause marker, we could accept BM's addition of "shall smite thee". It may be that the brass plates (BP) so read, but we have no additional support for this. LXX does not contain the BM ending to this verse, but, in its place, has the same ending as vss. 19 and 21 ("when he ariseth to shake terribly the earth"), to which this vs. should be compared. (K) (G)

2:11 = 2 Ne. 12:11

BM adds to the beginning, "And it shall come to pass that..." This is partially supported by IQIsa (*w-*) and LXX (*gar*), both of which add the conjunction "and". MT probably lost this part by haplography, for it is also the last letter in the preceding verse. (B)



2:12 = 2 Ne. 12:12

KJV: "For the day...*shall be* upon

BM: "For the day...soon cometh upon all nations, yea, upon

KJV: every *one* that is proud..."

BM: every one; yea upon the proud..."

KJV's "*shall be* upon" reads merely "is upon" when translated from MT. Hence, the BM version is just as valid as KJV at that point. (J) Cf. 3:6. It is possible - but unlikely - that MT dropped the Hebrew *yb'* ("shall come" - like BM "soon cometh") because of its phonetic resemblance to the middle portion of the word immediately preceding (*sb'wt*, "hosts").

The other changes are possible, assuming that BP read differently from MT. Though there is no version support, it is interesting that IQIsa drops the MT words *el kl* ("upon every") and moves the conjunction *w-* (usually meaning "and") to the following word. This happens to be in the same place as the variation between KJV and BM, and the mobile conjunction "and" may be BM "yea" (also a valid translation). It is possible that an earlier text contained an abbreviated *el kl g'*, which BM read "upon all nations" and MT read "upon every proud one". The Hebrew words begin with the same letter and hence could result from such an abbreviation. However, it is more likely that the original read (as reconstructed from the English of BM:

*el kl g'wym*  
*w-el kl g'h*

and that MT deleted the first through haplography because of its close resemblance to the second. That the original so read is evidenced by the fact that the "nations - proud" in this vs. are paralleled in vs. 14 by "high mountains/hills - nations/people". (C) (C)

2:13 = 2 Ne. 12:13

BM begins with "Yea, and the day of the Lord shall come" in place of KJV "And". The Hebrew would read very simply *wb' ywm Yhwh*. Because this addition parallels the beginning of vs. 12, it does not destroy the parallelisms in this section, but, rather, enhances them, though there is no version support. (C)

Add  
here &  
assign to  
(J)-

2:14 = 2 Ne. 12:14

KJV: " *that are lifted up.*"  
BM: "and upon all the nations which are lifted up, and upon every people."

This addition is without version support. However, it fits into the general pattern of parallelism found in this and adjacent verses. Here, "nations" parallels "people", just as, in vss. 13-15, we have the parallels: "cedars//oaks", "mountains//hills", and "tower//fenced wall". (The question of vs. 16 is discussed below.) This new parallelism apparently carries on the addition of "nations" to the "proud and lofty" and "lifted up" parallels in vs. 12. (Note that the mountains, hills, rivers, streams, towers of Isa. 30:25 compare well with vss. 14-15 of Chap. 2. Indeed, there are many other comparisons which could be made between Chapters 2 and 30.) It would have been easy for an MT scribe to have deleted the BM material, for each parallel begins with *w-<sup>e</sup>l kl...* ("and upon every"). It is true that, from the point-of-view of MT, "lifted up" belongs in parallel to "high" with "hills". But the latter adjective is deleted in LXX<sup>h</sup>, Old Latin and one MT ms. (C)

2:16 = 2 Ne. 12:16

BM adds to the beginning of the vs., "And upon all the ships of the sea." This phrase is not found in MT. Interestingly, LXX reads *Kai epi pan ploion talassēs kai epi pasan tean ploion kallous*, "And upon every ship of the sea, and upon all views of pleasant ships." Thus LXX "And upon every ship of the sea" replaces MT/KJV "And upon all the ships of Tarshish." (The Greek word for sea, *talassa*, superficially resembles the Hebrew word *Tarshish*.) But BM has both variants! (However, both T and V read "sea" with LXX, though the

expression "ships of Tarshish" occurs also in Ps. 48:7 and Ezek. 27:25.) It is possible that BP was defective, but it is also possible that the original contained all three parallels. The last of the three is not a good parallel if MT *škywt* (KJV "pictures") is correct. LXX, as we have seen, reads "views of... ships" here. Because of this, Weil proposes changing *škywt* to *skty*, "ships of" (cf. Egyptian *skti* and Ugaritic *tkt*, both meaning "ship"). Kittel proposes reading *spywt* (a Hebrew word for "ships"); cf. Jonah 1:5. (B)

2:19 = 2 Ne. 12:19

KJV: "for fear of the Lord and for the

BM: "for the fear of the Lord shall come upon them and the

KJV: glory of his majesty"

BM: glory of his majesty shall smite them..."

The changes in BM are similar to those seen in vs. 10 and almost identical to those in vs. 21. These vss. should be compared to NT passages derived therefrom, e.g., 2 Thess. 1:8-2:8 (note reference to the "wicked", as in Isa. 2:10 addition by BM); Rev. 6:15-16; 9:6; Luke 23:30. See also Hos. 10:8. BP appears to differ here, the Hebrew words representing "for" in these two translations being quite different in meaning. (K)

2:20 = 2 Ne. 12:20

KJV: "they made *each one* for himself"

BM: "he hath made for himself"

MT reads *šr šw lw*, lit., "which they made for him." Most LXX mss. follow MT in rendering the verb in the plural, but delete the dative pronoun. But LXX<sub>A</sub>, supported by V, has the singular verb, in support of BM. IQIsa apparently attempts to explain away the confusion between the plural verb and the singular dative by adding a new subject after the verb, thus giving us: *šr (šw šb) wtyw*, "which his fingers made". The missing portion in IQIsa (in parentheses) is

due to a tear on the edge of the scroll. Noting the amount of missing space, Burrows suggests the reconstruction we have given here (see BASOR 113, p. 29); Rosenbloom agrees. However, in view of the fact that the previous verb in this vs. ("shall cast") is in the singular, BM is most likely correct in rendering this, too, in the singular. The original probably read <sup>c</sup>śh rather than <sup>c</sup>św - a change of but a single letter. (B)

2:21 = 2 Ne. 12:21

The variations in this vs. correspond (except in one respect) to those in vs. 19, which see, along with vs. 10. BP was apparently different here and it is impossible to reconcile BM with KJV/MT. (K) Note that, instead of KJV "glory of his majesty" (which is retained in vss. 10 and 19), we have "majesty of his glory". This is no doubt a scribal error which has not been corrected. (L)

3:1 - 2 Ne. 13:1

The problem to be described in this vs. is known to Biblical scholars, who generally consider the vs. to be corrupt (the New English Bible deletes the problematic passage). KJV speaks of "the stay and the staff" but then goes on to mention the "stay of bread" and the "stay of water". The word translated "stay" from MT is <sup>ms</sup>c<sub>n</sub>, while its feminine counterpart, <sup>ms</sup>c<sub>nh</sub>, is translated "staff". The occurrence of the latter but once in MT/KJV destroys a parallel which is corrected in BM. (Note that, although KJV has the "staff of bread" in Lev. 26:26; Ezek. 4:16; 5:16; 4:13 & Ps. 105:16, these passages employ an entirely different word and are of no assistance here.) (C)

3:3 = 2 Ne. 13:3

BM 1830 followed KJV with the spelling "counsellor". But this was later changed to the American spelling "counselor". ~~(o)~~ (o)

3:6 = 2 Ne. 13:6

BM substitutes "and shall say" for KJV "*saying*". (J)

KJV: "*let* this ruin *be* under thy hand"

BM: "let not this ruin come under thy hand"

Both renditions make sense in English. However, I prefer to believe that "not" was added to BM by scribal error. Otherwise, we must add to MT not only the negative, but we would also have to add a verb and move the conjunction. This is possibly how BP read; however, the explanation of scribal error is simpler. (L) Moreover, the point being made in the verse is that people believe there will be NO ruin if they call upon their rich relatives. (As vs. 7 indicates, however, even these will be poor at that time.) KJV's "*let...be*" is in italics and is thus fair game - under Joseph Smith's rules - for change (see J). It is interesting to note that he changed "be" to "come". In at least one MT idiom, KJV translates the verb "to be" as "to come". This is in the expression, "the word of the Lord came to X" (e.g., Isa. 38:4), which reads, in Hebrew, *w-yhy dbr Yhwh l-*, "and the word of Jehovah was to..."

3:7 = 2 Ne. 13:7

BM's change from "an healer" to "a healer" is an updating of KJV to conform to more modern American English. (N) RLDS reads "ruler" instead of "healer" (which is the reading for KJV, 1830 and BM). This is more logical, since the person speaking had been asked to be "ruler" in the preceding vs. Moreover, he repeats "ruler" later in this same vs. One must assume that the RLDS committee consulted some Biblical commentary on this, unless the original manuscript so reads (in which case, this would be greater evidence for BM).

BM's change from KJV italicized "*is*" to "there is" adds no meaning and is acceptable. (J) Since there is no verb in MT, the English must add it to make sense. BM has chosen one way, while KJV has chosen another.

3:8 = 2 Ne. 13:8

As in vs. 7, the lack of a verb in MT has given rise to two different renderings. KJV has "*are*" while BM has "have been". (J)

3:9 = 2 Ne. 13:9

In the absence of a verb, BM is justified in adding "to be even" before KJV "as", in order to give sense to the English. Both are valid translations from MT. (F)

KJV: " they hide *it* not"

BM: "and they cannot hide it"

Though the conjunction is missing in KJV and MT, it is added in IQIsa (*w-*), LXX (*kai*), P and one ms. of the Targum. BM is hence supported by the versions. (B) It is interesting to see BM adding *mode* ("cannot"), which is a possible rendering of the MT Hebrew. (F)

KJV has "soul" in the singular, while BM renders it in the plural. MT, IQIsa and LXX all have the singular. However, inasmuch as Hebrew singulars often have collective meaning, BM is justified in its translation. (E) (To assume that MT *lnpšm* is really the plural *lnpšym* without suffix - or even abbreviated - is probably unwarranted. This plural form is found only in Ezek. 13:20; otherwise, the plural is *npšwt*.)

3:10 = 2 Ne. 13:10

The change from KJV "Say ye" to BM "Say" is to conform with more modern American English. (N)

KJV reads "to the righteous", even though the preposition is not found in MT (*šdyq*). BM emphasizes the existence of the preposition by using the longer form "unto". Indeed, IQIsa has the preposition in a superscript (<sup>l</sup>*šdyq*). It is also found in the Peshitta (*lšdyqy'*), which has the noun in plural, confirming BM "them" instead of "him" (below). In order to make "righteous parallel to "wicked" in the

next vs., we should have the preposition for both (in vs. 11, "wicked" -  $\text{r}^{\text{v}}\text{s}^{\text{c}}$  - has the preposition in MT). We thus have not only version support for BM, but additional evidence of the antiquity of BM's source. (B)

KJV: *"it shall be well with him"*

BM: "it is well with them"

Ecc1. 8:13 appears to be a paraphrase of the idea found here in Isa. 3:10-11 (for vs. 10, see also Deut. 4:40; 12:25; Ps. 128:2). BM's "it is" in place of KJV's italicized *"it shall be"* is more literal and hence perfectly in order. (F) But more interesting is the change from singular *"him"* to plural *"them"*. We have already noted, above, how P has the antecedent ("the righteous") in the plural. It is true that the singular of MT may be taken as a collective. It was not so understood by LXX, however, which has the singular (*ton dikaion*). However, Justin Martyr in his *Dialogue cum Tryphone* has the plural noun, curiously preceded by the singular article (*ton dikaiou*). This is also the case in Eusebius (citing Hegesippus) and Clement of Alexandria (Seeligman, p. 9, note 3). (B)

3:11 = 2 Ne. 13:11

KJV: *"it shall be ill with him"*

BM: "for they shall perish"

MT has  $\text{r}^{\text{c}}$  (KJV "ill") to parallel with *twb* (KJV "well") in vs. 10. However, the verb is not paralleled ("Say") and hence we need not suspect the BM text at this point, though it has no outside support. Note, however, Ecc1. 8:12-13, which seems to paraphrase Isa. 3:10-11 and which includes not only the idea of being "well" for the righteous, but also of perishing ("neither shall he prolong his days") for the wicked. Because the verb "say" is lacking in this vs., as compared with vs. 10, MT is nonsense. (We would expect, in MT, meanings such as "say: 'Well'" and "say: 'Bad'".) LXX solves



this by relegating *ponēra* ("harmful") to the next sentence ("It is harmful because..."). Wiel suggests that MT should read *ky r<sup>c</sup>* ("for (it is) evil"), and hence he unwittingly supplies us with the word "for", used to introduce the BM phrase. The use of the plural "they" in BM instead of the singular "with him" will be discussed below. ~~(B)~~(C) Kittel suggests adding *lō* ("to him") to both vss. 10-11, saying that the word *'mrw* ("say") of vs. 10 probably should read *'šry* ("happy, blessed", as at the beginning of the beatitudes in Hebrew translation). But it is also possible that each vs. began with an abbreviation *'* (for *'mrw*, "say"), which was misread as an abbreviation for *'wy* ("wo") in vs. 11.

KJV: "for the reward of his hands shall be given him"

BM: "for the reward of their hands shall be upon them"

KJV gives a very loose translation of MT here. MT reads *n<sup>c</sup>śh*, "shall be done", and not "shall be given". IQIsa employs a different verb entirely, *yšwb*, "shall return". Kutscher (p. 218) points out that, in the Bible, *gmwl* (KJV "reward") is only once followed by the root *cśh* (as here) in MT, but is eight times followed by the root *šwb* ("return"), as here in IQIsa. LXX agrees with MT (*sumbēsetai*), while T is completely different (*ythb*, "shall be hidden"?). Actually, LXX is closer to Prov. 11:27: *wdrš r<sup>c</sup>h tbw'mw*, "but he that seeketh mischief, it shall come unto him." BM could follow any of these three possibilities for the verb, but IQIsa is the most likely. As for the use of plural ("their hands...upon them") in BM instead of KJV singular ("his hands...given him"), we must admit that KJV is supported by MT and the versions. However, inasmuch as the antecedent, "the wicked" is probably a collective, BM is justified in translating these into the plural in English, though their Hebrew grammatical form would be singular. (E)

3:12 = 2 Ne. 13:12

KJV begins "As for my people", while BM begins, "And my people." The conjunction could properly be translated as in KJV, inasmuch as there is a contrast made here between the wicked (vs. 11) and

the people of God (vs. 12). However, MT lacks the conjunction ~~ו~~. KJV's "As for" is added to give better sense to the English. If we assume that BM is being literal here in its use of "And", then there must have been a prefixed conjunction in BP (as, indeed, we would normally expect in Hebrew). That this conjunction, *w-*, should be dropped by a pre-MT scribe is entirely possible, particularly in view of the fact that the last word of the preceding verse ends with this same letter. It appears to be a case of haplography. (C)

KJV's "which" (= 1830) was later changed to "who" in BM and RLDS, in order to conform to modern American usage. (O)

3:14 = 2 Ne. 13:14

KJV: " the spoil of the poor *is* in your houses"

BM: "and the spoil of the poor in your houses"

True to the Hebrew syntax, MT has no verb, and hence this is added by KJV ("*is*"). LXX also lacks the verb, which BM has deleted here. (I) Like BM, LXX adds the conjunction, *kai*. (B)

3:15 = 2 Ne. 13:15

BM deletes KJV's italicized "*that*", which does not exist in MT. (I)

3:18 = 2 Ne. 13:18

BM deletes KJV's italicized "*about their feet*" (not in MT) and the second and third occurrences of KJV italicized "*their*" (also not in MT). Though the first "their" was deleted in 1830 (= RLDS), it was returned in subsequent editions. ~~(I)~~ (I)<sup>(b)</sup> It is interesting to note that IQIsa adds the conjunction to subsequent verses (19, 20, 21, 22 and 23), which is to be expected in Biblical Hebrew. BM does not reflect this, however.

3:23 = 2 Ne. 13:23

BM deletes the definite article before "hoods". This, however, seems to be a scribal oversight, inasmuch as the article occurs in MT, where

it is expected because all the other nouns have it. It may be, of course, that the article (*h-*) was already lost from BP, but scribal error is a simpler explanation. (L)

3:24 = 2 Ne. 13:24

Following Joseph Smith's frequent practice, the italicized KJV words "*that*" (before "instead") and "*and*" (before "burning") have been deleted in BM. (I)

3: 26 = 2 Ne. 13:26

KJV's "and she *being* desolate" is rendered "and she shall be desolate" in BM, without change in meaning. On the surface, this appears to be a question of making sense out of the English by adding words not supplied in Hebrew. But such is not the case. Actually, MT employs a verb (*wnqth*), as in BM. (A)

BM adds the conjunction "and" to KJV's "shall sit". Both are possible renditions of the Hebrew, though MT does not have the conjunction. It is, nevertheless, added in LXX. (B)

4:2 - 2 Ne. 14:2

BM deletes KJV's "and" before "the fruit". This is probably a scribal oversight, since the conjunction is found in MT. It is possible that BP lacked the conjunction (*w-*), but scribal error is a simpler explanation. (L)

BM deletes KJV's italicized "*shall be*" without changing the sense. (I)

BM also changes KJV's "for them" to read "to them". Since the Hebrew dative preposition *l-* means both "for" and "to", there is no conflict here. (F)

4:3 = 2 Ne. 14:3

KJV: "*that he that is* left in Zion and *he that* remaineth..."  
BM: " they that are left in Zion and remain..."

KJV supplies italicized words to give meaning to the MT participles which, literally translated, are, respectively, "he who is left" and "he who remains". BM has reworded this with little change in meaning; only the number - singular to plural - has been altered. This, however, is acceptable, inasmuch as "they" (often used for indefinite number in English) here is used instead of "one", which can be collective in meaning. (J) Note that 1830 had "them" instead of the present BM "they" and also "remaineth" as in KJV (but for the latter, RLDS = BM). (O)

BM deletes the unnecessary KJV "even". (I)

5:1 = 2 Ne. 15:1

KJV: "Now Will I sing"

BM: "And then will I sing"

MT has 'šyrh n'. KJV traditionally translates the particle n' as "please" when it accompanies second person verbs (often imperatives), but as "now" elsewhere. Actually, it is an optative marker and should here be translated "May I sing..." This is like LXX 'Aisō dē, "And my lot (fate) is..." (i.e., "May I..."). Strangely, IQIsa deletes the particle. (A)

5:4 = 2 Ne. 15:4

BM, by reversing the order of KJV "brought it" to "it brought", gives the impression that the interrogative is being changed to indicative, as if "wherefore" (MT m<sup>o</sup>lō, "why?") were "therefore" (Heb. lkn). The disappearance of the question-mark likewise gives this impression, though the punctuation was not the doing of Joseph Smith. Throughout BM (and not only in Isaiah passages), Joseph Smith uses "wherefore" as though it were "therefore". (L)

5:5 = 2 Ne. 15:5

KJV "and break down" corresponds to MT infinitive absolute prš. BM renders it, "I will break down", as does LXX (katelō). This should be compared to the phrase above it, which is rendered "I will take away" by both KJV and BM, though the MT again has the infinitive absolute, here. In this instance however, IQIsa reads

*w'syr*, "and I will take away", corresponding to LXX *afelō* and to KJV = BM. This fits in well with the other conjugated verbs, *'wdy<sup>c</sup>*, "I will tell" (vs. 5) and *w-'šytlw*, "and I will lay it waste", and *'šwh*, "I will command" (vs. 6), but certainly not with the infinitive *prš*. (B)

5:7 = 2 Ne. 15:7

BM substitutes "and" for KJV "but" before "behold". In this, BM translates the Hebrew conjunction more literally. But KJV more adequately transfers the Hebrew meaning of contrast (and also parallels the contrast with "but" which follows in the same vs.). (F)

5:8 = 2 Ne. 15:8

BM deletes the KJV "*that* lay field to field". MT may have added this idea from Mic. 2:2 (Micah and Isaiah were contemporaries and their writings have several parallels, the most well-known being Isa. 2:1-4//Mic. 4:1-3. (H)

KJV: "till *there* *be* no place"

BM: "till there can be no place"

BM is justified in adding mode, which (except for optatives) is not expressed in Biblical Hebrew and hence must be added in the English. (J)

5:9 = 2 Ne. 15:9

BM uses "and" in place of KJV "*even*" (before "great"). Both words are added to give sense to the English translation. (J) However, the word "and" may have been added because of what follows in the verse (see below).

After the adjective "fair", BM adds "cities". One cannot admit the dropping of *c<sub>rym</sub>*, "cities", from MT since - in spite of its masculine plural ending - it is a feminine noun, while all the adjectives here used are masculine, agreeing with *btym*, "houses". It is possible that MT means to understand "cities" as conglomerates of "houses" without writing it. Indeed, "houses" and "cities" are paralleled in Isa. 6:11; 14:17 and 64:10-11. Should the idea of cities be in

the text, the desirability of adding "and" before "great" (see above) is increased. And if such were present in the original text, it would have disappeared through haplography, for the word immediately preceding *gdlym* ("great") ends with the letter *w* (the word is *yhyw*, "they will be"), which is the spelling of the Hebrew conjunction. I prefer to believe, however (using the principle of Occam's razor), in the simplest explanation, i.e., scribal error in the case of "cities", with the change from "*even*" to "and" having no connection therewith. (L)

5:10 = 2 Ne. 15:10

The 1830 ed. changed KJV "an homer" to "a horner". However, subsequent editions corrected to "homer", while retaining the change to "a", due to modern American usage. (N) The reading "horner" is possibly a scribal error, but is more likely a misreading of the handwritten ms. of BM by the printer in 1830. (M)

5:11 = 2 Ne. 15:11

KJV: "*till* wine inflame them"

BM: "and wine inflame them"

The conjunction is lacking in MT, but may be supplied in the English, just as KJV added "*till*". It is possible that an original conjunction *w-* was unintentionally deleted from *w-yyn* ("and wine"), where the resemblance between the first two Hebrew letters is great in later stages of Hebrew script. But the simpler explanation is that Joseph Smith opted for a variant reading for the italicized word found in KJV and not in MT. (J)

5:19 = 2 Ne. 15:19

BM drops KJV's italicized "*and*" (before "hasten"), which is not in MT. (I)

5:21 = 2 Ne. 15:21

KJV: "Wo unto *them that are* wise"

BM: "Wo unto                    the wise"

BM is a more literal translation of the MT adjective than KJV. Indeed, it may be said that the deletion of KJV's italicized words generally gives a more literal rendering to BM. (J)

5:22 = 2 Ne. 15:22

KJV: "Wo unto *them that are* mighty"

BM: "Wo unto                    the mighty"

As in vs. 21, BM is a more literal translation of the MT adjective. (J)

5:23 = 2 Ne. 15:23

KJV "which" (= 1830) became BM "who". (O)

5:24 = 2 Ne. 15:24

BM deletes KJV's italicized "*so*" (before "their root"), giving the same sense, however. (I)

In place of the singular "blossom" of KJV, we find the plural "blossoms" in BM. The MT uses a singular noun (as does LXX), but the Hebrew often employs the singular form to express the collective. The MT *prh̄m* ("their blossom") could have been for *prh̄ym* ("blossoms"), for the letter *y* here represents a vowel not written in older Hebrew texts. It is also possible that the text originally had an abbreviation, *prh̄'m*, for *prh̄ym* ("their blossoms"), or the latter could have lost a letter or two in the transmission process. It is much simpler, however, to see in this the use of a singular noun as a collective, for it parallels the singular "root" in the same verse. (E)

5:28 = 2 Ne. 15:28

KJV: " *are* sharp"

BM: "shall be sharp"

MT uses no verb at this point, so the English must add it for sense. BM has chosen to use the future, perhaps to correspond with what follows in KJV, "shall be counted like flint" (where a verb IS used in the Hebrew text). (J) However, BM departs from this pattern by deleting the italicized "*shall be*" before "like a lion". (H) Though the latter is in BM vs. 28, in KJV it is the beginning of vs. 29. This separation may account for why BM departed from its pattern at this point. Of course, verse divisions were not used in the original Hebrew text, nor even in the 1830 BM. (BM was not divided into verses until 1879, so this was not done by Joseph Smith.)

