

“BEHOLD, OTHER SCRIPTURES I WOULD THAT YE SHOULD WRITE”: MALACHI IN THE BOOK OF MORMON

Colby Townsend

The years following the return of the Jewish captives from Babylon were filled with tension. While literal walls were being built around Jerusalem to keep the city safe, pious Jewish leaders were constructing religious walls around the Jewish faith to ensure that YHWH would never again become angry enough to allow his holy city to be destroyed. It was during this period that an unknown author, known later as “Malachi,” produced the final book of the *Nevi'im* or “Prophets.” Written to correct what the author viewed as improper religious and social behavior, Malachi calls for the post-exilic Jewish community—particularly the priests—to see the exile as a divine punishment for failing to honor their sacred covenant with YHWH and to correct their ways.

Despite its significance as the final book of the Christian Old Testament, the New Testament shows no explicit knowledge of the book of Malachi. In the case of the Book of Mormon¹ this is true up until

I am grateful to several friends, family members, and professors who have read and engaged with this essay since I originally wrote it for the undergraduate course, “The Book of Mormon as Literature,” taught by David Bokovoy at the University of Utah during the fall 2013 semester. I thank the following for their comments, encouragement, and helping me to rethink portions of this paper: David Bokovoy, Joshua Lipman, Kelsey Townsend, Christian Larsen, Bradley Parker, Margaret Toscano, and Robin Jensen.

1. Throughout this study I will use the 1830 edition as the base text of the Book of Mormon unless otherwise noted, and I am dependent on the one provided by the Joseph Smith Papers Project, <http://www.josephsmithpapers.org/paper-summary/book-of-mormon-1830/1>. I will also note variants between the 1830

3 Nephi 24 with the formal citation of Malachi by Jesus when he visits the Nephites at the temple in Bountiful. The fact that the Book of Mormon shows no direct knowledge of the text of Malachi until 3 Nephi 24 is intriguing because there are many quotations, allusions, and echoes² throughout the text prior to this part of the book.³ This is interesting for many reasons. First, with this in mind, students of the Book of Mormon can study those places in the text where Malachi is used and analyze them through source-critical means to answer the following questions: (1) How does the Book of Mormon utilize a text from the Bible, in this case the book of Malachi? (2) How is the text similar and how is it different? (3) Are there any significant differences between the two? Second, the use of Malachi in the Book of Mormon is dependent solely on the King James Version of the Bible, which will be demonstrated below. This has implications for understanding how the Book of Mormon came to be written. Third, the sections where the Book of Mormon uses the text of Malachi can substantially help us obtain a better grasp of the composition date of those sections in the Book of Mormon. They provide evidence against a “tight control” translation theory,⁴ which has been offered by a number of scholars on the translation process of the Book of Mormon.

and the original (O) and printer’s (P) manuscripts. For the printer’s manuscript I have relied on Royal Skousen and Robin Scott Jensen, eds., *The Joseph Smith Papers: Revelations and Translations Volume 3: The Printer’s Manuscript of the Book of Mormon*, 2 vols. (Salt Lake City: The Church Historian’s Press, 2015).

2. Malachi has influenced at least thirty-nine verses in the Book of Mormon directly, some more substantially than others. These verses together are only a preliminary list at the present moment and will be expanded upon in my future work: 1 Nephi 2:23; 3:7; 11:27; 14:17; 17:13; 22:15, 24; 2 Nephi 25:13; 26:4, 6, 9; 45:13a, 14a; Alma 45:14; 3 Nephi 24:1–18; 25:1–6; Ether 9:22.

3. Andrew E. Hill makes a similar statement about the use of Malachi in the New Testament in *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Yale Bible, vol. 25D (New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1998), 84.

4. The main proponent of this theory is Royal Skousen, the leading text critic of the Book of Mormon. See his “How Joseph Smith Translated the Book of

Traditionally, Malachi was the last prophet to write in the biblical canon (although historically it was the book of Daniel),⁵ and the text and ministry of the prophet are generally dated to the first half of the fifth century BCE, anywhere from 500 to 450 BCE.⁶ Scholars agree that it is composed of six oracles, and that the structure of each oracle is, in Andrew Hill's words, "a prophetic declaration followed by the hypothetical audience rebuttal and concluding with the prophet's refutation." While there is a scholarly consensus about the six oracles, Hill notes that

Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript," *Journal of Book of Mormon Studies* 7, no. 1 (1998): 22–31 and his essay, of which the former is an updated, shorter version, "Translating the Book of Mormon: Evidence from the Original Manuscript," in *Book of Mormon Authorship Revisited: The Evidence for Ancient Origins*, edited by Noel B. Reynolds (Provo: FARMS, 1997), 61–93.

5. Daniel was written around the 160s BCE. See John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 38; Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), 13; and Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "The Book of Daniel," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, edited by Leander E. Keck (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1996), 7:20–32, who seems to purposefully skirt the dating of the text of the book of Daniel. While he utilizes John Joseph Collins's earlier *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 16 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977) to argue for the dating of the "traditions," he never uses Collins's full commentary on Daniel, which explicitly dates the text later.