5:29 = 2 Ne. 15:29

See vs. 28 for comments regarding the mission portion of this vs. in BM as compared with KJV.

BM deletes the italicized KJV "*it*", occurring after the verbs "carry" and "deliver". The word, of course, does not appear in the Hebrew of MT, though the sense is there and might be so expressed in the English translation. (I)

5:30 = 2 Ne. 15:30

KJV: "if *one* look"

BM: "if they look"

MT *w-nbt* could be read in either manner, since it refers to an indefinite subject, which is expressed in English as either "one" or "they". Indeed, in Isa. 8:22, the same verb in the singular is translated by KJV as "they shall look" in a passage paralleling this one. LXX, however, has the plural *emblepsontai* and thus gives support to BM. (B)



6:2 = 2 Ne. 16:2

BM 1830 (= RLDS), following KJV, has "seraphims". In later editions, BM reads "seraphim". The change was no doubt made after Joseph Smith had learned sufficient Hebrew to know that the *-im* suffix was the Hebrew masculine plural ending, thus making the English *-s* redundant. (0) Cf. vss. 5 & 6.

6:5 = 2 Ne. 16:5

KJV reads "Wo *is* me." Joseph Smith, following his usual habit, deleted the italicized "to be" verb, giving "Wo me" in the 1830 edition. Later editions, however, have "Wo is unto me", which perfectly corresponds with MT *'wy ly*. Evidently, the change was made after Joseph Smith had learned sufficient Hebrew to know what the original idiom was. (0) Cff. vss. 2 & 6.

6:6 = 2 Ne. 16:6

As in vs. 2, KJV's "seraphims", though retained in the 1830 (= RLDS) edition, was changed to "seraphim" in subsequent editions. Cf. vss. 2 & 5 for the reasons for this. (0) It is interesting to note that these changes, made by Joseph Smith after he had learned some Hebrew, are clustered in this chapter. He was perhaps reading these passages for comparison with the Hebrew of Isaiah.

6:8 = 2 Ne. 16:8

BM 1830 deleted the KJV italicized "*am*" (after "Here"), which cannot be expressed by a word in Hebrew, but, rather, by syntax. It was returned, however, in later editions (incl. RLDS), to make more sense in English. It may be that, after Joseph Smith had studied Hebrew, he realized that there was no necessity to delete KJV's italicized "to be" verbs, since they expressed in English what Hebrew expressed by syntax. However, I have chosen to not so classify this change, since this idea is only a guess. (I)

6:9 = 2 Ne. 16:9

KJV: " understand not... perceive not"

BM: "they understood not...they perceived not"

KJV has imperatives and hence follows MT (which has 'ל followed by the 2nd person imperfect verb, indicating negative imperative). IQIsa has *w-<sup>c</sup>ל* ("and upon") instead of the negative particle 'ל both times but still retains the verb in the 2nd person plural. This vs. is quoted (and attributed to Isaiah) in Matt. 13:14 and Acts 28:26. The latter reads, in KJV, "Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive." These both follow LXX, which changes the imperative into aorist indicative (LXX<sub>B</sub> being the closest): *Akoē akousete kai ou mē sunēte kai blepontes blepsete kai ou mē idēte*, "Hearing, hear, and don't understand, and seeing, see, and don't perceive." In the quotes in Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; John 12:40 (this one attributed - see vs. 41); and Rom. 11:8, the pronoun is "they" rather than "ye" as in BM. Cf. Isa. 42:20; the cry is later taken up by Jer. (5:21; 6:10) and Ezek. (12:2). In addition to the version support, it is also possible to postulate a metathesis in the Hebrew text, changing 'ל to ל' before each of the verbs, thus giving the negative indicative meaning of "you won't" as an alternative to the negative imperative of MT. (B)

Note that 1830 retained KJV "understand". This was probably changed to the past "understood" in subsequent editions in order that it might correspond to "perceived". (O)

6:10 = 2 Ne. 16:10

The KJV active "convert" is passive "be converted" in BM (= RLDS). The MT *w-šb* means, simply, "and return", used in Judaism often to mean "repent". BM 1830 reads the same way as KJV and hence the BM change is likely due to the use of the passive in 19th century American English. Note, however, that this Isaiah passage has the passive "be converted" whenever it is quoted in the New

Testament, in Matt. 13:15; John 12:40 and Acts 28:27 (all attributing the quote to Isaiah) and Mark 4:12 (unattributed). Cf. also Rom. 11:8, where there is an allusion to this vs., along with Isa. 29:8. The NT quotes seem to be based on LXX, which uses the passive *epistrep̄sōsan*. Despite the fact that there appears on the surface to be version support for BM here, I believe that the simplest explanation is an attempt at rendering the idiom in a manner more acceptable to American English. By the same token, the use of the passive in Greek was to accomodate it to that language. (O)

6:12 = 2 Ne. 16:12

KJV: "and *there* *be* a great forsaking"

BM: "for there shall be a great forsaking"

By using a finite verb, BM is closer to MT, which reads *w-rbh* *h-<sup>c</sup>zwbh*, lit., "and the forsaking shall be great (or: multiplied)".(A)

6:13 = 2 Ne. 16:13

KJV: "But yet in it *shall be* a tenth, and *it* shall return"

BM: "But yet there shall be a tenth, and they shall return"

BM 1830 retains KJV "in it", which was subsequently deleted, probably by printer error (it is in MT) because it sounded or looked like the preceding word "yet". (L) The addition of "there" is perfectly valid for making the English text read well. (J)

The use of "they" in BM instead of "*it*" is also justified, since the word "tenth", while singular, has a plural sense in the passage, referring to people (though in Hebrew the verb most often would agree with "tenth", which is grammatically singular). (J)

7:1 = 2 Ne. 17:1

BM (= RLDS) reads the same as KJV here. However, in the 1830 ed., the word "*that*" before "Rezin" read "and". This is unjustified by MT and seems to have been a scribal error later corrected. (M)

7:6 = 2 Ne. 17:6

KJV's italicized "*even*" (before "the son") is, in BM, "yea", which is a perfectly valid emmendation to the English text. (J)

7:8 = 2 Ne. 17:8

BM deletes the italicized "*is*" before "Rezin". (I)

7:11 = 2 Ne. 17:11

KJV "depth" and "height" are rendered in the plural in BM. The plural is more normal in the English idiom, and while the Hebrew words are in the singular (so, too, in LXX), yet they can have a collective meaning. It seems likely, however, that, due to the plurals being more idiomatic in English, a scribal error has been made here - a case of overcorrection. (Hence, we have not listed these changes under Category E, "Singular-Plural Distinctions", but, rather, under L, "Uncorrected BM Errors".)

7:17 = 2 Ne. 17:17

KJV's italicized "*even*", occurring after "Judah", is deleted in BM. (I)

7:20 = 2 Ne. 17:20

KJV's italicized "*namely*", occurring after "hired", is deleted in BM. (I)

7:21 = 2 Ne. 17:21

KJV's italicized "*that*", occurring after "day" is deleted in BM. (I)

7:22 = 2 Ne. 17:22

KJV's italicized "*that*", occurring after "milk", is deleted in BM. (I)

7:23 = 2 Ne. 17:23

KJV's italicized "*that*" (occurring after "that day") and "*even*" (occurring after "which shall") are deleted in BM. (I)

7:25 = 2 Ne. 17:25

KJV's italicized "*on*", occurring as the second word in this vs., is deleted in BM. (I)

KJV "for" before "the treading" is also deleted, apparently through an oversight (scribal or printer's error), since it is there in MT. (L)

8:1 = 2 Ne. 18:1

KJV: "                    the Lord said"

BM: "the word of the Lord said"

The BM version is never used in all of KJV. The usual Hebrew idiom whenever "word" is employed is better translated "And the word of the Lord was (KJV usually has "came") unto..." (*wyhy dbr Yhwh l-*). BP must be different here. (K) Note that the BM idiom occurs in some pseudepigraphal works - notably the Books of Adam & Eve - but not in Biblical Hebrew.

8:4 = 2 Ne. 18:4

KJV: "For                    before the child shall                    have knowledge to

BM: "For behold,                    the child shall not have knowledge to

KJV:                    cry, My father, and my mother..."

BM:                    cry, My father, and my mother, before..."

Both versions say the same thing. MT means, lit., "For, by the time the child knows to say..." It is possible that "behold" was written in BM by error (being read for "before" by Joseph Smith or at least so understood by his scribe), thus necessitating the addition of "before" at a later place. The positioning of "before" in BM is more usual for American English and hence may be deliberate. However, inasmuch as the exact reason for the change cannot be determined, we shall classify these as equally valid translations from MT. (F)

8:10 = 2 Ne. 18:10

We have here an unimportant variation in spelling. KJV and 1830 have "nought", which is modernized in BM and RLDS to "naught". (O)

8:12 = 2 Ne. 18:12

KJV: "to all *them to* whom"

BM: "to all to whom"

These two versions mean the same thing. (I)

8:19 = 2 Ne. 18:19

KJV: "the living to the dead?"

BM: "the living to hear from the dead?"

The additional words are unwarranted by MT, where we read as in KJV, *h-hyym 'l h-mtym*. But the sense, in English, would permit this. (K)

8:20 = 2 Ne. 18:20

BM adds "and" before "if they speak not..." This is not found in MT, but could have been in the BP version. No change of meaning here. (K)

8:22 = 2 Ne. 18:22

KJV: "and *they shall be* driven"

BM: "and shall be driven"

No change in meaning. (I)

9:1 (MT 8:23) = 2 Ne. 19:1

KJV: "afflict *her by* the way of the sea"

BM: "afflict by the way of the Red Sea"

The deletion of italicized "*her*" is understandable, since it is not in MT. (I) However, BM must be wrong in speaking of the "RED Sea", which is certainly not "beyond Jordan, in Galilee", nor near the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali. This appears to be a case of scribal overcorrection, due to prior mention of the Red Sea in the BM text. (L) For Isa 9:1-2, see Matt. 4:15-16; Luke 1:29 where the — is — the sea of Galilee.

9:3 (MT 9:2) = 2 Ne. 19:3

KJV "*and* not increased" becomes "and increased" in BM. While the Ketib is ל' ("not"), the Qere of MT (supported by 20 mss. of MT as also the Peshitta and Targum) reads לו, "for him" (the two words are pronounced alike in Hebrew). (B)

9:4 (MT 9:3) = 2 Ne. 19:4

BM deletes, at the end of the vs., "as in the day of Midian", with no explanation possible other than a variant reading of BP or an accidental deletion by Joseph Smith, his scribe or the printer. It is there in MT. (K)

9:5 (MT 9:4) = 2 Ne. 19:5

BM 1830 deleted the KJV italicized "*is*" after "warrior". This was returned in subsequent editions, including RLDS. (See commentary on 6:8, above.) (I)

9:6 (MT 9:5) = 2 Ne. 19:6

We have here a spelling variation, "Counselor" in KJV and BM but "Counsellor" in BM 1830. (See 3:3, above.) (O)

9:7 (MT 9:6) = 2 Ne. 19:7

BM deletes KJV "*his*" before "government". (I)

KJV: "*there shall be* no end"

BM: "there is no end"

MT has 'yn qš, which is rendered more literally in BM, though both translations are valid. (F)

9:9 (MT 9:8) = 2 Ne. 19:9

KJV "inhabitant" is plural "inhabitants" in BM. MT has the singular, which could have a collective sense in Hebrew. LXX has the plural, in support of BM: *hoi enkatēmenoi*. There is a great likelihood that the original text had an abbreviated *w-ywš*, which could have been

read as either singular or plural. This is the very abbreviation found at this point in IQIsa! In any event, the sole difference between the singular and plural construct forms would be the addition of the letter -y to the plural. This smallest of all Hebrew letters could easily have been lost from the text. Because of versional support, we shall classify this as (B) rather than (E).

BM 1830 adds "the" before "stoutness", but this has been deleted in subsequent editions, including RLDS. It was probably a scribal or printer's error. (M)

9:12 (MT 9:11) = 2 Ne. 19:12 (9:12-13 is paraphrased in 2 Ne. 28:32)

BM 1830 (= RLDS) deleted KJV "is" before "stretched out". But this was returned in later editions, to make sense out of the English. Cf. vss. 17, 21; chap. 10:4; 14:27. (I)

9:12-13 (MT 9:11-12) = 2 Ne. 28:32

Paraphrase only. (Q)

9:14 (MT 9:13) = 2 Ne. 19:14

KJV "Therefore the Lord will..." was unchanged in 1830, but was later reworded "Therefore will the Lord..." to update the language (BM as well as RLDS). (O)

9:15 (MT 9:14) = 2 Ne. 19:15

KJV "and honourable" (after "ancient") is deleted in BM, though it is there in MT. Perhaps it was lacking in BP. (K)

9:17 (MT 9:16) = 2 Ne. 19:17

BM changed "an" to "a" before "hypocrite" to update the language. (N)

BM 1830 (= RLDS) deleted "is" before "stretched out". But this was returned to subsequent editions, to make sense out of the English. See 9:12, 21; 10:4; 14:27. (I)



9:21 (MT 9:20) = 2 Ne. 19:21

KJV: "and" before "they together" is deleted in BM. (I)

BM 1830 (= RLDS) deleted "is" before "stretched out", but it was later returned in subsequent editions, to make sense out of the English. See 9:12, 17; 10:4; 14:27. (I)

10:4 = 2 Ne. 20:4

BM 1830 (= RLDS) deleted "is" before "stretched out", but it was later returned in subsequent editions, to make sense out of the English. See 9:12, 17, 21; 14:27. (I)

10:5 = 2 Ne. 20:5

KJV "mine indignation" is BM "their indignation". LXX *orgēs* appears without the possessive pronoun. It is there in MT, but it is a matter of a single letter change from *z<sup>c</sup>my* ("mine indignation") to *z<sup>c</sup>mm* ("their indignation"). Nevertheless, "the staff...mine indignation" parallels, in the same vs., "the rod of mine indignation", and so we should expect the first person in both. BM is probably in error. The scribe probably got the idea from the preceding "in THEIR hand is" and overcorrected. It is possible, of course, that BP already contained the error. (L) MT also happens to be corrupt at this point and, for proper parallelism, should read, as suggested by the New English Bible, *w-mṯh z<sup>c</sup>my (hw) b-ydm*.

10:6 = 2 Ne. 20:6

BM changes KJV "an" (before "hypocritical") to "a", in order to update the language. (N)

10:7 = 2 Ne. 20:7

KJV: "it is in his heart"

BM: " in his heart it is"

BM here attempts to update the language. (N)

10:10 = 2 Ne. 20:10

KJV "found" (agreeing with MT, while LXX has *elabon*, "take") was apparently misunderstood by the scribe, who wrote "founded" in BM, an example of overcorrection. (L)

10:13 = 2 Ne. 20:13

KJV: "By the strength of my hand I have done

BM: "By the strength of my hand and by my wisdom I have done

KJV: *it*, and by my wisdom."

BM: these things."

KJV translates literally from MT (as does LXX, *tē isXui poiēsō kai tē sofia*). But BM has correctly understood the principles underlying Hebrew verbs with dual adverbials, wherein the first prepositional phrase occurs (in Hebrew) with the verb, while the second is added after the conjunction. Translated literally, like KJV, the second gives the impression of an afterthought in English, though it was part of the main thought in the Hebrew. BM is idiomatic English and shows the proper relationship of both adverbial phrases. I class this, however, as an attempt to update the language. (N) The change from "*it*" to "these things" belongs to category (J).

KJV: "I have removed the bounds"

BM: "I have moved the borders"

While "bounds and borders" are synonymous terms and "moved and "removed" nearly so (LXX reads *afelō*, "I carried away"), the BM forms are probably scribal mishearings which, fortunately, do not change the meaning. (L)

10:15 = 2 Ne. 20:15

BM 1830 (= RLDS) changed the spelling of "ax" to "axe". This was corrected in subsequent editions. (M)

BM deletes KJV "*or*" before "shall the saw". (I)

10:17 = 2 Ne. 20:17

KJV: "and it shall burn and devour"

BM: "and shall burn and shall devour"

Both are valid translations from MT, with BM being more literal. (F)

10:21 = 2 Ne. 20:21

BM adds "yea" before KJV "*even*", with no change in meaning. (J)

10:29 = 2 Ne. 20:29

KJV "Ramah" (MT *Rmh*) is rendered "Ramath" in BM. This would be the more ancient form of the name, with the old feminine *-ath* suffix which, in later (even Biblical, usually) Hebrew disappeared in pausal form of the noun. Cf. vs. 28, where both KJV and BM have the name "Aiath", with the same old feminine ending. This is particularly interesting, since it is *eyt* in MT but was written *eyh<sup>t</sup>* in IQIsa, with the *-t* suffix apparently added as an afterthought (it is in superscription), following a writing which shows later pronunciation. I.e., IQIsa originally wrote it as "Aiah" - as MT wrote "Ramah" - and later added a superscript letter to show the older form "Aiath". This provides evidence that BP is from an older source than MT. (D)

10:30 = 2 Ne. 20:30

KJV "thy voice" is BM "the voice". This may be a scribal or printer's error, since the pronominal suffix appears in MT. (LXX handles the whole matter by a verb, *feuzetai*.) However, since the suffix comprises but one letter, it may have been added to MT and the article need not have even existed to give us "the". Nevertheless, I opt for scribal error as the simplest explanation. (L)

11:4 = 2 Ne. 21:4; 30:9

KJV & 2 Ne. 21: "But...shall he judge"

2 Ne. 30: "And...shall the Lord God judge"

The Hebrew conjunction *w-* may be properly translated as either "and" or "but", as in the two BM passages. (F) 2 Ne. 30 (vss. 9-15) is apparently a paraphrase and hence "he" is defined as "the Lord God".

This is further evidenced by the fact that it adds a whole verse (10), which is not found in Isaiah nor in 2 Ne. 11. (However, cf. 2 Thess. 2:8-12, which may be based on Isa. 2:10, 19, 21.) (Q)(P)

11:6 = 2 Ne. 21:6; 30:12

KJV & 2 Ne. 21: " The wolf also shall dwell"  
2 Ne. 30: "And then shall the wolf dwell"

(The same idea is to be found in Isa. 65:25.) Here, 2 Ne. 30 is more literal as a translation from MT (*w-gr z'b*), though all are valid renditions. (P)

2 Ne. 21 deletes "the" before "fatling", though it is there in both KJV and 2 Ne. 30. Actually, MT has no definite article before any of these nouns and they are supplied only to make the English read better. (F)

11:8 = 2 Ne. 21:8; 30:14

In both BM passages, 1830 (= RLDS) follows the KJV "sucking". However, later editions changed this in 2 Ne. 30 to "suckling", perhaps in an effort to make the English more palatable. (0)  
In both passages, BM renders KJV "cockatrice" as "cockatrice's". (0) (See also (P).)

11:11 = 2 Ne. 21:11; 25:17; 29:1

While 2 Ne. 21 reads as KJV, the other two passages are paraphrases thereof. (Q)

$$11:13 = 2 \text{ Ne. } 21:13$$

KJV: "The envy also of Ephraim"  
BM: "The envy of Ephraim also"

MT does not have "also". The word is supplied in English because it is a construction of the type "Both X and Y". Therefore, its placement is a matter of style. (N)

11:14 = 2 Ne. 21:14

KJV "toward" was retained by 1830 (= RLDS) but changed in later editions to read "towards", a more common American form. (0)

11:16 = 2 Ne. 21:16

KJV "an" before "highway" was changed to "a" in BM to conform to American usage. (N)

12:2 = 2 Ne. 22:2

KJV: "he also is become"

BM: "he also has become"

BM 1830 (= RLDS) repeats KJV. But this was subsequently changed to more idiomatic American usage. (0)

This Isa. passage is a quote from Ps. 118:14 (or Ps. 98:1, 3); cf. also Isa. 52:10.

13:3 = 2 Ne. 23:3

KJV: "for mine anger, *even* them that rejoice in my highness."

BM: "for mine anger is not upon them that rejoice in my highness."

MT reads לֹ-פִי עֲלֵיזֵי גִ'וּתִי (lit., "to/for mine anger, the rejoicers of my highness"). At first glance, it appears as though Joseph Smith mistook the KJV "for" to be the English conjunctive "for" (Heb. *ky*) rather than the dative "for" (Heb. לֹ-), which would not be possible in Hebrew. Upon closer examination, however, one notes that the KJV/MT is gibberish at this point and requires some correction. We probably have a case of double haplography. To illustrate, let us reproduce here the Hebrew of MT and a Hebrew translation of BM:

MT: לֹ- פִי עֲלֵיזֵי גִ'וּתִי

BM: לִ' פִי עַל עֲלֵיזֵי גִ'וּתִי

The MT scribe, or a predecessor, has - perhaps after a long tiring day of work - made two deletions here. Firstly, he deleted the Hebrew letter aleph (') from the negative particle, thus producing the preposition לֹ-. Because the earliest Hebrew writing has no

spaces to divide words, the mistake would have been even easier. The second deletion involved the preposition <sup>ע</sup>ל ("upon"). Both of these cases of haplography occurred because of the proximity of other identical alphabetical elements to those which were deleted (׳ being followed by ׳ and <sup>ע</sup>ל being followed by <sup>ע</sup>ל). The reconstructed Hebrew sentence based on the reading of BM (with "for" added at the beginning for English style) thus reflects an older version of Isaiah for BP than for MT (especially notable since MT/KJV is nonsensical anyway). It is true that, in such non-verbal sentences as this, we would normally expect ׳*yn* instead of ל׳ as negative particle (though the latter is used in such instances in modern Hebrew). However, the Bible has many examples of ל׳ being used in such sentences, four of which occur in the book of Isaiah (27:11; 37:19; 53:2; 55:8). (C)

13:4 = 2 Ne. 23:4

KJV has "a multitude", agreeing with MT. BM, however, makes it definite, "the multitude". It is possible, of course, that we have an example of scribal error (mishearing "the" for "a"). On the other hand, it is just as likely that MT dropped the article through haplography because it is identical with the first consonant of the word to which it is prefixed; i.e., *h-hmwn* became *hmwn*. (C)

13:5 = 2 Ne. 23:5

KJV's "even" is substituted by "yea" in BM. (J)

13:8 = 2 Ne. 23:8

BM deletes KJV "they shall be in pain as a woman that travaileth". The Hebrew is represented by but two words, *k-ywldh yhy'wn*, and could thus easily have been dropped from BP/BM or added to MT. It is possible that MT borrowed the idea from Hos. 13:13 or Isa. 26:17-18 (see John 16:21; see also Mic. 4:9; Jer. 6:24 and cf. Isa. 42:14ff). (H)

13:11 = 2 Ne. 23:11

BM drops KJV's "*their*" before "evil". (I)

13:14 = 2 Ne. 23:14

BM adds "and" before "they shall every man" and thus disagrees with KJV/MT, 1830 and RLDS. There is no change in meaning, however, and the addition seems to be stylistic. (O)

13:15 = 2 Ne. 23:15

KJV: " and every one that is joined *unto them*"

BM: "yea, and every one that is joined to the wicked"

The addition of "yea" is stylistic. (K) The change from "*unto them*" (not in MT) to "to the wicked" is not to be admitted from MT, but must either be an explanation by the translator or something found in BP. (J)

13:17 = 2 Ne. 23:17

KJV: "and *as for* gold, they shall not delight"

1830: "and gold, nor shall they not delight"

BM: "and gold, nor shall they delight"

The erroneous double negative reading of the 1830 ed. was followed by RLDS. But BM has corrected it, choosing a new style but giving the same idea. This is perfectly valid, since Hebrew does not distinguish between our English "not" and "nor". (M)

The deletion of the italicized KJV "*as for*" is to be expected. (I)

13:18 = 2 Ne. 23:18

KJV: "Their bows also shall"

BM: "Their bows shall also"

A change in style, not affecting the meaning. (N)

13:22 = 2 Ne. 23:22

BM adds to the end of the vs.: "For I will destroy her speedily; yea, for I will be merciful unto my people, but the wicked shall perish." (Cf. Rev. 18:2ff) The last portion of the vs. is rendered by LXX *taXu erXetai kai ou Xroniei*, "quickly shall it be done and shall not be delayed", which partially confirms BM. IQIsa adds *cwd* ("more, still, yet") to the end of the verse, and while it does not give support to BM it shows some variation at this point. It is possible that the vs. ending, which BM retains, was dropped in MT by haplography, for it would begin with the word *ky* ("for"), which happens to be the initial word in the next vs. (14:1). Additional evidence that this portion was in the original is to be found in the fact that 14:1 is NOT a logical successor to 13:22 without the addition, which introduces the subject of the Lord's mercy toward Israel. (B)

14:2 = 2 Ne. 24:2

After KJV "to their place", BM adds, "yea, from far unto the ends of the earth; and they shall return to their lands of promise." While MT has simply *'l mqwmm* ("to their place"), IQIsa reads *'l 'dmtm w-'l mqwmm* ("to their land and to their place"), thus agreeing somewhat with BM. One Targum (Codex Reuchlinianus) agrees with MT (*l-'l trhwm*), as does LXX (*eis ton topon auton*). However, another Targum (Bibl. Nationale Ms. 1325) lends support to IQIsa and BM by reading *l-'l r<sup>c</sup>hwm* ("to their land"). Note that "their own land" is mentioned in vs. 1. This may have influenced the dropping of our BM phrase from MT through haplography. Moreover, immediately after BM's addition, MT reads, *w-htnh<sup>c</sup>lwm byt ysr<sup>c</sup> l<sup>c</sup>l 'dmt Yhwh*, "And the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord." We are struck not only with the recurrence of "land" (*'l dmh*), but also with the fact that *byt* ("house") closely resembles *bryt* ("covenant"), which may be the "promise" of our BM passage (i.e., the "lands of promise" might be *'rswt h-bryt*; by mere coincidence, this is the modern Hebrew name for "The United States". For the use of the word *bryt* in "promising" the land of Canaan to Abraham,



see Gen. 17:7-10; Ps. 105:8-11. Regarding the "ends of the earth" in our BM passage, see Isa. 45:22; 52:10; Jer. 16:19; Mic. 5:3; Zech. 9:10; Deut. 33:17; 1 Sam. 2:10; Ps. 2:8; 22:28; 59:14; 67:8; 72:8; 98:3; Prov. 30:4. Here, BM has internal evidence as well as versional support. (B)

KJV: "in the land"

BM: "and the land"

This could be a version disagreement. MT has <sup>e</sup>l, "upon" (= LXX *epi*), while IQIsa has 'l, "unto". It is more likely, however, that BM represents a mishearing by the scribe. (L) Note that IQIsa adds *rbym* ("many") after <sup>e</sup>*mym* ("people") at the beginning of the verse.

KJV: "whose captives they were"

BM: "unto whom they were captives"

Both are valid translations of MT *l-šbyhm*, "to those who capture them" (or, "to their captors"). BM is more literal in giving "unto", while it departs from a literal translation by its wording "they were", which it took from KJV and re-arranged. Nevertheless, I believe this to be an attempt to render the English more acceptable and hence assign this variation to category (N).

14:3 = 2 Ne. 24:3

KJV "the day" is BM "that day". The difference would indicate that BM had the additional word *h-lw'* ("that") which, while it is not in MT, is found in some Hebrew mss. KJV's wording makes vs. 3 the protasis of vs. 4, which begins with "that". This is possible, for the initial word of vs. 4 is the Hebrew conjunction *w-* (normally translated "and"), which may show just such a syntactic relationship. In fact, it may show such a relationship even when the following apodosis begins with *w-hyh* ("and it shall come to pass") as in BM vs. 4. However, this possibility disappears by the addition of the demonstrative "that" in BM. The original probably read as follows: *w-hyh b-ywm h-lw' w-hnyh Yhwh lk*, "And it shall come to pass in that day that (w-) the Lord shall give thee rest..." We assume

that the first change was the deletion of *w-* (here meaning "that" in the temporal sense of "when" rather than a relative marker "in which" - the latter would be *ky*). It would be a simple deletion since the letter would already have been written by the scribe in the preceding word (*h-lw'*), with just one letter intervening (and perhaps without word-divisions). This would produce a sentence which could read in one of two ways, either "And it shall come to pass in that day, the Lord shall give thee rest..." or, "And it shall come to pass in that day, the Lord's giving of rest (lit., "making rest") to you..." Neither sentence is without its problems. But without the demonstrative *h-lw'* (easily dropped by haplography, since it begins with the same letters as the two words between which it is situated), it becomes, "And it shall come to pass in the day of the Lord's giving you rest" (or, as in KJV's more idiomatic English, "when the Lord shall give you rest"). This leaves us without a complete sentence unless we continue on to vs. 4, which then dropped its beginning as redundant (see below). BM is supported in this respect by LXX also, which reads *en tē hēmera ekeinē*, "in that day". In prophecy, "that day" (see also vs. 4) often refers to the "day of the Lord" and is so read throughout much of the Bible. (B)

14:4 = 2 Ne. 24:4

BM adds at the beginning, "And it shall come to pass in that day..." This is a repeat from the preceding verse. If the changes took place in vs. 3 as we have speculated, then this would of necessity have been dropped from vs. 4 of MT to make it the apodosis of vs. 3. MT begins with the conjunction *w-* (= LXX *kai*), but the rest is missing. Some LXX mss. support the BM version by adding here *en tē hēmera ekeinē*, "in that day". (B)

14:5 = 2 Ne. 24:5

BM deletes KJV "and" between "wicked" and "scepters". (I)

14:8 = 2 Ne. 24:8

BM adds "also" before "the cedars", without changing the meaning. The verse begins with the Hebrew *gm*, "also" (here translated "yea" by KJV). It is likely that, since the "cedars of Lebanon" parallels "the fir-trees", both originally had *gm*, which BM retained while MT lost it. BM has support from some LXX mss. which have *kai* in both places. (B)

14:11 = 2 Ne. 24:11

KJV's "*and*" before "the noise" is deleted in BM. (I)

After the words "noise of thy viols", BM adds "is not heard". This is unsupported by MT and the versions, being perhaps understood. (K)

14:12 = 2 Ne. 24:12

BM deletes KJV "*How*" before "art thou cut down". In this it is followed by MT and LXX which, though they have the word at the beginning of the verse, do not repeat it here. This is, however, probably not a case of version support, but, rather, another example of how Joseph Smith deleted KJV italicized words which he knew were not part of the Hebrew original. (I)

BM changes KJV "didst" to did". (N)

14:13 = 2 Ne. 24:13

KJV's "thine" is changed to "thy" before "heart" in BM. (N)

14:16 = 2 Ne. 24:16

KJV: "*and* consider thee, *saying*"

BM: "and shall consider thee, and shall say"

BM properly rendered "shall consider thee" as future, as in the Hebrew MT. (F) But the verb "to say" is missing from MT and must be understood, though there is a possibility that it became lost from the original. (J)

14:17 = 2 Ne. 24:17

KJV: "*that* made...and destroyed...*that* opened not"

BM: "and made...and destroyed...and opened not"

In this case, BM has chosen to alter the KJV style (but not the meaning) by changing the italicized words. (J)

14:18 = 2 Ne. 24:18

KJV's "*even*" is replaced by "yea" in BM. (J)

14:19 = 2 Ne. 24:19

KJV: "and *as* the raiment"

BM: "and the remnant"

MT fully backs KJV and hence the change from "raiment" to "remnant" is probably a scribal mishearing (or a misreading of the handwritten ms. by the printer). (L) However, it is interesting to note that LXX has a third reading: *meta pollōn tetnēkoion*, "with the multitude of the slain". The explanation of scribal or printer error is, nevertheless, the simplest and most logical in this case. Moreover, the Israelites did not practice the burning of corpses, though the burning of the possessions of a deceased person is a widespread custom in the ancient world. As for the deletion of KJV's italicized "*as*", we have seen it before. (I)

14:21 = 2 Ne. 24:21

KJV "iniquity" appears in BM in the plural, "iniquities". The MT word is singular, but probably in a collective sense. BM is here supported by LXX, which also has the plural, *tais hamartias*. (B)(p)

14:27 = 2 Ne. 24:27

BM deletes KJV "*it*" after "annul". The word is understood in MT. (I)

BM 1830 (= RLDS) deletes KJV "*is*" after "hand", but this was returned in later editions. Cf. 9:12, 17, 21; 10:4. (I)

14:32 = 2 Ne. 24:32

KJV: "What shall *one* then answer the messengers"

MT: "What shall then answer the messengers"

Here, we have KJV = MT (*w-mh y<sup>c</sup>nh*) but BM = IQIsa (*w-mh y<sup>c</sup>nw*), and hence it is more than a case of simple deletion of an italicized KJV word. Though "messengers" can be the subject of even the singular verb in MT (e.g., Kaiser, p. 50 & note f), it is interesting to note that IQIsa makes it unambiguous by changing the verb to plural. LXX reads, *kai ti apokritēsontai basileis etnōn*, "and what shall the kings of the nations answer?" The Targum reads similarly, agreeing with LXX and IQIsa on *młky* ("kings of") instead of the similar *mł'ky* ("messengers of"). In fact, of all the versions, only MT/KJV and BM have "kings". Perhaps the change to "kings" was made before BP was written, or perhaps Joseph Smith did not think it necessary to make the change (or didn't know). In any event, BM is partially supported by the versions, and is most certainly supported in the one point where it disagrees with KJV/MT. (B)

Parts of Isaiah 28 and 29 are interspersed throughout 2 Ne. 25-29 (and elsewhere) as follows:

28:10 or 13	2 Ne. 28:30a
29:3	2 Ne. 26:15b
29:4	2 Ne. 26:15c-16
29:4, 11	2 Ne. 27:6-9ff
29:5	2 Ne. 26:18
29:6	2 Ne. 6:15
29:6-10	2 Ne. 27:2-5
29:11-12	2 Ne. 27:15b-19
29:13	2 Ne. 28:14b
29:13-14	2 Ne. 27:25-35
29:13, 15	2 Ne. 28:9
29:14	2 Ne. 29:1
29:14 + 49:22	1 Ne. 22:8
11:11 + 29:14	2 Ne. 25:1
29:21	2 Ne. 28:16a

Some of these are direct quotes (often with variations), followed by commentary, while others are paraphrases (also with commentary in many cases). Some critics have attacked Joseph Smith, saying that he deliberately altered Isa. 29 in 1 Ne. 27 in order to back his own story (e.g., Martin Harris' visit to Prof. Anthon, as recorded in JS-H 1:63-65). But a careful reading of 2 Nephi 27 will reveal that this is not a transcription of Isaiah 29, but, rather, a *midrash* or scriptural commentary. After quoting Isaiah chapters 2-14 (2 Ne. chapters 12-24), Nephi proposes to "speak somewhat concerning the words which I have written which have been spoken by the mouth of Isaiah. For behold, Isaiah spake many things which were hard for many of my people to understand... (but) because the words of Isaiah are not plain unto you, nevertheless they are plain unto all those that are filled with the spirit of prophecy..." (2 Ne. 25:1, 4) The subsequent verses outline his intention to pursue the matter, giving Isaiah's prophecies meaning by use of his own revelations and prophecies. Thus, in 2 Ne. 26:15-16, 18, he paraphrases Isa. 29:3-5, then comments on the passages, while drawing another paraphrase from Isa. 55:1 (vs. 25). As we have said, the *midrash* continues into chapters 27 and 28. Because many of his Isaiah quotes are paraphrased and intermingled with his own thoughts in these chapters, it should not be surprising to see the BM version of Isaiah 29 quite at variance with KJV. Nephi and some of the other prophets of the Book of Mormon were fully aware of the purpose for which they were making their record. They knew of Joseph Smith's future mission, and it is by no means accidental that Nephi here refers in part to that mission, by drawing upon the prophecies of Isaiah.

Having laid this foundation, let us now continue with an examination of the Isaiah variants in the Book of Mormon.

28:10 or 13 = 2 Ne. 28:30a

Cf. D&C 50:24; 93:20. Paraphrase only. (Q)

may have come about because of the abbreviation for Ariel, which was misunderstood. Nevertheless, because BM follows the versions in giving a variant form ("Zion") which corresponds to the name of Jerusalem, it is more likely that the original abbreviation was in the Hebrew text. (G)

29:8 = 2 Ne. 27:3b

Nephi's quote is almost identical to KJV and the few variants do not change the meaning. This passage is found in conjunction with Isa. 6:10 in Rom. 11:8. The variants here are probably due to paraphrasis. (Q)

29:9-10 = 2 Ne. 27:4-5

This, too, is paraphrase, with change of person. Nephi is apparently speaking to his future audience. IQIsa has some problems at this point, but is of no assistance in clarifying BM. (Q)

29:11 = 2 Ne. 27:15b-18; 27:6-9ff

Having arrived at that portion of Isaiah's prophecy which deals specifically with the Nephite record, Nephi has much to add in the way of commentary here. The first part of the vs. is deleted from BM and it is this part which reads differently in some of the Greek and Latin mss. (Q)

29:12 = 2 Ne. 27:19

This vs., too, is paraphrased. KJV reads, "And the book is delivered", in agreement with MT *w-ntn h-spr* and LXX *kai dotēsetai to biblion*. But BM changes the passive to active ("the Lord God will deliver again the book"). IQIsa also has the active (as in vs. 11): *w-ntnw h-spr*, "And they shall deliver the book." But IQIsa does not have the accusative marker 't, which should normally appear if "the book" is the direct object instead of the subject of a passive verb. Moreover, whereas MT has <sup>e</sup>l ("upon"), IQIsa has 'l ("unto"). KJV reads, "And he saith", while BM makes it future, "And the man shall say". BM is justified by MT *w-'mr* and LXX *kai erei*. However, IQIsa apparently makes it past tense, *w-yw'mr*. (Q)

29:3-5 = 2 Ne. 26:15b-18 (vss. 4 + 11 also paraphrased in 2 Ne. 27:6-9ff)

This passage is a paraphrase, interspersed with Nephi's own words (e.g., vs. 17, which is not in KJV or any other Isaiah version).

Few judgments can therefore be made regarding this passage.

However, there is one change of particular interest in Isa. 29:5:

KJV: "the multitude of thy strangers"

BM: "those who have been destroyed"

MT reads *zryk*, "thy strangers" (which Kaiser - p. 263, note e - emends to read *zrym*, "strangers"). But IQIsa has *zryq*, the meaning of which is unknown (perhaps nonsensical and a scribal error). LXX deletes one occurrence of "multitudes" and replaces the other by *ploutos tōn asebōn*, "wealth of the unholy ones", thus destroying a parallelism. There is therefore some confusion on this matter in the versions. (G)

29:6 = 2 Ne. 27:1 (also 2 Ne. 6:15)

Here, as throughout, Nephi paraphrases, changing from second person (KJV "thou") to third person (BM "they"). The quote in 2 Ne. 6:15 is also a paraphrase, listing backward the items found in 2 Ne. 27:2. (P)

29:7 = 2 Ne. 27:3a

Continuing the paraphrase, BM deletes KJV "the multitude of". It also deletes the words "even all that fight against her and her munition". But, more important for our study is the fact that KJV "Ariel" is changed to "Zion" in BM. At first glance, this seems unwarranted, since IQIsa also has the *'ry'l* of MT. However, a check of LXX discloses that most LXX Mss. give *Israēl* (abbreviated *iēl*, which resembles "Ariel"). We find "Jerusalem" (*Hierousalēm*, abbreviated *ilēm*) in the greater part of the Hexapla and the Lucian Mss., being perhaps a later variant. The original of LXX may have had *Ariēl*, which is "found only in the Syrohexapla, in the closely kindred codex 88, Rome tenth cent., (= 01) and in Hieronymus." (Seeligman, p. 10) The other variants in LXX mss.



29:13 = 2 Ne. 27:25; 28:9, 14b

Here BM is almost identical to KJV in 2 Ne. 27:25, while 2 Ne. 28 (which adds Isa. 29:15) is more paraphrase. But there are some few variations to note in 2 Ne. 27. KJV "near" is "near unto" in BM, which is like the Isaiah quote in Matt. 15:8, "nigh unto me". (F)

The nouns "heart" and "precept" become plural in BM. MT has *lbw*, lit., "his heart", probably to be understood as collective. As for MT *mšwt*, depending upon which vowels are added, one may read it as singular or plural, "precept(s)". Note that the word is plural in the quotes found in Matt. 15:9; Mark 7:7; Col. 2:22; Tit. 1:14. (E)

The change from "toward" to "towards" is stylistic. (N)

KJV and BM agree on the wording "have removed their heart(s)" (= MT *w-lbw rḥq*, lit., "and his heart is far"). But IQIsa differs at this point, reading, *w-lbw rḥwq mmy*, "and his heart is far from me." (LXX reads similarly, *hē de kardia autōn porrō apeXeī ap'emou*, "and their heart is held far from me.") The Qumran and LXX versions agree more nearly with the same scripture as quoted elsewhere ("their hearts are far from me"), i.e., JS-H 1:19; Matt. 15:8; Mark 7:6. (Q) ?

their?  
where?

29:14 = 2 Ne. 27:26 (also 1 Ne. 14:7; 22:8; 2 Ne. 25:17; 29:1)

All of these are paraphrased. The paraphrase in 1 Ne. 22:8 also adds elements from Isa. 49:22. (Q)

29:15-20 = 2 Ne. 27:27-31 (vss. 13b + 15 also paraphrased in 2 Ne. 28:9)

Again, these are paraphrased. (Q)

29:21 = 2 Ne. 27:32; 28:16a

Both a paraphrase, though not identical. (Q) What follows, however (29:22-24 = 2 Ne. 33-35) is not paraphrased and represents in BM an exact quote from KJV.

40:3 = 1 Ne. 10:8

Paraphrased. Cf. Matt. 3:3; 11:10; D&C 65:1; 88:66; 128:20. (Q)

45:18 = 1 Ne. 17:36

Paraphrased. (Q)

48:1 = 1 Ne. 20:1

KJV: " Hear ye this"

BM: "Hearken and hear this"

While there is no difference in meaning, yet BP appears to have had an additional imperative, Heb. *h' zyruw*. (K)

KJV "which" (= 1830) appears twice in this vs. and is changed in BM to "who" (= RLDS) in an attempt to update the language. (O)

BM adds, after "Judah", the words "or out of the waters of baptism". This is not found in 1830 or RLDS. Hugh Nibley says of it, "It is said that Parley P. Pratt suggested the phrase, and certainly Joseph Smith approved it, for it stands in all the early editions after the first." (*Since Cumorah*, p. 151) Actually, the phrase should appear in parentheses, since it is not a translation from the Nephite record but, rather, a modern commentary which explains Isaiah's words. (O)

KJV's "but" is lengthened in BM to "yet they swear". The emendation would read, in Hebrew, *l' nšb<sup>c</sup>ym*. It could have been readily lost through haplography due to the fact that the next two phrases begin with the negative particle *l'*. But, since the evidence is less clear on this, we shall relegate it to category (K).

48:2 = 1 Ne. 20:2

There are a number of changes here, none of which find outside support (cf. Mic. 3:11 and Rom. 2:17).

KJV's introductory word, "For" is BM "Nevertheless". It probably involves a change from *ky* to *w-* (cf. vs. 9). (K)

KJV: "and                      stay themselves"

BM: "but they do not stay themselves"

From a logical point-of-view, either fits into the vs., though they are contradictory statements. To MT Hebrew, we need merely add the word *l'* (see below) to get the BM meaning. (K)

After "Israel", BM adds "who (= RLDS; 1830 has "which") is the Lord of Hosts; yea..." To the reader of English, it mayh seem presumptuous to suppose that MT could have lost words in three different places in this verse. However, these words and those of the preceding example ("but they do not") represent, in Hebrew, but three words, which could be written one after another in the Hebrew text, to complete the phrase as follows: *w-<sup>c</sup>l 'lhy ysr' l Yhwh sb'wt l' nsmkw*, lit., "and upon the God of Israel, the Lord of hosts, they do not lean." This does not change the word-order of MT, but merely inserts the three underlined words, giving us the reading in BM. The missing portion was perhaps lost by haplography because its first two words complete the first. However, since this is only a guess, we must classify this variant as (K).

48:3-4 = 1 Ne. 20:3-4

BM adds "Behold" to the beginning of vs. 3. The word may have been lost from MT because it (*hnh*) begins with the same letter as the word which followed it. But since haplography cannot be proven by other supportive documents or internal evidence, we must classify this as (K).

KJV: "and I shewed them; I did                      them suddenly, and they came to

BM: "and I showed them; I did show them suddenly. And I

KJV: pass." Because..."

BM: did it because..."

(Note that 1830 & RLDS have "shewed" like KJV. (0) The "show" added after "did" was "shew" in 1830. (0))

This seemingly great problem is easily explained by a comparison of the two Hebrew texts behind the English versions cited:

MT (like KJV):  $w-\dot{s}my^c pt'm \quad \dot{c}syty \quad w-tb'nh. \quad m-\dot{d}^c ty \quad ky...$

BP (probably):  $w-\dot{s}my^c pt'm. \quad \dot{c}syty \quad m-\dot{d}^c ty \quad ky...$

By deleting a single word from MT, we have the presumed BP reading, which translates into BM with only one "show". Note that, instead of MT  $m-\dot{d}^c ty$  (lit., "from my knowing"), IQIsa reads  $m-\dot{s}r \quad \dot{y}d^c ty$ , lit., "from which I knew" (i.e., "because I knew") (the dots are on the scroll, probably having been added by a later scribe to show that these letters were not found in other texts available to him). The idea of "coming to pass" is found also in Isa. 42:9, but is missing from similar passages (e.g., Isa. 41:22; 43:9; 44:7-8; 45:21; 56:9-10). LXX here reads *kai akouston egento*, following MT. BM is without support and it may be that BP (or its copy in the Nephite BM) deleted the one word which is missing. (K)

In vs. 4, KJV "is" became "was" in 1830 (= RLDS), but was later recorrected to "is". (M)

48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5

BM adds "And" to the beginning of the verse. Though the conjunction is not in KJV, it is in MT ( $w-\dot{s}gyd$ ), making BM a better translation from MT. (A)

BM deletes the KJV "it" after "declared" (I) and changes the same italicized word after "showed" to the plural "them". (J) It then adds "and I showed them for fear", which has no versional support. (K) In the latter, as also in the part preceding it, 1830 has "shewed", agreeing in the first with KJV where BM changed these... Another spelling change was "shouldest" (KJV/1830) to "shouldst"

48:6 = 1 Ne. 20:6

KJV: "Thou hast                heard, see"

BM: "Thou hast seen and heard"

Properly, the second verb in MT (= KJV) is an imperative form. However, BM makes just as much sense in translation as KJV. Indeed, Kittel proposed a correction in MT to *hzyt*, "thou hast seen", which corresponds to BM. (F)

As in vs. 5, KJV "*it*" is changed to plural "*them*" after "declared". (J)

BM adds "and that" before KJV "I have shewed" (= 1830, RLDS; BM has "showed" (0)). The loss of Heb. *w-ky* in MT would have been simple, since the word preceding it ends in *-w*. But there is versional support as well, from LXX, which reads *alla kai*. (B)

48:7 = 1 Ne. 20:7

BM adds, after "heardest them not", the words "they were declared unto thee", which would be *hgdw lk* in Hebrew. There is no versional support. (K)

48:8 = 1 Ne. 20:8

KJV's "yea" reflects MT *gm*, while BM's "yea and" is the same as IQIsa *w-gm*. (B)

BM deletes KJV "*that*" after "time". (I)

48:9 = 1 Ne. 20:9

BM adds to the beginning "Nevertheless". This is apparently the conjunction *w-*, which has no versional support but would be easy to lose from the Hebrew text. Cf. also vs. 2. (K)

1830 changed KJV "name's" to "name", but this was corrected in subsequent editions. (M)

48:10 = 1 Ne. 20:10

BM adds to the beginning, "For", without changing the meaning. The word would be a short one (either *w-* or *ky*), easily lost, but has no versional support. (K)

After "thee", BM deletes KJV "but not with silver". The idea may have been suggested to MT by Ps. 66:10 (see also Zech. 13:9; cf. 1 Pet. 1:6-7). (H)

48:11 = 1 Ne. 20:11

KJV's "even" became "yea" in BM, while "it" became "this". (J)

KJV: "for how should *my name* be polluted"

BM: "for I will not suffer my name to be polluted"

KJV here follows MT, *ky 'yk yhl* (without "my name"), which finds agreement in LXX (*to emon onoma bebeloutai* - which does have "name"), as also in the Old Latin version. But several versions have the verb in first person:

IQIsa: *'y<sup>ky</sup>kh 'yhl* (the superscription is on the scroll)

V: *ut non blasphemet* (prob. read from *'hl*)

T, one ms. has: *d-l' ythl* (3rd person)

another has: *d-l' 'thl* (1st person)

Peshitta: *d-l' 'tṭws* (1st person, apparently translated from Heb. *'hl*)

Thus BM has good support from the versions. (B) See Ezek. 39:7, where KJV reads, "I will not *let them* pollute my holy name any more", from the Hebrew (MT) *w-l' 'hl 't šm qdšy 'wd*. Cf. Ezek. 20:9.

48:12 = 1 Ne. 20:12

BM adds "for" before "I *am* he", with no change in meaning, nor any versional support. (K) Again, this could be a small word (*w-* or *ky*), easily omitted in MT.

KJV: " I also *am* the last"

BM: "and I am also the last"

The change in word order is for style. The addition of "and" appears to be for the same reason (LXX has the conjunction, but it evidently translates MT *gm*, "also", and is hence not supportive). (N)

48:13 = 1 Ne. 20:13

KJV: "*when* I call unto them"

1830: "and I called unto them"

BM: " I call unto them"

BM 1830 is probably a scribal error; the scribe probably misheard "and" for "*when*" and "called" for "call". In subsequent editions, "and" was dropped (having replaced a KJV italicized word) and "called" changed back to "call". This is significant because it was a deliberate action on the part of Joseph Smith and because this is exactly the way MT reads (*qr' 'ny 'lyhm*).

KJV: " they stand up"

BM: "and they stand up"

Here, KJV follows MT (*y<sup>c</sup>mdw*), while BM follows IQIsa, which also has the conjunction (*w-y<sup>c</sup>mdw*). The conjunction is also found in LXX (*kai*), S and P, giving support to BM. (B)

48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14

KJV's "which" (= 1830) is "who" in BM (= RLDS). (O)

After "things", BM adds "unto them". LXX agrees with this addition (*autois*), but the rest of the vs. in LXX has 2nd person, while MT has 3rd. The original Heb. probably read *hgyd 't 'lh 'lyhm*, "declared these (things) unto them". But, because of the close resemblance between *'lh* ("these (things)") and *'lhm* ("unto them"), the latter was dropped by haplography. Thus, we have not only version support, but additional evidence that BP is an older source than MT, from internal evidence. (B)

After "loved him", BM adds "yea, and he will fulfill his word which he hath declared by them." There is no support for this. (K)

Immediately after this last addition, BM adds "and" to "he will do". KJV is in agreement with MT (*y<sup>c</sup>śh*), while BM is supported by IQIsa (*w-yśh*, where the scribe forgot the letter <sup>c</sup>). (B)

KJV: "his arm *shall be* on"

BM: "his arm shall come upon"

We have already seen KJV "to be" verbs changed into BM "to come" (2:12; 3:6; esp. see the latter for details). There is no change in meaning here. (J)

48:15 = 1 Ne. 20:15

KJV: I *even* I have spoken"

BM: "Also, saith the Lord; I the Lord, yea, I have spoken"

An addition unsupported elsewhere. (K) The change of the KJV italicized word is normal for BM. (J)

After "I have called him", BM adds "to declare" (Heb. *l-hgyd*). IQIsa relegates the pronominal suffix to the next word as conjunction (*w-*), while LXX deletes it. There is no version support here, however. (K)



48:16 = 1 Ne. 20:16

After "unto me", BM deletes KJV "hear ye this". It is there in MT ( $\text{šm}^c w z' t$ ). But both IQIsa and LXX add the conjunction to the verb. BM receives no support here. (K)

KJV: "it was there *am* I ; and now..."

BM: "it was declared have I spoken; and..."

BM probably has two scribal errors here. Firstly, "declared" (which sounds very much like "there", which it replaces) was probably added because of the scribe's recent recording of the word "declared" in vss. 3, 5 and 7. MT and IQIsa both have the word "there" ( $\text{šm}$ ), as does LXX (*ekei*). The second scribal error is in the omission of "now" after "and"; it, too, is there in MT and IQIsa ( $w^c th$ ). (L) There is no version support for BM's "have I spoken", which replaces KJV "*am* I". (J) BM also deletes KJV "hear ye this" after "unto me", again without support. (K)

48:17 = 1 Ne. 20:17

BM adds "And" at the beginning, without support. (K)

KJV: "I *am* the Lord"

BM: "I have sent him, the Lord"

BP may have contained  $\text{šlhtyw}$  ("I have sent him") to provide this meaning, but there is no support for it. (K)

Twice, KJV's "which" (= 1830) became BM "who" (= RLDS). (O)

BM deletes "*that*" of KJV after "the way". (I)

BM adds to the end, without support, "hath done it". (K)

48:20 = 1 Ne. 20:20

KJV: "utter it *even* to"

BM: "utter to"

MT reads *hwšy'wh* and hence has the pronominal direct object not found in BM and probably deleted through scribal error. Though both the verb and its pronominal suffix are missing from IQIsa, this is not to be considered versional support, since the Qumran text appears to also be corrupt. (L) The deletion of KJV "*even*" is normal. (I)

48:21 = 1 Ne. 20:21

BM deletes KJV "*when*" before "he led". (I)

KJV "clave" was corrected to "cleaved" in 1830 (a stylistic preference), but later revised by BM (= RLDS) to "clave". (M)

48:22 = 1 Ne. 20:22

BM adds to the beginning, "And notwithstanding he hath done all this, and greater also..." This is not found in any of the versions. However, LXX adds to the end of vs. 21, *kai pietai ho laos mou*, "and my people drank". Thus both BM and LXX add material between MT/KJV vss. 21-22, though they do not agree on the content. (G)

The word "also", found at the end of the BM addition, probably should be preceded by a comma to show that it belongs with what follows, "there is no peace", rather than with "greater". Indeed, while MT reads *'yn šlwm* (= KJV), IQIsa does add the conjunction, giving us *w-'yn šlwm*, "and there is no peace". BP probably read like IQIsa. (B)

49:1 = 1 Ne. 21:1

BM adds a preface to KJV. Because this preface is in chiasmus, it is good evidence of the authenticity of the BP account, even though there are no supporting facts from the versions. The preface may be outlined as follows:

"And again:

- (A) Hearken, o ye house of Israel
- (B) all ye that are broken off
- (C) and are driven out
- (D) because of the wickedness of the pastors of my people;
- (B') yea, all ye that are broken off
- (C') that are scattered abroad
- (A') Who are of my people, O house of Israel."

The Hebrew of this chiasm would begin with the word  $\sqrt{sm}^o w$ , "hearken", which also begins the section to follow. The loss of the preface in MT was probably due to haplography because of the resemblance of the two parts beginning with the same word. (C)

"Who" in the last line of the preface (= RLDS) was "which" in 1830. (O)  
The ideas contained in the preface are also found in Jer. 10:21; 23:1-4; Ezek. 34:5-8ff. (Regarding the "isles", see the commentary on vs. 8 below.)

49:4 = 1 Ne. 21:4

BM deletes "*yet*" before "surely". (I)

There are two spelling variations here. KJV "laboured" is without "u" in BM. (N) KJV "nought" (= 1830) is spelled "naught" in BM. (O)

49:5 = 1 Ne. 21:5

KJV: *to be* his servant"

BM: "that I should be his servant"

Though both give the same idea, neither is justified in adding the verbal meaning. MT has merely  $l-bd\ lw$ , "for/as a servant for him". With a change in vowelizing from the MT version, this could read "to work for him". It is not supported by the IQIsa text, however, which would have had partial vocalization ( $*l-bwd$ ) if it had understood this to be an infinitive. Moreover, the usual idiom would be  $l-bd\ 'wtw$ , "to serve him". (J)

49:6 = 1 Ne. 21:6

KJV's "shouldest" (= 1830) is spelled "shouldst" in BM. (O)

49:7 = 1 Ne. 21:7

BM deletes "*and*" before "his Holy One". (I)

BM deletes "a" before "servant". Since there is no indefinite article in Hebrew (indefiniteness being the absence of a definite marker), the word is not reflected at all in MT. (F)

KJV "nation" is BM "nations". MT has the singular *gwy*, but LXX has the plural *tōn etnōn*. The Hebrew is perhaps to be understood as a collective or it may be that the original text contained an abbreviation. (E)

BM deletes the KJV ending "*and* the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee." This, however, is found in the versions, though BP may have lost it. (K)

49:8 = 1 Ne. 21:8

After "heard thee", BM adds "o isles of the sea". This is not in MT nor in the quote of this vs. in 2 Cor. 6:2. Isaiah does, however, make frequent reference to the "isles" (23:2, 6; 24:15; 40:15; 41:5; 42:4, 10; 49:1; 51:5; 60:9; 66:19). MT perhaps dropped *'yy h-ym* ("isles of the sea") because *ym* ("sea") resembles the next word, *b-ym*, "in a day". Indeed, this would have been an easy deletion in an earlier Hebrew text when both words would have been spelled *ym* without vowel. (C)

Before "for a covenant", BM adds "my servant", thus making "thee" the dative rather than the accusative. This is possible by the addition of *ʿbdy* ("my servant") which could have been dropped by haplography because it closely resembles the next word, *l-bryt* ("for a covenant"). The last three letters of *ʿbdy* are, in the Hebrew script, like the first three letters of *bryt* in form (two

are identical), and confusions often occur concerning such in the Bible itself. The expression "my servant" is very common in Isaiah and hence to be expected (see 20:3; 22:20; 37:35; 41:8, 9; 42:1 - cf. 42:6 with 49:8 here - 42:19; 43:10; 44:1, 2, 21; 49:3, 16; 52:13; 53:11). (C)

49:9 = 1 Ne. 21:9

KJV: "to them that *are* in darkness"

BM: "to them that sit in darkness"

MT reads ל־שֵׁר בְּחֹשֶׁךְ, which is followed by various mss. of T and by IQIsa as well as LXX. I propose that the original read as Isa. 42:7 (which see for comparison with this vs.), ל־יֹשְׁבֵי חֹשֶׁךְ ("to those who sit in darkness", lit., "to the sitters/dwellers of darkness"). By scribal error, the Hebrew letter YOD (smallest in the alphabet), which occurs at the beginning of the first word, could have been either deleted or not copied because it was damaged at that pin-prick on the scroll (a frequent occurrence in, e.g., the Dead Sea Scrolls). This would have given ל־שֵׁב חֹשֶׁךְ, written (because there were no word divisions in early Hebrew writing) ל־שְׁבִחֶשֶׁךְ (the second YOD, as a diphthong, would not have been written at some stages in the history of Hebrew, and it may also have easily disappeared because of its small size). Since Hebrew ל־שֵׁב־בְּחֹשֶׁךְ would be "to those who are in darkness", the text would then have given the KJV meaning. However, in place of the שֵׁ-, MT has the longer form, שֵׁר (both words are the relative marker and can be translated as "which" or "who"). The idea of "sitting" in the darkness is also found in Matt. 4:16 and Luke 1:79 which, however, are quotes from Isa. 9:2 (where we find "walk"). BP's antiquity is evidenced here by internal points as well as by the fact that its rendering is expected in Hebrew. (C)

49:10 = 1 Ne. 21:10

KJV "sun" is BM "the sun". LXX has the article for both this and for "heat", but this is necessary to the Greek. The unattributed Isaiah quote in Rev. 7:16 also has "the sun", but its original is also Greek. MT has the pair שֵׁרֵב וְשֶׁמֶשׁ, "heat and sun", which go together without

article in Hebrew. English is better with the article, but this is merely an attempt at updating the language, with no real change in meaning. (Note that "heat" has the article in both KJV and BM, though not in MT. In this respect, BM is more consistent, though the KJV article may be construed as applying to both nouns.) (N)

49:12 - 1 Ne. 21:12

BM adds to the beginning, "And then, O house of Israel." The versions do not support this. (K)

49:13 = 1 Ne. 21:13

After "O earth", BM adds "for the feet of those who are in the east shall be established." (In 1830, "those who" was "them which", an expression later changed in BM and RLDS. (O)) There is no version support for the addition. (K)

After "o mountains", BM adds, "for they shall be smitten no more." This is not found in MT. At this point, LXX also disagrees with MT, though it does not support BM: *hrēksatōsan ta orē eufrosunēn kai hoi bounoi dikaiosunēn*, "let the mountains break out in jubilation, and the hills in righteousness." (G)

49:14 = 1 Ne. 21:14

KJV: "But Zion said"

BM: "But, behold, Zion hath said"

BM's "behold" is not found in MT or the versions. (K) The addition of "hath" does not change the meaning. (F)

BM adds to the end, "but he will show (1830 "shew") that he hath not." This is not found in the versions. (K) (The spelling change is category (O).)

49:15 - 1 Ne. 21:15

The addition of "For" at the beginning in BM is for style only. (K) The Hebrew would have been a small word, *ky*, possibly lost from a text predating MT but not necessarily so.

BM adds at the end, "O house of Israel" (in a similar passage, Ps. 137:5 adds "O Jerusalem"). LXX also adds at this point, but not in agreement with BM: *eipen kurios*, "says the Lord". It is possible that an earlier text had contained an abbreviation, either *b"y* (for *byt Ysr'l*, "house of Israel") or *'"y* (for *'mr Yhwh*, "says the Lord"). There is evidence for extensive use of both abbreviations in the Hebrew text of the Bible. As to which of the two abbreviations is original, I would opt for that of BM because it has its parallel in the similar passage in Ps. 137:5 (where Jerusalem in Hebrew begins with the same letter as Israel). (G)

49:18 - 1 Ne. 21:18

KJV "come" is BM "they shall come". MT is backed by LXX aorist *ēltosan*. However, MT *b'w* was probably originally *w-b'w*, like BM, "and they shall come". The conjunction would have been dropped by haplography because the preceding word (*nqbsw*) ends in the same letter. BP appears to be older here, though it is, of course, possible that BP reduplicated the letter. (C) The English rendering of BM might be considered better, though KJV is more literal as a translation from MT.

BM adds "and" before "*as I live*", without a change in meaning. It may have been on BP, but it is more likely either a scribal over-correction ("and" and "*as*" sound alike) or a modification of a KJV italicized word to two words ("*and as*"). (J)

In KJV's "bind them *on thee* as a bride *doeth*", BM deletes the italicized "*doeth*" (I) and substitutes "on even" for italicized "*on thee*". (J)

Cf. this vs. with Isa. 60:4, which is a variant (this part is identical with 49:18, above, in MT).

49: 20 = 1 Ne. 21:20

KJV (= 1830) "which" was later changed in BM (= RLDS) to "whom". (O)

KJV's "other" (= 1830) was later changed to read "first" in BM (= RLDS). There is no real change in meaning here. Moreover, the first half of the verse ("The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other/first") is taken from MT *bny skwlyk*, which means, simply, "the sons/children of thy childishness". Thus BM is just as valid as KJV here. (O)

BM has also reworded KJV's "shall say again" to read "shall again... say". (N)

KJV's "strait" was spelled "straight" in 1830 and corrected in subsequent editions. (M)

49:21 = 1 Ne. 21:21

KJV: "where *had* they been"

BM: "where have they been"

No change in meaning here. (J)

49:22 = 1 Ne. 21:22; 22:6, 8

While 1 Ne. 21:22 reads the same as KJV, the vss. in 1 Ne. 22 are paraphrases. (Q) (P) 1 Ne. 22:8 apparently also incorporates Isa. 29:14. Cf. D&C 4:1.

49:23 = 1 Ne. 21:23; 2 Ne. 6:7

KJV "toward" was changed to "towards" in both BM passages. (N)

KJV "face" remains in the singular in 1 Ne. 21, but is plural in 2 Ne. 6. The Hebrew word, though generally singular in meaning, always has a plural form, and hence it is not possible to know which translation is correct. (E) (P)

Cf. this vs. with Isa. 60:9-16.

49:24 = 1 Ne. 21:24; 2 Ne. 6:16

BM adds "For" at the beginning in both instances. (K)



KJV "captive" is singular in 2 Ne. 6, but plural in 1 Ne. 21. MT has the word in the singular, but it may have a collective meaning and hence both are properly translated. (D) (P) It is possible that an earlier text had an abbreviation, *šb*", which could have been read as singular by one scribe, plural by another.

49:25 = 1 Ne. 21:25; 2 Ne. 6:17

1 Ne. 21 reads like KJV. But 2 Ne. 6 seems to be a paraphrase (as are perhaps the Isa. 50-51 quotes which follow it). It adds, after "delivered", the words, "for the Mighty God shall deliver his covenant people", and then, after "for", it adds, "thus saith the Lord". (Q) It changes the singular "him" to "them" (perhaps a collective idea) (E) and deletes the KJV ending "and I will save thy children". (P) (Q)

49:26 = 1 Ne. 21:26; 2 Ne. 6:18

2 Ne. 6 reads like KJV, except that "Saviour" (= 1830 in both BM passages) has become "Savior" in later BM editions, following the American spelling. (O) But 1 Ne. 21 deletes "and" after "flesh", perhaps a scribal error. (L) (P)

50:1 = 2 Ne. 7:1

BM adds to the beginning, "Yea, for thus saith the Lord: Have I put thee away, or have I cast thee off forever? For..." This passage could easily have been lost in MT because it so closely resembles what follows:

KJV: "divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of  
BM: "divorcement? To whom have I put thee away? or to which of

KJV: my creditors *is it* to whom I have sold you?"  
BM: my creditors have I sold you?"

There is some disagreement here with MT (which LXX follows). The "whom" after divorcement in KJV is, in MT, the relative clause marker and not the interrogative "whom?" as in BM. (While English employs the same word in these two functions, Hebrew has two dif-

ferent words.) The Isaiah passages beginning in 2 Ne. 6:16 (see also the paraphrases of earlier verses in vss. 6-7) and going to the end of chapter 8 are in the middle of a sermon given by Jacob, brother of Nephi. It is likely that much of Jacob's quotation (from memory?) from the Brass Plates are paraphrases, and hence we shall not be held to the wording in our comparisons. (Q) The best evidence that he is paraphrasing is that, where these same Isaiah passages are cited elsewhere in BM, they are not worded the same as in Jacob's speech.

After the quote given above, BM adds (again, no doubt in paraphrase), "Yea, to whom have I sold you?" (Q) Anyone listening to General Conference or other sermons will likewise hear speakers interject such statements in the midst of their scriptural quotations.

50:2 = 2 Ne. 7:2

KJV's "I came" was "I come" in 1830. Apparently a printer's error, picked up from a misreading of the vowel in the handwritten BM ms., it was corrected in subsequent editions, including RLDS. (M)

KJV: "was there... was there..."

BM: "there was...yea, there was..."

The change in the word order is due to a confusion between "wherefore" (interrogative) and "therefore" (consequential). See commentary on 5:4 and category (L). For the idea contained in this passage, cf. Isa. 65:12; 66:4.

BM adds, after "answer", the words "O house of Israel". We have seen such additions elsewhere in the BM text (cf., e.g., 49:15). (K)

KJV: "and their fish stinketh because there is no water

BM: "and their fish to stink because the waters are

KJV: and dieth for thirst."

BM: dried up, and they die of thirst."

There was apparently some confusion in the original over the words *tb'š* (MT), "shall stink", and *tybš* (IQIsa), "shall dry up". V followed MT by reading *computrescent*, while LXX is like IQIsa (*ksērantēsontai*). It would seem that BM picked up both verbs, applying one to the waters (for this idea in Isaiah, see 42:15; 44:27; 50:2), the other for the fish (see Ex. 7:18, 21). It is, of course, possible that the original contained both verbs and that, because they so closely resembled each other, MT lost one of them by haplography (or, of course, BM could have added one by near-dittography). We shall therefore note this as version support for BM. (B)

50:4 = 2 Ne. 7:4

KJV: "that I should know how to speak a word in season *to*

BM: "that I should know how to speak a word in season unto thee,

KJV: *him that is weary*, he waketh..."

BM: O house of Israel. When ye are weary, he waketh..."

Both occurrences of *y<sup>c</sup>yr* ("wake") are preceded by the conjunction (*w-y<sup>c</sup>yr*) in IQIsa. It is possible that BP had *'tm y<sup>c</sup>pm* (becoming *y<sup>c</sup>pym* in later Hebrew spelling), "ye are weary", instead of *'t y<sup>c</sup>p*, the accusative market plus "weary". The change would have meant the dropping of the plural marker *-m* from each word. But there are problems with the word order (esp. the direct object, *dbr*, "word"). Note that other versions (LXX, S and TR) change the subject here. LXX has "to answer", hence Westerman (p. 225) and Kittel read Heb. *l-<sup>c</sup>nwt* instead of MT *l-<sup>c</sup>wt*. The Targum has *l-'<sup>c</sup>lp'*, which would correspond to Heb. *l-r<sup>c</sup>wt*. Each change would involve but one letter. However, all of this is of little consequence, for it would appear that Jacob is here paraphrasing Isaiah, changing from third person to second person in addressing his audience. (Q) The addition of the phrase "O house of Israel" (cf. 49:15; 50:2) appears to be a part of the paraphrase.

50:5 = 2 Ne. 7:5

KJV's "opened" was misunderstood by the BM scribe, who wrote "appointed" (see 1830 = RLDS). This was corrected in subsequent editions. (MT and IQIsa support KJV.) (M)

50:8 = 2 Ne. 7:8

KJV: " *He is near* that justifieth me."

BM: "And the Lord is near, and he justifieth me."

Jacob is again paraphrasing. (Q)

KJV "near to me" is BM "near me", with no change in meaning. (N)

Jacob again paraphrases by adding at the end of the vs., "and I will smite him with the strength of my mouth." The idea seems to have been taken from Isa. 11:4. (Q; cf. also the list in G)

50:9 = 2 Ne. 7:9

This is again paraphrase. BM substitutes "For" for the initial "Behold" and later changes KJV's "lo" into "behold" without affecting the meaning. (Q)

KJV "they all" is changed to "all they" for stylistic purposes. (N)

KJV: "who *is* he *that* shall condemn me?"

BM: "And all they who shall condemn me..."

This is another paraphrase. MT has the interrogative "who?" (*mi*) and not the relative (*šr*). BM changes this from a question to an indicative statement (1830 had "which" instead of "who", though BM and RLDS have the latter. (M)) BM is justified in using "they" instead of "he" even though MT is singular, for MT follows this up by using *kḏm*, "all of them". Again, the important thing is not that BM differs from KJV/MT, but that Jacob was paraphrasing in his discourse. (Q) But note that LXX supports BM in adding "And" (*kai*) before "the moth". This may have been lost from MT, inasmuch as the Hebrew would be a single letter, *w*-. (B)

50:10 = 2 Ne. 7:10

BM deletes, at the end, "let him trust in the name of the LORD, and stay upon his God." It is impossible to know if this deletion is due to Jacob's paraphrasing or if BP lacked this portion of the passage. I would guess that it is a result of the paraphrase. (Q)

50:11 = 2 Ne. 7:11

BM 1830 changed KJV's "kindle" to "kindleth". The plural is called for here ("ye") and hence the change is unwarranted. The mistake was corrected in subsequent editions, incl. RLDS. (M)

BM deletes "a" before "fire" (the indefinite article being non-existent in Hebrew), without a change in meaning. (F)

KJV's "*that*" became "which" in BM. (J)

51:1 = 2 Ne. 8:1

BM deletes KJV "ye that seek the LORD". It is not possible to know whether this is a result of Jacob's paraphrasing or whether BP actually lacked the phrase. I shall venture to guess that it is a result of the paraphrase. (Q)

BM changed KJV "*whence*" to "from whence" in both instances. (J)

51:2 = 2 Ne. 8:2

KJV: "Sarah        *that* bare you"

BM: "Sarah, she that bare you"

Actually, MT has not a participle, but, rather, *thwllkm*, best translated "your progenitress". (J)

51:4 = 2 Ne. 8:4

KJV: "a light        of the people"

1830: "a light thing of the people"

BM: "a light        for the people"

KJV is the best translation from MT. BM 1830 is probably a scribal error (overcorrection). In trying to correct this error, the matter was complicated in BM by the change from "of" to "for" (in which RLDS followed suit). (M)

51:5 = 2 Ne. 8:5

KJV "mine arms" is BM "mine arm". Both would be written the same in Hebrew (MT *zr<sup>e</sup>y*), though MT has the vowel pointing for the plural (vowels were not added until the early Christian era). But, in the second occurrence in this vs., MT has the vowels for singular! IQIsa, with its more complete spelling, has *zrw<sup>e</sup>y*, "mine arm(s)", for the first, and *zrw<sup>e</sup>w*, "his arm" (rather than *zrw<sup>e</sup>yw*, "his arms") for the second. LXX has the singular in both, *ton braXiona*. (E)

51:7 = 2 Ne. 8:7

KJV: "in whose heart *is* my law"  
BM: "in whose heart I have written my law"

Either BP contained the words *ktbt<sup>y</sup> 't* ("I have written" + accusative marker) or Jacob is paraphrasing here. But it is not possible to know which is the correct solution. It is, of course, possible that Joseph Smith was here substituting new phrasing for a KJV italicized word, but less likely because some real substance is added to BM at this point. We shall therefore list this as an unexplained variation. (K)

51:9 = 2 Ne. 8:9

BM deletes KJV "in the generations of old". It is possibly an omission due to paraphrasing. But it is interesting to note that some MT mss. lack *drwt*, "generations". There is, therefore, some version support for BM here. (B)

KJV: "Art thou not it that" (= 1830, RLDS)  
BM: "Art thou not he that"

On this, see the commentary in vs. 10, below. (L)

51:10 = 2 Ne. 8:10

KJV: "Art thou not it which" (= 1830, RLDS)

BM: "Art thou not he who"

Cf. with vs. 9 above. At first glance, one has the impression that this could be solved through the Hebrew. MT reads, in each vs., *h-l' 't hy'*, "art thou not it/she". Vs. 9 in IQIsa has *h-lw' 'th hy'h*. The change from feminine *'t* to masculine *'th* ("thou") would allow the BM translation, assuming, however, that *hy'* ("she, it") were originally *hw'* ("he, it"), which is possible since these two pronouns are frequently confused in the Biblical and Qumran texts (particularly since the middle letters on the two resemble each other in Hebrew script over the past 2,000 year period). However, this would also necessitate changing the subsequent verbs from feminine to masculine in the Hebrew. It is possible that MT could have dropped the final *-h* from *'th* through haplography, especially since the next word begins with the same letter. However, it is more likely that the reverse happened, and that the IQIsa scribe copied this letter twice. This is borne out by the fact that, in vs. 10, IQIsa has *'ty*, which, by its ending, is clearly feminine. Moreover, the subject of these passages is NOT the Lord (which would have to take masculine), but, rather, the "arm of the Lord", which is indeed feminine in Hebrew. The corrections to BM are hence unwarranted, and the 1830 edition is seen as more reliable. (L) The change from "which" to "who" in later editions of BM is in accordance with standard practice in the revision of the BM text. (O)

51:11 = 2 Ne. 8:11

After "joy", BM adds "and holiness". This is no doubt a paraphrase by Jacob; it is lacking in the variant found in Isa. 35:10. (Q)

51:12 = 2 Ne. 8:12

KJV: "I *even* I am he"

BM: "I am he; yea, I am he"

The addition seems to be due to Jacob's paraphrasing rather than to Joseph Smith's replacement of italicized KJV words. (O)

KJV's "a man" became BM "man". Since the indefinite article does not exist in the Hebrew language, both are valid translations from MT. (F)

After "man", KJV has "that". BM 1830 changed this to "which", but it was later corrected to "who" in BM (incl. RLDS). (O)  
After the second occurrence of "man", 1830 retained KJV's "which", but it became "who" in BM and RLDS. (O)

KJV's "as" (before "grass") was changed by BM to "like unto", with no change in meaning. (J)

This same idea is found in Isa. 57:11.

51:15 = 2 Ne. 8:15

KJV has "his name", while BM reads "my name". It is a simple matter of changing the pronominal suffix, from MT *šmō* to *šmī* (these two letters are frequently confused in the Biblical text because of their resemblance one to another). LXX agrees with BM in this instance (*onoma moi*, "my name"), so it is apparently not just a question of paraphrase. (B) The possibility of an abbreviation also exists, but is not the simplest explanation.

51:16 = 2 Ne. 8:16

KJV: "and I have covered"  
BM: "and have covered"

There is no real change in meaning, since, in English, the verb may borrow the "I" of the previous verb. We cannot know for sure whether the scribe accidentally omitted the pronoun in English BM or whether it was an intentional stylistic change. KJV is more literal, though both are valid translations. (F)

BM adds "Behold" before "thou art". This may have been added by Jacob during his discourse, or it may have been in BP. Cf. such small stylistic additions in other places. (K)



51:17 = 2 Ne. 8:17

KJV: "*and* wrung *them* out"

BM: " wrung out"

The deletion of the KJV italicized items follows Joseph Smith's usual practice and makes BM more literal than KJV. (I)

51:18 = 2 Ne. 8:18

KJV: "*There is* none to guide"

BM: "And none to guide"

Though it would appear to be a simple case of italics substitution, it is not so in this case, for BM is supported by LXX (*kai*). It would appear that MT lost the prefixed conjunction *w-*. (B)

BM deletes KJV's "*whom*" following the first occurrence of the word "sons". (I)

BM deletes KJV's "*is there any*" after "neither". (I)

BM deletes KJV's "*that*" following the second occurrence of the word "sons". (I)

51:19 = 2 Ne. 8:19

KJV's "two *things*" reads "two sons" in BM. MT has simply <sup>v</sup>*stym*, the feminine numeral "two". It is hence not possible to admit that the original read "sons". Moreover, the two "things" are then listed in the same verse as "desolation and destruction", then reworded as the parallels "the famine and the sword". On the surface, the substitution of another word for the one italicized in KJV looks like normal procedure for Joseph Smith, but it could also be scribal error. The BM change was probably prompted by the fact that vs. 18 ends by speaking "of all the sons she hath brought up", while vs. 20 begins by speaking of "thy sons". (L)

KJV's "desolation" takes on a possessive pronoun in BM: "thy desolation". It is, of course, possible that the pronominal suffix (-k) could have been lost from MT. But the word does not really fit here, where we have part of the list of the "two things". Moreover, if it had the suffix, we should expect the same for its partner, "destruction", in the Hebrew text, even though, in English, one pronoun could serve both nouns. It is much more reasonable to assume that this is a scribal error, influenced by the word "thee", which immediately precedes it. It may be that Joseph Smith repeated "thee" in his dictation and that it was written down as both "thee" and "thy". (L)

51:20 = 2 Ne. 8:20

After "Thy sons have fainted", BM adds "save these two". The reference seems to be to the "two sons" (instead of KJV's "two things") of vs. 19. The Book of Mormon critics will immediately see in this Joseph Smith's tampering with Isaiah's words. That, of course, is a possibility, when viewed from their point-of-view. However, it is also possible that the changes made in this vs. and in vs. 19 are really to be attributed to Jacob, who is quoting these passages in his discourse. We have already seen how much he paraphrased earlier portions of Isaiah during the same speech. However, not knowing if this be truly paraphrase, we must designate this variant as category (K).

51:21 = 2 Ne. 8:21

BM renders KJV's "but" as "and". Both are valid translations of the Hebrew (MT) conjunction *w-*. BM is actually more literal here. (F)

51:22 = 2 Ne. 8:22

BM deletes KJV's italicized words "*that*" (after "thy God") and "*even*" (before "the dregs"). (I)

51:23 = 2 Ne. 8:23

BM 1830 retained KJV's "which". However, it was changed to "who" in later editions, incl. RLDS. (O)

52:1 = 2 Ne. 8:24; 3 Ne. 20:36; Moro. 10:31a

The passage in Moroni is a paraphrase which also draws from Isa. 54:2. (Q) In the quotation from Isa. 52:1, it switches the order of "Jerusalem" and "Zion". The quote in 3 Ne. is also a paraphrase, which adds "again, and" after "Awake, awake". (Q) Jacob's quote in 2 Ne. is identical to KJV. (P)

In the passage as quoted in Moroni 10, we have "and arise", which corresponds to IQIsa *w-qwmy*, as opposed to MT (= KJV) *qwmy*, "arise". Note that LXX agrees here, with *kai anastēti*. This may be mere coincidence, however, inasmuch as Moroni is quite a departure from KJV. (P)

52:2 = 2 Ne. 8:25; 3 Ne. 20:37; Moro. 10:31b

BM (2 Ne. and 3 Ne.) deletes "and" before "sit down". The word is not found in MT, but it is in IQIsa and LXX. The deletion is because of the italics. (I) ~~The conjunction is retained in Moro. (C)~~

52:3 = 3 Ne. 20:38

KJV "nought" is spelled "naught" in BM. (N)

52:6 = 3 Ne. 20:39

BM, apparently in a paraphrase, changes the first word (KJV "Therefore") to "Verily, verily, I say unto you that..." (Q) (But note that one of the Hebrew words which may be translated "verily" is *'kn*, which differs in but one letter from *lkn*, "therefore".) The second KJV "therefore" (after "my name") is changed to "yea", a typical BM stylistic change in instances where MT lacks the word which would then be reflected by italics in KJV. In this case, the second "therefore" (MT has *lkn*) is deleted in IQIsa, V and LXX. (B)

BM places "in that day" (MT *b-ywm h-hw'*) immediately after "yea", which is its correct place in the Hebrew of MT. KJV displaces it by the interjection of the phrase "they shall know" (not in MT), which is added to make sense of the text after the introduction by MT of the second *lkn* ("therefore"), which was originally not there (see above). (B)

BM deletes from the end of the KJV wording, "behold, *it is* I." The Hebrew is merely *hnnny* in MT and could easily have been added in error to MT or lost in error to BP. But, more likely, it was deleted in the paraphrase. (Q)

52:7 = 1 Ne. 13:37b; Mos. 12:21; 15:14-18; 3 Ne. 20:40

The passages in 1 Ne. and Mos. 15 are paraphrases which greatly differ from the original text. (Q)

Mos. 12 reads exactly like KJV. But 3 Ne. 20 is paraphrased, though only slightly. It adds to the beginning of the verse, "And then shall they say". It also adds after each occurrence of "tidings" the words "unto them". (Q) IQIsa has some variations on this vs., but none apply here. Cf. Nahum 1:15; Rom. 10:15. See D&C 128:8? (P)

52:8 = Mos. 12:22; 15:29; 3 Ne. 16:18; 20:32-33

3 Ne. 20 is part of Jacob's speech. It begins with the addition of the words "Then shall" (cf. Abinadi's addition, "Yea, Lord", in Mos. 15). The last part of the vs. ("when the Lord shall bring again Zion") is unchanged in all except 3 Ne. 20, where Jesus expands on it as follows (vs. 33): "Then will the Father gather them together again, and give unto them Jerusalem for the land of their inheritance." (Q) (P)

KJV reads "the voice", and is followed by Mos. 12 and 3 Ne. 16. Here, MT has *qwl*, "a voice". The Peshitta agrees with MT, as does LXX by its absence of article and pronoun. Mos. 15 and 3 Ne. 20 both have "their voice", which corresponds perfectly to IQIsa (*qwl m*) and TR (*qwl hum*). For version support, see (B), but concerning the divergency of the BM versions, see (P).

52:9-10 = Mos. 12:23-24; 15:30-31; 3 Ne. 16:19-20; 20:34-35 (vs.

10 = 1 Ne. 22:10-11)

3 Ne. 20 begins, "Then shall they break forth", while the other BM versions follow KJV/MT. (P) This is probably paraphrase, though the word "then" may be reflected in LXX *kai* and IQIsa *w-*, not found in MT. (Q)

3 Ne. 20 substitutes "the Father" for "Lord" and "God" throughout these two verses. Regarding this, see comments below on Isa. 52:11-12. (Q) (P)

Note that, while Mos. 12 and 15 follow KJV's concluding words, "our God", the possessive pronoun is deleted in 3 Ne. 16. The original of this comes from Ps. 98:1, 3 or Ps. 118:14 (cf. Isa. 12:2). (P)

For 52:9, cf. 54:1. Isa. 52:10 is paraphrased in 1 Ne. 22:10-22. (Q) (P) Cf. D&C 133:3?

52:11-12 = 3 Ne. 20:41-42; 21:29

MT is reflected in KJV and 3 Ne. 20, "Lord...God" (vs. 12). 3 Ne. 21 has "I...the Father, I". These are apparently due to paraphrase. (Q) Note, however, that, while IQIsa agrees with MT (*Yhwh* then ' *lwhy Ysr' l*), IQIsb substitutes ' *lwhyraw* ("our God") for *Yhwh* ("Lord"). LXX reads *kurios ho teos Israēl*, "the Lord the God of Israel". The wording has changed to first person in 3 Ne. 21 because it is Jesus speaking. (P)

3 Ne. 21:29 is a paraphrase, which reduces Isa. 52:11 to but a few words and then makes other changes. It is in this paraphrase that Jesus substitutes "the Father" for "the God of Israel". Cf. also the quote of vs. 11 of Isa. 52 in 2 Cor. 6:17, to which is added the following (vs. 18): "And will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." (See Ex. 4:22; Eph. 1:5.) This is the same kind of paraphrase found in 3 Ne. 21:29. (P)

In both BM passages, the spelling of KJV's "rereward" (= 1830) has been changed to "rearword" (also RLDS), in an attempt to update the spelling and probably also to avoid confusion with re-reward. (O)

52:15 = 3 Ne. 20:45; 21:8b (for vs. 15b only)

BM 1830 deleted the word "not" in 3 Ne. 20, though it is found in all other versions. BM deletes "at him" in 3 Ne. 21, though it is found in the others. These are perhaps scribal or printer's errors. (L) (P)

53:2 = Mos. 14:2

BM deletes "a" before "dry ground". Since there is no indefinite article in Hebrew, both read equally well as translations from MT. (F)

53:3 = Mos. 14:3

KJV "*our* faces" (= 1830) was later changed to read "our face" (BM and RLDS). Though all have the possessive pronoun "our", it is not there in the MT, being understood. The Hebrew word (*pnym*), though singular in meaning, has a grammatical plural form which is invariable. Thus either translation is correct. LXX happens to have the singular, supporting BM. The change from plural to singular is likely due to the fact that, in later times, Joseph Smith had learned enough Hebrew to know that this word, though plural in form, most often had a singular meaning. (O)

53:4 = Mos. 14:4

BM changes the archaic KJV "hath" (= 1830) to more modern "has" (also RLDS). (O)

53:6 = Mos. 14:6

KJV "iniquity" is plural in BM, "iniquities". MT has *ʿwn* which, while singular in form, may be used in a collective sense. Note that LXX has the plural (*tais amartias*), agreeing with BM. (E)  
Cf. Isa. 53:12.

53:7 = Mos. 14:7; 15:6b

While Mos. 14 is identical to KJV, it is paraphrased in 15:6b. (Q) (P)

53:8 = Mos. 14:8; 15:8a

While Mos. 14 is identical to KJV, it is paraphrased in 15:8a. (Q) (P)

53:9 = Mos. 14:9

KJV: "violence...deceit"

BM: "evil.....deceit"

NT: "sin.....guile"

The NT quote (which does not attribute the passage to Isaiah) is found in 1 Pet. 2:22 (see also Zeph. 3:13; Rev. 14:5). LXX reads *anomian...dolos*, "lawlessness...deceit". Actually, the MT *mzmh* means both "evil" and "violence", and hence both KJV and BM are valid translations from the Hebrew. (F)

53:10 = Mos. 14:10; 15:8b

While Mos. 14 is identical to KJV, it is paraphrased in 15:8b. (Q) (P)

53:11 = Mos. 14:11

KJV: "He shall see of the travail" (= 1830, RLDS)

BM: "He shall see the travail"

MT reads, *m-<sup>c</sup>ml npšw yr'h*, "from the travail of his soul he shall see". To this, IQIsa and IQIsb add the word '*wr*', "light" (added also as *fos* in LXX), an idea perhaps based on 9:2 (MT 9:1). But our difficulty seems to have been a printer error committed after the first edition of BM was printed in 1830. The small word "of" (represented in MT) was deleted in error. (L)

53:12 = Mos. 14:12

KJV's "bare" remained thus in 1830 (= RLDS), but was later changed to read "bore" in BM, apparently in an attempt to update the language. (O)

KJV: "the sin of many"

BM: "the sins of many"

KJV correctly translates MT *hṭ'* as "sin", though this may be used as a collective. All the other versions have the plural, agreeing with BM:

IQIsa & b	<i>ḥt'y rbyḡ</i>
S (plur.)	<i>ḥth' d-sgy''</i>
Targum	<i>ḥwbyḡ sgy'yn</i>
LXX	<i>amartias pollōn</i>
Sym.	<i>amartias pollōn</i>
Vulgate	<i>peccata multorum</i>

Note that "sins" is the word used in the unattributed Isaiah quote in Heb. 9:28. Cf. 53:6. (E)

54:4 = 3 Ne. 22:4

After "thy youth", BM adds "and shalt not remember the reproach of thy youth". This was not in 1830, nor is it found in RLDS. It is apparently a printer's error, post-dating the 1830 edition. It was caused when the printer began setting the type for the next part, which reads, "and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more". After the word "reproach", his eye returned to the last word in the previous section, "youth", which he then added. He then continued from the word "youth", where it occurs in the original text, and did the last part of the verse again, this time properly, for he put "thy widowhood any more" in place of "thy youth". (L)

54:5 = 3 Ne. 22:5

KJV's italicized "*is*" (after "thy Maker") was deleted by BM. (I)

In an attempt to update the language of the text, BM changed "thine" to "thy" before "husband". (N)

54:9 = 3 Ne. 22:9

BM deleted KJV's "*is as*" before "the waters". (I) Actually, there is a word-play in this vs. in Hebrew, but it is irrelevant to our present study.

BM deletes the KJV ending, "nor rebuke thee", for no reason we can see. (K)



54:10 = 3 Ne. 22:10; Mos. 15:10

The quote in Mos. 15 is a paraphrase only. (Q) (P)

BM replaces, in 3 Ne., KJV's "peace" by "people". This is no doubt a scribal mishearing, which RLDS has corrected. KJV is supported by MT and the versions. Moreover, the "covenant of peace" is mentioned in Ezek. 34:25; 37:26; cf. also Mal. 2:5. (L)

54:15 = 3 Ne. 22:15

KJV "*but*" is deleted, leaving only "not" in BM. This, however, does not change the meaning. (I) It is interesting to note that, in place of MT *'ps* ("nothing, not"), IQIsa has the meaningless (?) *'ks*. Both S and LXX delete the "but not", making it affirmative.

Before the change described above and just after "shall...gather together", BM adds "against thee". This is in line with the rest of the verse, where we read, "whosoever shall gather together against thee". Moreover, there is support from LXX, which adds here *soi*, "to thee". (B)

55:1-2 = 2 Ne. 9:50-51 (vs. 1 = 2 Ne. 26:25b)

Both BM versions are paraphrased. Cf. Rev. 21:6; 22:17. (Q)

Finally, it should be noted that the idea found in Alma 5:22-23 is found also in Isa. 59:3 & 12. However, there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the conclusion that BM is paraphrasing the Biblical Isaiah passage, only that the ideas are similar.

## Chapter 4

### CLASSIFYING THE VARIANTS

During the course of this study, it was determined that it would be useful to group together by category the Isaiah variants occurring in the Book of Mormon. The categories reflect the explanation for the variation between BM and KJV, as seen in the preceding chapter. They are as follows:

- A. BM is Superior to KJV as a Translation from MT Hebrew.
- B. Version Support for BM.
- C. Evidence of Scribal Error in Ancient Times, with Evidence Favoring BM.
- D. Evidence Indicating that BM is from a More Ancient Text than MT.
- E. Singular-Plural Distinctions.
- F. BM and KJV are Equally Valid Translations from MT Hebrew.
- G. BM Disagrees with KJV/MT in Instances where at least Some Versions also Disagree, without Supporting BM or KJV.
- H. Items Found Elsewhere.
- I. Deletion of KJV Italicized Words in BM.
- J. Change of KJV Italicized Words in BM.
- K. BM Variations from KJV with No Explanation.
- L. Uncorrected BM Errors.
- M. BM Errors Subsequently Corrected.
- N. Attempts at Updating the KJV Language in BM.
- O. Changes in Post-1830 Editions of BM.
- P. Internal Variations in the BM Quotes of Isaiah.
- Q. Paraphrases of Isaiah in BM.

In all of these, we have assumed that Joseph Smith made use of the KJV text of Isaiah and that the variants are departures therefrom. From an examination of the linguistic evidence internal to BM and in the various versions (including MT), it has generally been possible to

determine why Joseph Smith departed from the KJV language in the case of these variants. When such was not possible, however, items were relegated to Category K ("BM Variations from KJV with No Explanation").

Generally speaking, Categories A, B, C and D are to be considered as favorable to the authenticity, while Category K is unfavorable and the rest are usually neutral. To this latter statement, we must add the modification that Categories L and M are basically unfavorable to BM. Nevertheless, these discrepancies can most often be explained as scribal or printer's errors. While such mistakes are not wholly justified, they reflect only on the English text of BM and not on the Nephite record from which it came, nor on the brass plates of Laban from which the Nephite scribes copied their Isaiah quotes.

As each of the categories is given below, an attempt will be made to note whether the category of the different variants illustrated for each are either favorable (+) or unfavorable (-) to BM or whether they are neutral in their support of BM as opposed to KJV (=). The chapter will then conclude with a listing for each of these three classifications.

A. BM IS SUPERIOR TO KJV AS A TRANSLATION FROM MT HEBREW.

These variations, four in number, must all be rated +.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:26 = 2 Ne. 13:26	and she <i>being</i> desolate	and she shall be desolate
5:1 = 2 Ne. 15:1	Now will I sing	And then will I sing (+ version support)
6:12 = 2 Ne. 16:12	and <i>there be</i> a great forsaking	for there shall be a great forsaking
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	I have even	And I have even

B. VERSION SUPPORT FOR BM.

All of these variants - 36 in number - are rated +. They may be subdivided into six categories, as follows:

1. BM adds the conjunction "and", which is confirmed in at least some versions.

3:9 = 2 Ne. 13:9	before "they"
3:14 = 2 Ne. 13:14	before "the spoil"
3:26 = 2 Ne. 13:26	before "shall sit"
48:8 = 1 Ne. 20:8	after "yea"
48:13 = 1 Ne. 20:13	before "they stand up"
48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14	before "he will do"
50:9 = 2 Ne. 7:9	before "the moth"
51:18 = 2 Ne. 8:18	at beginning of vs., in place of KJV " <i>there is</i> "

Also cf., in Category A, 48:5, where the addition of "And" to the beginning of the vs. is confirmed in MT, though KJV lacks the conjunction.

2. BM adds to KJV text, being support by at least some versions.

2:16 = 2 Ne. 12:16	BM has both the MT/KJV and the LXX renditions.
48:22 = 1 Ne. 20:22	BM's "also" is confirmed by IQIsa "and" before "there is no peace". (Cf. Category B-1, above.)

3. Change of pronoun from KJV to BM, where BM is supported by versions while KJV = MT.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:10 = 2 Ne. 13:10	<i>with him</i>	with them (as a reference to "the righteous"; cf. 3:11)
5:30 = 2 Ne. 15:30	<i>one</i> look	they look

6:9 = 2 Ne. 16:9	understand perceive (imperatives)	they understood they perceived
14:32 = 2 Ne. 24:32	What shall <i>one</i> then answer the messengers (dative)	What shall then answer the messengers (nominative)
52:8 = Mos. 15:29;	the voice (MT: a voice)	thy voice (see (P))

Though not a pronoun change itself, the following represents a similar change, where BM is supported by the versions:

48:11 = 1 Ne. 20:11	for how should <i>my name</i> be polluted	for I will not suffer my name to be polluted
---------------------	---	--

#### 4. Other BM Changes from KJV, Supported by Versions.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:2 = 2 Ne. 12:2	<i>that</i> the mountain	when the mountain
3:11 = 2 Ne. 13:11	for the reward of his hands shall be given him	for the reward of their hands shall be upon them (NB: the pronoun has no version support, but see (B-3).)
52:6 = 3 Ne. 20:39	therefore (2nd)	yea (+ syntactic change backed by MT)

#### 5. BM Deletes from KJV, is Supported by Versions.

9:3 = 2 Ne. 19:3	not	before "increased"
51:9 = 2 Ne. 8:9	in the genera- tions of old	after "ancient days"

#### 6. BM has version support coupled with additional evidence.

2:11 = 2 Ne. 12:11	BM adds to the beginning "And it shall come to pass that..." Some versions add "and". There is evidence that MT lost this portion by haplography.
--------------------	---

2:20 = 2 Ne. 12:20

KJV "they made *each one* for himself" is BM "he hath made for himself". BM has partial version support + parallel with the singular verb in the earlier part of the verse.

3:10 = 2 Ne. 13:10

KJV reads "to the righteous" where MT has no preposition. BM emphasizes the preposition by using "unto". In this, it is supported by some versions having the preposition. Moreover, this part parallels "to the wicked" of vs. 11, which has the preposition.

5:5 = 2 Ne. 15:5

KJV "break" comes from MT infinitive. BM has a conjugated verb, "I will break", supported by versions and paralleled by other conjugated verbs in the passage.

9:9 = 2 Ne. 19:9

KJV "inhabitant" is plural in BM. This is supported by versions with evidence of MT misunderstanding of an abbreviation. (Cf. Category (E).)

13:22 = 2 Ne. 23:22

The BM addition to the end has partial version support, coupled with evidence of haplography in MT and further textual evidence.

14:2 = 2 Ne. 24:2

BM has version support plus evidence of haplography in MT.

14:3 = 2 Ne. 24:3

KJV "the day" is "that day" in BM, which has version support and evidence of haplography in MT which gave rise to syntactic changes also evidenced here.

14:4 = 2 Ne. 24:4

The BM addition at the beginning has version support + internal evidence of change in MT.

14:8 = 2 Ne. 24:8

BM added the word "also", in which it is supported by some versions. There is additional evidence in the fact that there is a parallel in the same verse.

48:6 = 1 Ne. 20:6

BM's "and that" is supported by LXX, with additional evidence of haplography in MT.

48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14

KJV "these *things*" was expanded by BM to read "these things unto them". There is both version support and evidence of haplography in MT.

- 13:4 = 2 Ne. 23:4      KJV "a multitude" became BM "the multitude", which has, in Hebrew, some evidence for haplography in MT.
- 49:1 = 1 Ne. 21:1      BM adds a preface, which is in chiasmus, as befits Hebrew prophecy. There is also evidence for haplography in MT.
- 49:8 = 1 Ne. 21:8      BM adds "o isles of the sea", which was probably dropped by haplography from MT.
- In this same verse, BM adds "my servant", which could also have been dropped from MT by haplography. The word is quite common in Isaiah and hence well within its environment.
- 49:9 = 1 Ne. 21:9      BM reflects the expected Hebrew, easily explained as scribal error in MT.
- 49:18 = 1 Ne. 21:18      BM adds "they shall" before "come", with evidence for haplography at this point in MT.

D. EVIDENCE INDICATING THAT BM IS FROM A MORE ANCIENT TEXT THAN MT.

We have here but one example (which should be compared with those in (C) above), rated +.

- 10:29 = 2 Ne. 20:29      KJV contains the place-name Ramah, a late Hebrew form of the earlier Ramath, which is the spelling contained in BM.

E. SINGULAR-PLURAL DISTINCTIONS.

There are 11 of these in all, 5 of which are rated +, while 6 are rated =. All of those with a + rating have version support. The others are to perhaps be explained on the basis on abbreviation (where MT understood one form, while BP took another) or lack of vowels, as was normal in very early Hebrew writing, or, as is often likely, the use of a grammatically singular form to represent a collective (also known in Hebrew). In all cases but the last, it is MT/KJV which has the singular, while BM exhibits the plural.

3:9 = 2 Ne. 13:9	soul(s)	=
5:24 = 2 Ne. 15:24	blossom(s)	=
14:21 = 2 Ne. 24:21 53:6 = Mos. 14:6	iniquity/ies	+
29:13 = 2 Ne. 27:25	heart(s)	=
	precept(s)	=
49:7 = 2 Ne. 21:7	nation(s)	+
49:23 = 2 Ne. 6:7	face(s)	=
53:12 = Mos. 14:12	sin(s)	+

There are two instances of singular/plural distinctions in pronouns. The second of these reflects back on the antecedent, which is singular in KJV, plural in BM, with evidence favoring BM (see (B)).

3:11 = 2 Ne. 13:11	KJV: his hands...upon him	=
	BM: their hands...upon them	
49:25 = 2 Ne. 6:17	KJV: him	BM: them
		=

In one case, it is KJV which is plural and BM singular:

51:5 = 2 Ne. 8:5	arm(s)	+
------------------	--------	---

One singular-plural distinction not listed here is 9:9, which has both version support and internal evidence for BM and so is listed above under (B). Note for 49:23 that while 2 Ne. 6:7 disagrees with the KJV singular by making it plural, the quote in 1 Ne. 21:23 remains singular (see (P)).

#### F. BM AND KJV ARE EQUALLY VALID TRANSLATIONS FROM MT HEBREW.

There are 21 instances wherein both BM and KJV are equally valid translations from the MT Hebrew text. All of these are rated =. In some cases, one or the other version may be a more literal translation, but neither can be said to be truly superior.



1. BM is a more literal translation from MT than KJV.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:10 = 2 Ne. 13:10	<i>it shall be well</i>	it is well
5:7 = 2 Ne. 15:7		
11:4 = 2 Ne. 30:9	but	and
51:21 = 2 Ne. 8:21		
(NOTE: For 11:4, there is agreement in the quote found in 2 Ne. 21:4. See (P).)		
9:7 = 2 Ne. 19:7	<i>there shall be no end</i>	there is no end
10:17 = 2 Ne. 20:17	and it shall burn and devour	and shall burn and shall devour
11:6 = 2 Ne. 21:6	the fatling (= 2 Ne. 30:12; see (P))	fatling

2. Both are valid, BM is not more literal.

In some few of these cases, KJV is more literal. When this is so, it is marked \*.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:9 = 2 Ne. 13:9	sin as* they hide <i>it</i> not	sin to be even as they cannot hide it
4:2 = 2 Ne. 14:2	for them	to them
8:4 = 2 Ne. 18:4	For before the child shall have...	For behold, the child shall not have... before...
29:13 = 2 Ne. 27:25	near	near unto
48:6 = 1 Ne. 20:6	Thou hast heard, see* (but is corrupt text)	Thou hast seen and heard
49:14 = 1 Ne. 21:14	Zion said	Zion hath said
51:16 = 2 Ne. 8:16	and I have covered*	and have covered
53:9 = Mos. 14:9	violence... deceit	evil... deceit

### 3. BM deletes the KJV indefinite article.

Since the article comprises but a single letter in English, it is possible that it was deleted through scribal or printer error. However, Hebrew has no indefinite article and hence BM is more literal in these cases.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
49:7 = 1 Ne. 21:7	a servant	servant
50:11 = 2 Ne. 7:11	a fire	fire
51:12 = 2 Ne. 8:12	a man	man
53:2 = Mos. 14:2	a dry ground	dry ground

### G. BM DISAGREES WITH KJV/MT IN INSTANCES WHERE AT LEAST SOME VERSIONS ALSO DISAGREE, WITHOUT SUPPORTING BM OR KJV.

There are 8 examples here, all of them rated =.

2:10 = 2 Ne. 12:10	BM has an addition at the end. LXX also adds to the end, though the material is not the same (LXX has the same ending as vss. 19 and 21). See also (K).
2:12 = 2 Ne. 12:12	BM adds a little to this vs. At the same place, IQIsa deleted some words and moved the conjunction. See also (C).
3:11 = 2 Ne. 13:11	BM alters italicized KJV words at a point where LXX also makes changes and where scholars find difficulty with the MT.
29:5 = 2 Ne. 26:18	KJV, BM, LXX and IQIsa are all different one from another.
29:7 = 2 Ne. 27:3a	KJV, BM, some LXX mss. and others have different readings, probably based on an abbreviation which different scribes took to mean different things.
48:22 = 2 Ne. 20:22	BM adds to the end. LXX also adds, but not the same material.
49:13 = 1 Ne. 21:13	BM and LXX add to the end, but do not agree.
49:15 = 1 Ne. 21:15	Both BM and LXX add to the vs., but disagree. BM has a partial parallel in Ps. 137:5.

#### H. ITEMS FOUND ELSEWHERE.

There are instances where either BM or KJV/MT has information not found in the other but which is known from elsewhere in either Isaiah or other books of the Bible. In such cases, it is possible that either BM or MT borrowed the added material from another passage. This, however, cannot be certain. It is just as possible that BM (or BP) or MT deleted material found in the original through scribal error or that, as in (K), we simply do not know why they differ. Since none of these lend support to BM, they are rated - and number 4.

The first item is an example where BM added to KJV information found elsewhere in Isaiah:

2:5 = 2 Ne. 12:5                      "yea, come, for ye have all gone  
astray, every one to his wicked  
ways." (Cf. Isa. 53:6; 50:8)

The other three items are examples wherein BM deleted from KJV information found elsewhere in the Bible:

5:8 = 2 Ne. 15:8                      "*that* lay field to field" (cf. Mic. 2:2)

13:8 = 2 Ne. 23:8                      "they shall be in pain as a woman that  
travai~~leth~~" (cf. Hos. 13:13; Mic. 4:9;  
Jer. 6:24; Isa. 42:14+?, also cf. Isa.  
26:17-18 with John 16:21)

48:10 = 1 Ne. 20:10                      "but not with silver" (cf. Ps. 66:10;  
Zech. 13:9; 1 Pet. 1:6-7)

#### I. DELETION OF KJV ITALICIZED WORDS IN BM.

KJV found it necessary to occasionally insert words into its English translation which were not found in MT Hebrew, in order that the sentence might make sense in English. Sometimes, these English words serve a purpose which is filled in Hebrew by syntax alone, and hence they are valid additions to the text. To show that they are not part of the Hebrew original, the KJV prints these words in italics. Joseph Smith, knowing that these emendations were not found in the original, deleted a

large number of them from the BM Isaiah, in instances where their loss was of little effect to the English. All of these are rated = and number 59. RLDS renditions are marked \*.

3:14 = 2 Ne. 13:14	<i>is</i>	before "in your houses"
3:15 = 2 Ne. 13:15	<i>that</i>	before "ye beat"
3:18 = 2 Ne. 13:18	<i>about their feet</i>	before "ornaments"
3:24 = 2 Ne. 13:24	<i>that</i> <i>and</i>	before "instead" before "burning"
4:2 = 2 Ne. 14:2	<i>shall be</i>	before "excellent"
4:3 = 2 Ne. 14:3	<i>even</i>	before "every one"
5:19 = 2 Ne. 15:19	<i>and</i>	before "hasten"
5:24 = 2 Ne. 15:24	<i>so</i>	before "their root"
5:28 = 2 Ne. 15:28	<i>shall be</i>	before "like a lion"
5:29 = 2 Ne. 15:29	<i>it</i>	after "carry" and "deliver"
7:8 = 2 Ne. 17:8	<i>is</i>	before "Rezin"
7:17 = 2 Ne. 17:17	<i>even</i>	after "Judah"
7:20 = 2 Ne. 17:20	<i>namely</i>	after "hired"
7:21 = 2 Ne. 17:21	<i>that</i>	after "that day"
7:22 = 2 Ne. 17:22	<i>that</i>	after "milk"
7:23 = 2 Ne. 17:23	<i>that</i> <i>even</i>	after "that day" after "which shall"
7:25 = 2 Ne. 17:25	<i>on</i>	second word in vs.
8:12 = 2 Ne. 18:12	<i>to all them to whom</i>	to all to whom
8:22 = 2 Ne. 18:22	<i>and they shall be driven</i>	and shall be driven
9:1 = 2 Ne. 19:1	<i>afflict her by</i>	afflict by
9:7 = 2 Ne. 19:7	<i>his</i>	before "government"
9:21 = 2 Ne. 19:21	<i>and</i>	before "they together"

10:15 = 2 Ne. 20:15	<i>or</i>	before "shall the saw"
13:11 = 2 Ne. 23:11	<i>their</i>	before "evil"
13:17 = 2 Ne. 23:17	<i>as for</i>	before "gold"
14:5 = 2 Ne. 24:5	<i>and</i>	between "wicked" and "the sceptres"
14:11 = 2 Ne. 24:11	<i>and</i>	before "the noise"
14:12 = 2 Ne. 24:12	<i>How</i>	before "art thou cut down"
14:19 = 2 Ne. 24:19	<i>as</i>	before "the raiment/remnant"
14:27 = 2 Ne. 24:27	<i>it</i>	after "annul"
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	<i>it</i>	after "declared"
48:8 = 1 Ne. 20:8	<i>that</i>	after "time"
48:17 = 1 Ne. 20:17	<i>that</i>	after "the way"
48:20 = 1 Ne. 20:20	<i>even</i>	before "to the end"
48:21 = 1 Ne. 20:21	<i>when</i>	before "he led"
49:4 = 1 Ne. 21:4	<i>yet</i>	before "surely"
49:7 = 1 Ne. 21:7	<i>and</i>	before "his Holy One"
49:18 = 1 Ne. 21:18	<i>doeth</i>	after "bride"
51:11 = 2 Ne. 8:11	<i>and</i>	before "sorrow"
51:17 = 2 Ne. 8:17	<i>and...them</i>	from " <i>and</i> wrung <i>them</i> "
51:18 = 2 Ne. 8:18	<i>whom</i>	after first occurrence of "sons"
	<i>is there any</i>	after "neither"
	<i>that</i>	after second occurrence of "sons"
51:22 = 2 Ne. 8:22	<i>that</i>	before "pleadeth"
	<i>even</i>	before "the dregs"
52:2 = 2 Ne. 8:25; 3 Ne. 20:37	<i>and</i>	before "sit down" (in both)
54:5 = 3 Ne. 22:5	<i>is</i>	after "thy Maker"
54:9 = 3 Ne. 22:9	<i>is as</i>	before "the waters"
54:15 = 3 Ne. 22:15	<i>but</i>	before "not"

Sometimes, words deleted in the 1830 edition were returned in later editions of BM to give more sense to the English. These are as follows:

3:18 = 2 Ne. 13:18	<i>their</i>	3 times, before "tinkling", "cauls" and "round" Only the first of these was deleted in 1830 (and RLDS). (See (0))
6:8 = 2 Ne. 16:8	<i>am</i>	after "Here"
9:5 = 2 Ne. 19:5	<i>is</i>	after "warrior" (RLDS also returns)
9:12 = 2 Ne. 19:12	<i>is</i>	before "stretched out" (RLDS deletes)
9:17 = 2 Ne. 19:17		
9:21 = 2 Ne. 19:21		
10:4 = 2 Ne. 20:4		
14:27 = 2 Ne. 24:27		

#### J. CHANGE OF KJV ITALICIZED WORDS.

Occasionally, BM changes, rather than deletes, the KJV italicized words. These may be subdivided into two categories: (1) those which do not affect the meaning (35 of them, all rated =) and (2) those which affect the meaning (2 in number, rated -).

##### 1. Changes not affecting meaning.

2:12 = 2 Ne. 12:12	<i>shall be</i>	soon cometh
2:13 = 2 Ne. 2:13	<i>that are</i>	for they are
3:6 = 2 Ne. 13:6	<i>saying</i>	and shall say
	<i>let...be</i>	let...come
3:7 = 2 Ne. 13:7	<i>is neither</i>	there is neither
3:8 = 2 Ne. 13:8	<i>are against</i>	have been against
4:3 = 2 Ne. 14:3	<i>that he</i> <i>that is left...</i> <i>and he that</i> <i>remaineth</i>	they (1830 & RLDS "them") that are left... and remain (= RLDS; but 1830 "remaineth") (See (0).)

5:8 = 2 Ne. 15:8	till <i>there be</i>	till there can be
5:9 = 2 Ne. 15:9	<i>even</i> great	and great
5:11 = 2 Ne. 15:11	till wine inflammeth them	and wine inflammeth them
5:21 = 2 Ne. 15:21	Wo unto <i>them that</i> <i>are</i> wise	Wo unto the wise (BM more literal)
5:22 = 2 Ne. 15:22	Wo unto <i>them that</i> <i>are</i> mighty	Wo unto the mighty (BM more literal)
5:28 = 2 Ne. 15:28	<i>are</i> sharp	shall be sharp
6:13 = 2 Ne. 16:13	<i>shall be</i>	there shall be
	<i>it</i> shall return	they shall return
7:6 = 2 Ne. 17:6	<i>even</i> the son	yea, the son
10:13 = 2 Ne. 20:13	I have done <i>it</i>	I have done these things
10:21 = 2 Ne. 20:21	<i>even</i> the remnant	yea, even the remnant
13:5 = 2 Ne. 23:5	<i>even</i> the Lord	yea, the Lord
14:16 = 2 Ne. 24:16	consider thee, <i>saying</i>	consider thee, and shall say
14:17 = 2 Ne. 24:17	<i>That</i> made... <i>that</i> opened not	And made... and opened not
14:18 = 2 Ne. 24:18	<i>even</i> all of them	yea, all of them
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	shewed <i>it</i>	showed them
48:6 = 1 Ne. 20:6	declare <i>it</i>	declare them
48:11 = 1 Ne. 20:11	<i>even</i> for mine	yea, for mine
	will I do <i>it</i>	will I do this
48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14	his arm <i>shall</i> <i>be upon</i>	his arm shall come upon
48:15 = 1 Ne. 20:15	<i>even</i>	yea
49:5 = 2 Ne. 21:5	<i>to be</i> his servant	that I should be his servant
49:18 = 1 Ne. 21:18	bind them <i>on thee</i>	bind them on even

49:21 = 1 Ne. 21:21	where <i>had</i> they been	where have they been
50:11 = 2 Ne. 7:11	<i>that</i> ye have kindled	which ye have kindled
51:1 = 2 Ne. 8:1	<i>whence</i> (twice)	from whence (twice)
51:2 = 2 Ne. 8:2	<i>that</i> bare you	she that bare you
51:12 = 2 Ne. 8:12	made <i>as</i> grass	made like unto grass

## 2. Changes affecting meaning.

13:15 = 2 Ne. 23:15	joined <i>unto them</i>	joined to the wicked
48:16 = 1 Ne. 20:16	<i>am</i> I	have I spoken

## K. BM VARIATIONS FROM KJV WITH NO EXPLANATION.

It may be, in these examples, that BP or at least the Nephite version of BM varied from MT. In the absence of an original text, however, it is impossible to ascertain that such is the case, nor can one prove that these are not errors in BM. The fact that BP or BM may have variant readings does not invalidate them insofar as the original Isaiah is concerned, since we do not possess the any Isaiah manuscripts from before the second century BC, while the prophet lived at the turn of the 8th-7th centuries BC. Nevertheless, because the 41 variants listed here have no support from the earliest documents available, we must rate them -.

## 1. Brief additions to the beginning of the verse.

These may be stylistic additions only, and hence should be compared with Category N. None of them change the meaning of the text to which they are added.

48:3 = 1 Ne. 20:3	Behold
48:9 = 1 Ne. 20:9	Nevertheless
48:10 = 1 Ne. 20:10	For



48:17 = 1 Ne. 20:17	And
49:15 = 1 Ne. 21:15	For
49:24 = 1 Ne. 21:24; 2 Ne. 6:16	For (both)
51:16 = 2 Ne. 8:16	Behold

2. Additions & Changes by BM which do not change the meaning of the KJV text.

As with (K-1) above, some or all of these may be merely stylistic variations peculiar to the English of BM. One evidence that this is the case is that all of the examples in (K-1) and half of those given here are from Chapters 20-21 of 1 Nephi. The prophet Joseph Smith may have taken extra precautions in those two chapters (the earliest long quotes from Isaiah) to render the English style more acceptable. Cf. List (N).

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
8:19 = 2 Ne. 18:19	the living to the dead	the living to hear from the dead
8:20 = 1 Ne. 18:20	if they speak	and if they speak
13:15 = 2 Ne. 23:15	and every one	yea, and every one
48:1 = 1 Ne. 20:1	Hear ye this	Hearken and hear this
48:2 = 1 Ne. 20:2	For	Nevertheless
48:12 = 1 Ne. 20:12	I <i>am</i> he	for I am he
49:14 = 1 Ne. 21:14	But Zion	But, behold, Zion

3. Unexplained additions & changes by BM which give new meaning to KJV text.

2:10 = 2 Ne. 12:10	0 ye wicked ones shall smite thee	Added at beginning. Added at end (coupled with dropping of "for" before "the glory" and addition of "the" before "fear")
2:19 = 2 Ne. 12:19 2:21 = 2 Ne. 12:21	...shall come upon them... <del>shall smite them</del>	Added in middle and end (coupled with <del>the same</del> changes noted for 2:10)

8:1 = 2 Ne. 18:1	the word of the Lord said	Versus KJV "the Lord said".
14:11 = 2 Ne. 24:11	is not heard	Added after "the noise of thy viols".
48:1 = 1 Ne. 20:1	but	Versus KJV "yet they swear".
48:2 = 1 Ne. 20:2	but they do not	Replaces KJV "and" before "stay themselves"
	who (= RLDS; 1830 has "which") is the Lord of Hosts; yea...	Added after "Israel".
48:3 = 1 Ne. 20:3	Changes here, including deletion of "and they came to pass".	
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	and I showed them for fear	Added to end.
48:7 = 1 Ne. 20:7	they were declared unto thee	Added after "thou heardest them not".
48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14	yea, and he will fulfill his word which he hath declared by them	Added before "he will do his pleasure".
48:15 = 1 Ne. 20:15	Also, saith the Lord; I the Lord, yea, I have spoken to declare	Replaces KJV "I <i>even</i> I have spoken". Added after "I have called him"
48:17 = 1 Ne. 20:17	I have sent him, the Lord hath done it	Replaces KJV "I <i>am</i> the Lord". Added at end.
49:12 = 1 Ne. 21:12	And then, O house of Israel	Added at beginning.
49:13 = 1 Ne. 21:13	for the feet of those who (1830 "them which") are in the east shall be established	Added after "O earth".
49:14 = 1 Ne. 21:14	but he will show (1830 "shew") that he hath not	Added to end.

50:2 = 2 Ne. 7:2	0 house of Israel.	Added after "answer".
51:7 = 2 Ne. 8:7	in whose heart I have written my law	Replaces KJV "in whose heart <i>is</i> my law". (This was not consigned to (J) because BM adds a verb.)
51:20 = 2 Ne. 8:20	save these two	Added after "fainted".

4. BM deletes from KJV text, with no explanation.

9:4 = 2 Ne. 19:4	as in the day of Midian	At end of the verse.
9:15 = 2 Ne. 19:15	and honourable	After "ancient".
48:16 = 1 Ne. 20:16	hear ye this	After "unto me".
49:7 = 1 Ne. 21:7	<i>and</i> the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee	At end.
54:9 = 3 Ne. 22:9	nor rebuke thee	At end.

L. UNCORRECTED BM ERRORS.

The errors in the BM text of Isaiah are to be attributed to scribal and/or printer error in almost every case. They are not the result of mistranslation, nor do they reflect upon the validity of the BP or Nephite records. Hence, they are not rated at all and number 29.

1. Homonyms.

There are several instances where, because a word sounded very much like another word which made sense to the scribe (i.e., near homonyms), the wrong word was written down. It is possible, of course, that these are errors read out by Joseph Smith from the KJV text, or made by misreading on the part of the printer. But scribal error is the most likely explanation.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
10:10 = 2 Ne. 20:10	found	founded
10:13 = 2 Ne. 20:13	removed the bounds	moved the borders
10:30 = 2 Ne. 20:30	thy voice	the voice
14:2 = 2 Ne. 24:2	in the land	and the land
14:19 = 2 Ne. 24:19	raiment	remnant
48:16 = 1 Ne. 20:16	there	declared
51:19 = 1 Ne. 8:19	thee - desolation	thee - thy desolation
54:10 = 3 Ne. 22:10	people	peace

In each of these examples, MT supports KJV. In all but 14:19 (which also disagrees with BM), the versions also support MT, and hence the evidence for scribal error is enhanced.

## 2. Brief items added to the KJV text by BM.

It is likely that the scribe added these, giving us some examples of overcorrection. The printer may also have done so, as, too, Joseph Smith when reading from the KJV text. But scribal error is the most likely explanation.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:9 = 2 Ne. 12:9	boweth... humbleth	boweth not... humbleth not (= RLDS) (1st "not" in 1830, hence prob. a printer error or later added to parallel the other)
3:6 = 2 Ne. 13:6	let this ruin	let not this ruin
5:9 = 2 Ne. 15:9	even great and fair	and great and fair
7:11 = 2 Ne. 17:11	depth...height	depths...heights
9:1 = 2 Ne. 19:1	the sea	the Red Sea

### 3. Single-word deletions from the KJV text by BM.

Some of these are scribal errors, in instances where MT agrees with KJV in supplying the deleted word, backed by the versions. Others are clearly printer's errors, and it is possible that all could be so classified. Note that this list does not include the deletion of the indefinite article ("a"), for which see (F-3).

3:23 = 2 Ne. 13:23	the	Before "hoods".
4:2 = 2 Ne. 14:2	and	Before "the fruit".
6:13 = 2 Ne. 16:13	in it	After "But yet". In KJV, 1830 and RLDS, it was omitted by printer error in later BM editions.
7:25 = 2 Ne. 17:25	for	Before "the treading".
48:16 = 1 Ne. 20:16	now	Between "and" and "the Lord God".
48:20 = 1 Ne. 20:20	it	After "sitter".
49:26 = 1 Ne. 21:26	and	After first occurrence of "flesh". (However, 2 Ne. 6:8 = KJV. See (P).)
52:15 = 3 Ne. 21:8b	at him	After "mouths"

### 4. Special cases of BM error.

2:21 = 2 Ne. 12:21	KJV has "glory of his majesty", while BM has "majesty of his glory". KJV is followed in vss. 10 and 19, hence this is a scribal error.
5:4 = 2 Ne. 15:4 50:2 = 2 Ne. 7:2	The word "wherefore", as employed by the KJV Bible, has two meanings: (a) equivalent to "therefore" (e.g., Gen. 16:14) and (b) the meaning of "why?" (e.g., Gen. 31:27, 30). The first is generally translated from MT <i>lkn</i> or <i>lkn</i> , "therefore" (each having the same word preceded by a different preposition). The second generally derives from MT <i>lmh</i> or <i>mdw</i> , both meaning "why?". BM generally uses the word "wherefore" in a non-interrogative sense, as an equivalent to "therefore". Indeed, I could find but two examples (1 Ne. 4:3; 2 Ne. 29:8) of "wherefore" in the sense of "why?". In the two Isaiah passages, the KJV "wherefore" (MT <i>mdw</i> ) was misunderstood

either by the translator or the scribe. This necessitated a change in the word-order, giving us indicative, rather than interrogative, sentences. The versions support KJV here.

10:5 = 2 Ne. 20:5

KJV's "mine indignation" was changed to BM's "their indignation". This is a scribal error, based on what precedes it ("in THEIR hands is"). All versions (and logic) lend support to KJV here, though it, too, is corrupt at this point.

51:9 = 2 Ne. 8:9  
51:10 = 2 Ne. 8:10

BM 1830 agreed with KJV. However, a subsequent change produced an error in BM. See commentary on vs. 10.

51:19 = 2 Ne. 8:19

KJV's "two *things*" became BM "two sons", perhaps because of the term used in a nearby environment. This, however, produced other errors. See commentary for details.

54:4 = 3 Ne. 22:4

There is a case of dittography on the part of the printer in post-1830 editions, which, however, RLDS did not follow.

#### M. BM ERRORS SUBSEQUENTLY CORRECTED.

Some of the scribal or printer's errors made in the 1830 edition were corrected in later editions of BM. All of those listed here (17 in number) are not rated. RLDS does not always adopt the correction, so the RLDS form will be indicated here by \*.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>1830</u>	<u>BM</u>
5:10 = 2 Ne. 15:10	homer	horner	homer*
7:1 = 2 Ne. 17:1	<i>that</i> Rezin	and Rezin	that Rezin*
9:9 = 2 Ne. 19:9	and stoutness	and the stoutness	and stoutness
13:17 = 2 Ne. 23:17	and <i>as for</i> gold, they shall not delight	and gold, nor shall they not delight*	and gold, nor shall they delight
48:4 = 1 Ne. 20:4	neck <i>is</i>	neck was*	neck is

48:13 = 1 Ne. 20:13	when I called	and I called	I call*
49:20 = 1 Ne. 21:20	strait	straight*	strait
50:2 = 2 Ne. 7:2	came	come	came*
50:5 = 2 Ne. 7:5	opened	appointed*	opened
50:9 = 2 Ne. 7:9	who	which	who*
50:11 = 2 Ne. 7:11	kindle	kindleth	kindle*
51:4 = 2 Ne. 8:4	a light of the people	a light thing of the people	a light for the people* (still wrong!)
52:15 = 3 Ne. 20:45	had not been	had been	had not been*

Though not in error, there are some spelling variations and one archaic form modernized, each of which was returned to its older form after the 1830 edition:

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>1830</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:4 = 2 Ne. 12:4	plow	plough	plow
10:15 = 2 Ne. 20:15	ax	axe*	ax
48:9 = 1 Ne. 20:9	name's	name	name's
48:21 = 1 Ne. 20:21	clave	cleaved	clave*

#### N. ATTEMPTS AT UPDATING THE KJV LANGUAGE IN BM.

KJV English is not the same as 19th-century American English. Therefore, in some instances, Joseph Smith apparently felt it best to make changes that would render the Isaiah text of BM more acceptable to its readers, while not changing the meaning. All of these changes - 25 in number - are not rated, since they have nothing to do with translation. This list does NOT include changes made subsequent to the 1830 edition (for which see (0)), but the two lists should be compared.

1. The change from "an" to "a" before words beginning with "h".

	<u>before</u>
3:7 = 2 Ne. 13:7	healer
5:10 = 2 Ne. 15:10	homer (1830 "horner")
9:17 = 2 Ne. 19:17	hypocrite
10:6 = 2 Ne. 20:6	hypocritical
11:16 = 2 Ne. 21:16	highway

Of a like nature is the change from "thine" to "thy":

14:13 = 2 Ne. 24:13	heart
54:5 = 3 Ne. 22:5	husband

2. Spelling changes.

Cf. Categories M and O for similar items.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
14:12 = 2 Ne. 24:12	didst	did
29:13 = 2 Ne. 27:25 49:23 = 1 Ne. 21:23; 2 Ne. 6:16	toward	towards
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	shouldest	shouldst
49:4 = 1 Ne. 21:4	laboured	labored
52:3 = 3 Ne. 20:38	nought	naught

3. Changes in syntax.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
10:7 = 2 Ne. 20:7	<i>it is</i> in his heart	in his heart it is
10:13 = 2 Ne. 20:13	I have done it and by my wisdom	and by my wisdom I have done these things
11:13 = 2 Ne. 21:13	The envy also of Ephraim	The envy of Ephraim also
13:12 = 2 Ne. 23:12	Their bows also shall	Their bows shall also



14:2 = 2 Ne. 24:2	whose captives they were	unto whom they were captives
48:12 = 1 Ne. 20:12	I also <i>am</i> the last	and I am also
49:20 = 1 Ne. 21:20	shall say again	shall again...say (= RLDS)
50:9 = 2 Ne. 7:9	they all shall	all they shall

#### 4. Miscellaneous stylistic changes.

These changes do not affect the meaning. Some examples which might have been listed here were in disagreement with KJV, adding thereto words which may have been in BP. They have therefore been listed in Category (K). Here we list the others.

	<u>KJV</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:10 = 2 Ne. 13:10	say ye	say
50:8 = 2 Ne. 7:8	near to me	near me

These two examples show the deletion of elements not necessary to BM English.

49:10 = ± Ne. 21:10	The article "the" is added before "sun", in order that it might parallel "the heat". Neither has the article in MT, nor is one necessary in the Hebrew.
---------------------	---

#### 0. CHANGES IN POST-1830 EDITIONS OF BM.

These changes are of the same type as those listed in (N). However, whereas those listed in (N) represent changes made by BM as early as the 1830 edition, we here list only changes made in later editions. They are 50 in number and are not rated.

##### 1. Spelling changes, in which 1830 = KJV. The RLDS rendition is shown by the asterisk \*. (Cf. M and N.)

	<u>KJV/1830</u>	<u>BM</u>
3:3 = 2 Ne. 13:3	counsellor	counselor
9:6 = 2 Ne. 19:6		

4:3 = 2 Ne. 14:3	remaineth	remain* (because of pronoun change)
8:10 = 2 Ne. 18:10		
49:4 = 2 Ne. 21:4	nought	naught*
11:14 = 2 Ne. 21:4	toward*	towards
48:3,5,6 = 1 Ne. 20:3,5,6	shewed	showed* (the one in vs. 5 only in 1830 & BM, not in KJV)
49:6 = 1 Ne. 21:6	shouldest	shouldst
49:26 = 1 Ne. 21:26; 2 Ne. 6:18	Saviour	Savior (both)
52:12 = 3 Ne. 20:42; 21:29	rereward	rearward* (both)

2. Change from "which" (KJV & 1830) to "who(m)" whenever the antecedent is human. RLDS follows the later editions of BM in making this change (which is general throughout BM and not only in the Isaiah quotes).

3:12 = 2 Ne. 13:12	48:17 = 1 Ne. 20:17 (twice)
5:23 = 2 Ne. 15:23	49:20 = 1 Ne. 20:20 ("whom")
48:1 = 1 Ne. 20:1 (twice)	51:23 = 2 Ne. 8:23
48:14 = 1 Ne. 20:14	

The change was made twice in 51:12. The first is after the first occurrence of "man", where KJV reads "that", changed to "which" in 1830 and to "who" in BM/RLDS. After the second occurrence of "man", KJV/1830 have "which", while BM/RLDS have "who".

### 3. Internal Changes.

In some instances, 1830 BM added to KJV but was later modified by subsequent editions. In the following examples, the RLDS version is marked by \*.

	<u>1830</u> (not in KJV)	<u>BM</u>
4:3 = 2 Ne. 14:3	them (KJV "he")	they (see also (J))
48:2 = 1 Ne. 20:2 49:1 = 1 Ne. 21:1	which	who*
49:13 = 1 Ne. 21:13	them which	those who*
48:3 = 1 Ne. 20:3 49:14 = 1 Ne. 21:14	shew	show*
48:5 = 1 Ne. 20:5	shewed	showed*

There is a special case in 3:18 = 2 Ne. 13:18, where KJV's "*their*" was deleted in 1830 (= RLDS) but returned in later BM editions. (See also (I).)

#### 4. Post-1830 stylistic changes.

In these, the RLDS is marked \*.

	<u>KJV/1830</u>	<u>BM</u>
2:8 = 2 Ne. 12:8	also is*	is also
6:9 = 2 Ne. 16:9	understand	understood
6:10 = 2 Ne. 16:10	convert	be converted*
9:14 = 2 Ne. 19:14	Therefore the Lord will	Therefore will the Lord*
11:8 = 2 Ne. 21:8; 30:14	sucking (= 2 Ne. 30) cockatrice'	suckling cockatrice's
12:2 = 2 Ne. 22:2	is become*	has become
13:14 = 2 Ne. 23:14	they shall*	and they shall
49:20 = 1 Ne. 21:20	other	first*
53:4 = Mos. 14:4	hath borne	has borne
53:12 = Mos. 14:12	bare*	bore

5. Changes in post-1830 editions which are apparently due to Joseph Smith's subsequent knowledge of Hebrew.

RLDS is marked \*.

	<u>KJV/1830</u>	<u>BM</u>
6:2,6 = 2 Ne. 16:2,6	seraphims*	seraphim
6:5 = 2 Ne. 16:5	Wo <i>is</i> me (KJV) Wo me (1830)	wo is unto me*
53:3 = Mos. 14:3	<i>our</i> faces	our face*

6. Other.

Post-1830 editions contain, in Isa. 48:1 (= 1 Ne. 20:1), an additional phrase, added at the suggestion of Parley P. Pratt, as an explanation rather than a translation.

P. INTERNAL VARIATIONS IN THE BM QUOTES OF ISAIAH.

Some Isaiah passages are cited more than once in BM. When this happens, they sometimes vary one from another. This is occasionally due to paraphrasis, and so each one must be dealt with on its own terms.

ISAIAH 11:4-9 (= 2 Ne. 21:4-9; 30:9, 11-15)

The quote in 2 Ne. 21 is part of Nephi's extensive copying from BP. The one found in 2 Ne. 30 forms a part of Nephi's own prophecies, and hence is paraphrased (note how, between vss. 4 and 5 of Isaiah, he inserts a lengthy passage - 2 Ne. 30:10).

	<u>2 Ne. 21</u>	<u>2 Ne. 30</u>
11:4	4. = KJV	9. Initial "But" reads "And".  Nephi changes the subject from "he" to "the Lord God".
11:5	5. = KJV	11. = KJV

11:6	6. = KJV	12. Deletes "also shall" after "The wolf" and adds before it "And then shall". = KJV
	Scribal error deletes "the" before "fatling".	
11:7	7. = KJV	13. = KJV
11:8	8. 1830 = KJV, but later editions read "suckling" instead of "sucking".	14. = KJV
11:9	9. = KJV	15. = KJV

ISAIAH 29:6 (= 2 Ne. 27:1; 6:15)

Both are paraphrases but do not agree one with the other.

ISAIAH 49:22-26 (= 1 Ne. 21:22-26; 2 Ne. 6:6b-7, 8, 16-18)

The quote in 1 Ne. is part of Nephi's lengthy reading from Isa. 48-49. 2 Ne. is a paraphrase in Jacob's speech.

	<u>1 Ne. 21</u>	<u>2 Ne. 6</u>
49:22	22. = KJV	6b. = KJV 8. Paraphrase also incorporating 29:14.
49:23	23. face (= KJV)	7. faces
49:24	24. captives	16. captive (= KJV)
49:25	25. = KJV  with him (= KJV) = KJV	17. After "for", adds: "the Mighty God shall deliver his covenant people. For thus saith the Lord:" with them Deletes, at end, "and I will save thy children".
49:26	26. Deletes "and" after "flesh".	18. = KJV

ISAIAH 52:1-3, 6-15.

This chapter of Isaiah is the one most often quoted in BM. The frequency with which each verse is quoted varies. These quotes come mostly from speeches, but some few are contained in written BM prophecies. None lays claim to being a direct extract from the BP records and there is much paraphrase and variation.

52:1 = 2 Ne. 8:24; 3 Ne. 20:36b; Moro. 10:31a

The quote in 2 Ne. reads like KJV. The one found in 3 Ne. is like KJV, except that, after the initial "Awake, awake", it adds "again and". The paraphrase in Moro. 10 is combined with a paraphrase from Isa. 54:2.

52:2 = 2 Ne. 8:25; 3 Ne. 20:37; Moro. 10:31b

The quotes in 2 Ne. and 3 Ne. delete the KJV italicized "*and*" after "arise". But the paraphrase in Moro. reads "and arise" and is supported (coincidentally) by the versions.

52:3 = 3 Ne. 20:38

The only variation here is in spelling (KJV "nought", BM "naught"), for which see (N).

52:4-5 are not cited in BM, being passed over even in 3 Ne. 20.

52:6 = 3 Ne. 30:39

BM's paraphrase is quite at variance (in wording, but not in meaning) with KJV.

52:7 = 1 Ne. 13:37b; Mos. 12:21; 15:14-18; 3 Ne. 20:40

While Mos. 12 reads just like KJV, 3 Ne. varies somewhat. It adds to the beginning, "And then shall they say". After each occurrence of "good tidings", it adds "unto them". The versions in 1 Ne. and Mos. 15 are paraphrases.

52:8 = Mos. 12:22; 15:29; 3 Ne. 16:18; 20:32-33

Mos. 12 and 3 Ne. 16 both follow KJV. The other two passages add introductory words but do not agree with each other ("Yea, Lord" in Mos. 15; "Then shall" in 3 Ne.). In 3 Ne. 20, we read "their watchmen", instead of "thy watchmen", as in KJV and the other three quotes. But both Mos. 15 and 3 Ne. 20 agree in reading "their voice" as against "the voice" in KJV and the other two quotes. KJV's "when the Lord shall bring again Zion" is followed by Mos. 12 and 15 and by 3 Ne. 16. But in 3 Ne. 20, it is paraphrased to read, "Then will the Father gather them together again, and give unto them Jerusalem for the land of their inheritance." (Replacing "Lord" by "Father" is typical of 3 Ne. 20 in succeeding verses as well.) This paraphrase is a separate vs. (33) in 3 Ne. 20.

52:9 = Mos. 12:23; 15:30; 3 Ne. 16:19; 20:34

Both Mosiah passages and 3 Ne. 16 agree with KJV. The paraphrase in 3 Ne. 20 changes from an imperative verb to a future tense by adding to the beginning, "Then shall they". It also substitutes "the Father" for "the Lord".

52:10 = 1 Ne. 22:10-11; Mos. 12:24; 15:31; 3 Ne. 16:20; 20:35

Both Mosiah passages follow KJV. The passage in 3 Ne. 16 differs therefrom only in the deletion of the possessive "our" before "God". Following his established custom in paraphrase, Jesus, in 3 Ne. 20, substitutes both "The Lord" and "our God" by "the Father". The quote in 1 Ne. 22 is a paraphrase.

52:11 = 3 Ne. 20:41

Having deleted vss. 8-10, which he had quoted in 3 Ne. 16, Jesus continues his paraphrase of Isaiah by introducing this vs. with the words, "And then shall a cry go forth:" KJV's "touch no unclean thing" is here rendered "touch not that which is unclean".

52:12 = 3 Ne. 20:42; 3 Ne. 21:29

3 Ne. 20 follows KJV, except that it reads "shall" (after "the God of Israel") instead of "will" and spells KJV's "rereward" as "rearward". The vs. is paraphrased in 3 Ne. 21, changing the subject from second to third person.

52:13-15 = 3 Ne. 20:43-45

Cited in 3 Ne. 20, this Isaiah passage finds no disagreement between KJV and BM. The latter part of vs. 15 is also found in 3 Ne. 21:8b, where it deletes the words "at him", though they are found in all other versions.

#### ISAIAH 53:7-10

These verses are quoted in Mos. 14:7-10, where all but vs. 9 read as in KJV. Interestingly, vs. 9 is the only one left out in the paraphrased quote of these verses in Mos. 15:6b-8.

#### ISAIAH 54:10

This vs. is quoted in 3 Ne. 22:10, where one word has been changed by scribal error. Another quote of the same verse in Mos. 15:10 is a paraphrase.

#### Q. PARAPHRASES OF ISAIAH IN BM.

Because of the tremendous variation in these, they are not listed here. Because they are paraphrased and therefore do not bear on the value of BM translation, they are not rated.



SUMMARY.

Of the KJV variants in BM, 265 were rated. The rest were not rated because they were either paraphrases or were errors internal to BM and having nothing to do with the quality of BM as a translation from an ancient text.

Those which were rated are as follows:

+	89	(favoring BM)
=	129	(equal)
-	47	(unfavorable to BM)

Those variants whose rating favors the Book of Mormon lend evidence to its authenticity as a translation from an ancient document, often with indications that it was older than the Hebrew text of Isaiah from which KJV was derived. Minus ratings do not necessarily condemn the Book of Mormon, for we have seen many instances where there have been several variant versions of Isaiah. Who is to judge which is correct in such cases? It is not impossible that the brass plates or the Nephite copies thereof may have contained errors (which Moroni himself admits on several occasions). But it is just as likely, in most of these cases, that the Hebrew Massoretic text behind KJV was in error. It will be noted that roughly half of the variants have been rated =, meaning that their lend support neither to BM nor to KJV. This is to be expected when dealing with variant texts where no original writing (in this case, in the hand of Isaiah) is available to us.

## Chapter 5

### THE DEUTERO-ISAIAH QUESTION

A little more than a century ago, a new school of Biblical scholars was founded by the German Wellhausen. Terming itself the school of "higher criticism", it quickly gained prominence and has, until this day, comprised the most noted of Biblical experts.

Higher criticism has concerned itself with the composition of the Biblical text, using varying styles of Hebrew language as criteria for determining the authorship of different parts of each book. Using such methods, higher critics perceived multiple authorship, for example, in the book of Genesis. At first, there were said to be two separate accounts later compiled and made into one. But as more and more of the experts gave their opinions, the book was sub-divided so much that some came to agree that the passages in Genesis came from four or more sources, intricately woven together at different stages by different scribes whose approach also varied one from another.

Though a number of prominent scholars - most of them Israelis, whose knowledge of Hebrew one must surely consider to be superior to that of others - have refuted the documentary hypothesis and leveled serious criticisms against the methodology of higher criticism, yet it continues to fare well in most scholarly circles. Indeed, it is common to see the research of some Biblical scholars refuted solely on the basis that the writer is not an adherent of the school of higher criticism.

When it came to the book of Isaiah, higher critics began by dividing into two parts. Chapters 1 through 39 were held to be a stylistic unity, while chapters 40 through 66 were said to be written by another man and hence came to be termed Deutero-Isaiah ("second Isaiah"). In time, others further subdivided the text so that, in the opinion of many scholars, Isaiah was actually written by four, five or even more individuals in ancient times.

A number of subsequent studies have refuted the idea of multiple authorship for Isaiah. Some of these have been computer-assisted and all have used the Hebrew style of the book as a basis for their judgment on the matter. It is not out intention to depart from our main subject by discussing the pros and cons of higher criticism and those who refute it in the case of Isaiah. We shall be content to point out that one of the main reasons for the attempts by subdivide Isaiah is that the scholars involved simply did not believe in the principle of divine revelation and prophecy. In Isaiah 44:28 and 45:1, for example, we read of Cyrus of Persia, who did not rise to power until about 150 years after the time of Isaiah. For those who cannot believe God can reveal the future to his prophets, these passages appear to be a serious anachronism, explainable only in terms of prophecies written *ex post facto* by someone other than Isaiah several generations later. Thus, the higher critic has tended to be biased from the beginning by his lack of belief in prophecy.

The believer, on the other hand, has tended to be biased in the other direction, despite the fact that there exist no original manuscripts from Isaiah's time to support either side of the dispute. The discovery of an Isaiah scroll at Qumran which some scholars have dated to the middle of the second century BC has been cited as evidence that the whole of Isaiah was written as a single book. And yet this is no evidence at all, for not even the higher critics believe the final composition of the book to have been so late in history.

Latter-day Saints have tended to cite the existence of Isaiah quotes in the Book of Mormon as evidence that all of Isaiah was written before 600 BC, when Lehi left Jerusalem, taking with him the brass plates of Laban from which the Nephites derived their knowledge of Isaiah. Is the Book of Mormon valid evidence for such a view? Certainly, one can say that it is no evidence at all for those who do not accept its authenticity and who tend to believe that it was invented by Joseph Smith in 1829/30. But what of its evidence for the believing Latter-day Saint? This is a subject which we shall attempt to investigate here.

The Book of Mormon does, in fact, cite from the so-called Deutero-Isaiah. If, in fact, Deutero-Isaiah is a document written later than the original book of Isaiah, then we would expect that its existence in the BM text would give evidence that the book is a single document. This is not necessarily so, however. If, for example, it is found that Jesus cites from Deutero-Isaiah during his visit amongst the Nephites, we can assume that he was quoting from the book of Isaiah as it was known in his day, which is as we have it today. Any subsequent BM quotes could then be attributed to the fact that Jesus revealed this information to the Nephites.

Indeed, we know from the account in 3 Nephi that Jesus did reveal to the Nephites some Old Testament scriptures which had been written after Lehi's departure for the New World. The most noteworthy case is that of the third and fourth chapters of Malachi (= 3 Ne. 24-25), which he recited with the commandment that they should be written down (3 Ne. 24:1).

In 3 Ne. 23:1, Jesus told his Nephite audience, "And now, behold, I say unto you, that ye ought to search these things. Yea, a commandment I give unto you that ye search these things diligently; for great are the words of Isaiah." In the same chapter, he commands them to add to their own records certain items which had been omitted.

It is not impossible that Jesus could have cited a post-Lehite Deutero-Isaiah document for the purpose of providing the Nephites with scripture which they did not yet possess. Indeed, all of the "Deutero-Isaiah" passages cited in 3 Nephi are in quotations from the mouth of Jesus. They are as follows:

<u>3 Nephi</u>	<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>Commentary</u>
16:18-20	52:8-10	Direct quote (one word, "our", deleted). Attributed in 3 Ne. 16:17 by Jesus to Isaiah.
20:11	52:9-10	Footnote to the Isa. passage, made by BM editors, is unjustified, since Jesus is here making only a general reference to Isaiah and does not quote a particular passage.

20:32-35	52:8-10	BM footnotes only Isa. 52:9-10. A paraphrase of the original. Not attributed by Jesus.
20:36-45	52:1-3, 6-7, 11-15	Direct quote of verses listed, with some changes after Isa. 52:3. Cited by Jesus as "that which is written". (3 Ne. 20:36)
21:8b	52:15b	Almost the same as KJV, but unattributed.
21:29	52:12	Paraphrase by Jesus, unattributed. Cf. with the same vs. quoted in 3 Ne. 20.
22 (all)	54 (all)	Direct quote, with some small variations. Cited by Jesus as "that which is written". (3 Ne. 22:1)

After the time of Jesus' visit to the Nephites, there are only two BM quotes which could possibly be attributed to Deutero-Isaiah:

Isa. 52:1-2 & 54:2	Moro. 10:31	Seems to be a paraphrase. But the idea of "stakes" of Zion (Isa. 54:2) is actually introduced in Isa. 33:20, which is never assigned to Deutero-Isaiah.
Isa. 66:15-16	Morm. 8:29-31	Not a quote at all, though footnoted. This is a common idea, found in Matt. 24:6 and elsewhere. Also footnoted for 1 Ne. 14:16.

For Jesus to have attributed any of these quotes to Isaiah is not unreasonable, for they formed part of the book known by that name as it existed in his day, whether or not it was a compilation from different sources. It is not these Christian-era Nephite passages of Isaiah which concern us directly in our discussion of the Deutero-Isaiah question. Rather, it is quotes from that portion of the book of Isaiah found in the pre-Christian part of the Book of Mormon. We shall examine these next.

<u>Isaiah</u>	<u>BM</u>	<u>Commentary</u>
40:3	1 Ne. 10:8	A paraphrase. Since this is a <u>prophecy</u> of what John the Baptist would declare in the New Testament gospel accounts (it being, in his mouth, a quote from Isaiah), this was most likely not taken from the Isaiah written on the brass plates, but directly revealed to Nephi.
43:6-7	1 Ne. 22:25	Not a quote, though footnoted. This idea is also found in Ps. 50:5 and Jer. 3:14, available to the Nephites.
44:27 (or 51:10)	Hel. 12:16	Not a quote, though footnoted. This idea is also found in Jer. 50:38; 52:32, 36, available to the Nephites.
45:18	1 Ne. 17:36	The BM passage is so paraphrased as to make it possible that it did not come from Isaiah at all.
48 - 49 (all)	1 Ne. 20 - 21 (all)	Direct quotation, with variations. Attributed by Nephi to Isaiah and said to be written on the brass plates. (1 Ne. 19:22-24)
49:22 (or 62:10)	2 Ne. 29:2	Not a quote, though footnoted. This idea is also found in Isa. 5:26; 18:3. Note, however, below, where we see this verse cited elsewhere in BM.
49:22-23 49:24-26 50 - 51 (all)	2 Ne. 6:6-8 2 Ne. 6:16-18 2 Ne. 7 - 8 (all)	Direct quotation by Jacob, with variations. In his introductory remarks (2 Ne. 6:4-5), he attributes what he is reading to Isaiah. This would indicate that it came from BP.
52:7	1 Ne. 13:37b	Paraphrased with great variation from KJV.
52:7	Mos. 15:14-18	Paraphrase by Abinadi in his explanation of Isa. 53.
52:7-10	Mos. 12:21-24	Direct quotation by Abinadi, who refers to "the words which are written". (Mos. 12:20)
52:8-10	Mos. 15:29-31	Direct quotation by Abinadi, in his explanation of Isa. 53.
52:10	1 Ne. 22:10-1	Greatly paraphrased in BM.
53 (all)	Mos. 14 (all)	Direct quotation, with some variations. Attributed by Abinadi to Isaiah. (Mos. 14:1)

53:7	Mos. 15:6	Direct quotation, attributed to Isaiah.
53:8-10	Mos. 15:10	Paraphrase by Abinadi, in his explanation of Isa. 53.
55:1	2 Ne. 26:25	A near quote, but with "milk and honey" instead of "wine and milk". Not attributed. This is possibly a quotation from an as-yet-unknown scripture (e.g., Zenos or Zenock?), which Deutero-Isaiah also quotes. See below.
55:1-2	2 Ne. 9:50-51	With a few minor word changes, Isa. 55:1 is directly quoted, while vs. 2 is paraphrased. As above, this may be a quotation from an unknown scripture which Deutero-Isaiah also quotes. Note the entry above and especially that while one lists "milk and honey", the other, following Isaiah, lists "wine and milk".
66:15-16	1 Ne. 14:16	Not a quote, though footnoted (also in Morm. 8:29-31, already listed above). This, as previously mentioned, is a common idea.

In all, the following "Deutero-Isaiah" passages are definitely quoted in the pre-Christian Nephite scriptures and are at the same time attributed to Isaiah:

Isa. Chap. 48 - 51

Isa. 52:1-2

Isa. Chap. 53

In addition, Isa. 52:7-10 is also cited by Abinadi as part of his explanation of Isa. 53 and is implicitly derived from Isaiah.

If, therefore, Deutero-Isaiah exists as a separate book, we must contend with the fact that chapters 48-53 were on the brass plates carried by Lehi to the New World about 100 years after the time of Isaiah himself. Moreover, these quotes are attributed at that early time to the prophet Isaiah and not to someone who came along generations later. (Isaiah was likely a contemporary of Lehi's grandfather and it therefore would be questionable that the writings of another could have been attributed to him in so short a time.)

Some scholars have sought to sub-divide Deutero-Isaiah (chapters 40-66) into two parts, with chapters 40-48 forming one book and 49-66 another. This, however, does not solve our problem, since, under this system, BM quotes from both Second and Third Isaiah! It would not be impossible to contend that Lehi possessed chapters 1ff (though the first is never cited in BM) and at least 48-53 or 48-55. But this would tend to complicate the situation. It is much easier to assume that the Book of Isaiah is essentially a whole, that it was written by the prophet of that name and that any problems which it might have are due to subsequent scribal error, either on the part of the Nephites or of the Jews.

Essentially, then, one can conclude that the Book of Mormon does, indeed, present evidence for the unity of the Book of Isaiah. However, we must be cautious to note that, because it does not quote the entire book, it would be impossible to vouch for each and every passage of Isaiah. In the absence of the brass plates, we cannot know in all cases how the text possessed by the Nephites read. Nevertheless, we have tried, in this work, to give some idea of how the variants occurred.



## Chapter 6

### CONCLUSIONS

There are a number of conclusions which can be derived from the study presented here.

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. It is not always possible to know whether the Book of Mormon or the King James Version represents the original thoughts of the prophet Isaiah. Scribal error is possible along all lines and in different geographical locations. Moreover, because we often have a number of different versions of Isaiah which disagree one with another, it is obvious that we cannot always know which follows the original. This cannot be known unless we have before us the very scrolls prepared by the hand of Isaiah.
3. The evidence for the authenticity of antiquity of the Book of Mormon version of Isaiah - particularly when supported by internal textual evidence and/or by the versions - should be seen as evidence also for the authenticity of the Book of Mormon itself. It is inconceivable that Joseph Smith could have made so many correct changes in the Isaiah text and placed them in a fraudulent book. He could have made himself a much better reputation in the scholarly community by writing a philological treatise on the subject of the Isaiah text. Knowing, however, that he was not schooled in such matters, we must conclude that his story concerning the coming forth of the gold plates and their translation by divine assistance is true.

4. With its authenticity and antiquity established, the Book of Mormon can - even in its English translation - become a tool which can assist us in better understanding the book of Isaiah. It is true, of course, that the brass plates themselves or even the original Nephite records would be more valuable in such a task. But, in their absence, we at least have the English text to assist us.
5. Because of the linguistic evidence which supports Joseph Smith's account of the translation of the Book of Mormon, we can further see that the probability of his being a prophet is greatly enhanced. Consequently, it would be, to say the least, unwise to reject his story concerning the translation and production of other modern scriptures such as those found in the Doctrine and Covenants and Pearl of Great Price. And if these be truly the word of God through ancient and modern prophets, there are then additional implications concerning the Church restored through Joseph Smith and the doctrines and practices it follows.

Finally, I believe that I have been thoroughly honest and objective in this study, leaving emotion and faith aside as I pored through the linguistic material before me. It was not my intention to "slant" the evidence toward the Book of Mormon and, indeed, as the reader has seen, I have been frank whenever there were evidences of errors in the Book of Mormon or a lack of explanation for the Isaiah variants, thus shedding unfavorable light on Joseph Smith's work.

Despite what I hope has been a thorough - if perhaps not exhaustive - investigation of the Isaiah variants in the Book of Mormon, it is to be hoped that I have opened a few doors through which other scholars can walk. The greatest accomplishment I could want from this research is the satisfaction that it has started others to thinking more seriously about the nature and use of ancient scripture and that they have been inspired to study these important works to a greater extent than ever before.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Birnbaum, S. A., "The Date of the Isaiah Scroll," BASOR 113 (1949), 33-35.
- Brownlee, William W., "The Manuscript of Isaiah from Which DSIa was copied," BASOR, Oct. 1952, 16-20.
- Burrows, Millar, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," BASOR 111 (Oct. 1948) 10-24; 113 (Feb. 1949), 24-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "~~Was~~ and ~~Yodh~~ in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DIIsa)," BASOR 135 (1954), pp. 28-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Orthography, Morphology & Syntax of the St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1949, pp. 195-214.
- Burrows, Millar; Trevor, J. C. and Brownlee, William H. Jr., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, I. The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*. (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).
- Cross, Frank Moore Jr. and Talmon, Shemaryahu, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975).
- De Waard, J., *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Vol. IV of *Studies of the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, ed. by J. Van der Ploeg O.P. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965).
- Gottstein, M. H., "Bible Quotations in the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls," *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953), pp. 79-82.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Die Jesaiah-Rolle und das Problem der hebraischen Bibelhandschriften," *Biblica* 35 (1954), pp. 429-443.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Die Jesaiah-Rolle im Lichte von Peschitta und Targum," *Biblica* 35 (1954), pp. 51-72.
- Kittel, Rudolf (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica*. (Württembergische Bibelanstalt Stuttgart, 1937).
- Kutscher, Yehezkel, *Ha-lashon ve-ha-reqa<sup>c</sup> ha-leshoni shel megilat Yesha<sup>c</sup>yahu ha-shelemah mi-megilot Yam ha-Melah*. (In Hebrew.) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press of the Hebrew Univ., 1959).

- Mansoor, M., "The Massoretic Text in the Light of Qumran," *Vetus Testamentum Suppl.* 9 (1962), 305-321.
- Muilenburg, J., "Fragments of Another Isaiah Scroll," *BASOR* 135 (1954), pp. 28-32.
- Murphy, E. R., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament Comparisons," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 18 (1956).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*. (Westminster, 1957).
- Orlinsky, H. M., "Studies in the Saint Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950), 149-166; *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1950/51), 151-154; *Journal of Near East Studies* 11 (1952), 153-156).
- \_\_\_\_\_, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: the Septuagint Text," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959), pp. 26-34.
- Roberts, B. J., "The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumran," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 42 (1959-60), pp. 132-44.
- Rosenbloom, Joseph R., *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis. A Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1970).
- Seeligman, I. L., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948).
- Stenning, J. F., *The Targum of Isaiah*. (Oxford, 1949).
- Thomas, J. Winton, *Liber Jesaiah* (part of the revision of Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, listed above, 1968).
- Teicher, J. L., "The Christian Interpretation of the Sign X in the Isaiah Scroll," *Vetus Testamentum*, 1955, p. 189-198.
- Ziegler, J., "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (IQIsa)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78 (1959), pp. 34-60.