6. See Hill, *Malachi*, 80–84, who assigns 500 BCE; W. Neil, "Malachi," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by George A. Buttrick (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1962), 3:229, who assigns 460–450 BCE; John Carmody, Denise Lardner Carmody, and Robert L. Cohn, *Exploring the Hebrew Bible* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1988), 257, who assign 500–450 BCE; David Noel Freedman, et al., *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 848, who offer different dates ranging from ca. 605–550 BCE, 515–456 BCE, or into the late Persian period, but these earlier dates are highly unlikely because of Malachi's affinities with other post-exilic texts; and Michael D. Coogan, *The Old Testament: A Historical and Literary Introduction to the Hebrew Scriptures* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 436, who says "a date in the fifth century BCE is likely."

“the same cannot be said for the structure of the entire book itself.”⁷ Although almost all scholars agree that there are six oracles or units in the text,⁸ they do not agree on whether or not one can assign firm structures within each of these units.⁹

Malachi has suffered little from additions or alterations to the text, as far as historical- and text-critical methods can discern. Scholars have expressed doubts concerning the authenticity of some of the different sections of the book of Malachi, but the general consensus is that only Malachi 2:11–12 and 4:4–6 are thought to be non-genuine.¹⁰ There have been disagreements over whether or not the superscription at 1:1, the “universalist” intrusion at 1:11–14, the shift to third person narrative at 3:1–4, or the smoothing over of 2:15–16 are at all original to the text.¹¹ It is possible that any of these are correct. It appears that at least ten of the thirty-nine verses in the Book of Mormon are influenced by two of the pericopes from Malachi that may or may not be original to the book. These sections support my purposes here but ultimately they are not technically necessary to consider for the present investigation since the entire book of Malachi post-dates Lehi and Nephi in Jerusalem and therefore would not have been available to the Nephites in any form.

Intertextuality and Textual Dependence

In order to fully describe the relationship between the text of the Book of Mormon and Malachi, I will briefly describe current methods in biblical

7. Hill, *Malachi*, 26.

8. See Carmody, et al., *Exploring the Hebrew Bible*, 257. They state that the “traditional division of the brief text is into eight sections,” citing Eric M. Meyers, “Malachi, the Book of,” in Paul J. Achtemeier, ed., *Harper’s Bible Dictionary* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 598.

9. See Hill’s discussion of the differing views in Hill, *Malachi*, 26.

10. *Ibid.*, 19.

11. *Ibid.*, 19–20.

criticism used to establish dependence and label the relationship of parallel texts. There have been numerous studies over the last three decades that have reviewed how the books in the Hebrew Bible influenced one another,¹² how the books in the Hebrew Bible influenced later Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphic texts,¹³ how the Septuagint (i.e., the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible) influenced the New Testament,¹⁴ how the books of the New Testament influenced one another,¹⁵ and how

12. For example, see John E. Harvey, *Retelling the Torah: The Deuteronomistic Historian's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 403 (London: T&T Clark International, 2004); Michael A. Lyons, *From Law to Prophecy: Ezekiel's Use of the Holiness Code*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 507 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009); G. Brooke Lester, *Daniel Evokes Isaiah: Allusive Characterization of Foreign Rule in the Hebrew–Aramaic Book of Daniel*, Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 606 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); and Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*, Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

13. See John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 1 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988); G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 89–156; and Devorah Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section 2 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 379–419.

14. See Steve Moyise, *Evoking Scripture: Seeing the Old Testament in the New* (London: T&T Clark, 2008) and Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 148 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

15. See Anne M. O’Leary, *Matthew’s Judaization of Mark: Examined in the Context of the Use of Sources in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*, Library of New Testament

the New Testament influenced the first few centuries of Christian thought and beyond.¹⁶ These studies have created a storehouse of information on how to approach the methodological questions of availability and influence of one author on another.

There are two classic texts on inner-biblical exegesis and intertextuality in this field. Michael Fishbane's study *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*¹⁷ provides an exhaustive investigation of how the texts of the Hebrew Bible interpreted and expanded one another prior to the formation of the Hebrew canon. He presents evidence of exegesis similar to the later development of interpretation in rabbinic literature within the texts of the Hebrew Bible themselves. Although his study is exhaustive and has moved forward the field of inner-biblical exegesis, the terms that he uses are often difficult to follow for both lay and academic readers. In order to keep this study as clear as possible, I will therefore rely more on a second classical text, Richard Hays's *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*,¹⁸ and a more recent study by Christopher Beetham,¹⁹ for describing the relationships that I have found between the Book of Mormon and the King James Version text of Malachi.

Studies 323 (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

16. For example, see Carroll D. Osburn, *The Text of the Apostolos in Epiphanius of Salamis*, New Testament in the Greek Fathers, no. 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004) and Jean-Francois Racine, *The Text of Matthew in the Writings of Basil of Caesarea*, New Testament in the Greek Fathers, no. 5 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

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

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

19. Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, Biblical Interpretation Series 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Hays focuses primarily on describing the phenomenon of literary echo²⁰ and therefore leaves other types of relationships, such as quotations, allusions, and parallels, between texts alone. Beetham expounds on Hays's descriptions and comes up with a more complete list. These criteria are central to this study and, as defined by Beetham, they are the following:

Quotation: An intentional, explicit, verbatim or near verbatim citation of a former text of six or more words in length. A *formal* quotation is a quotation accompanied by an introductory marker, or *quotation formula*; an *informal* quotation lacks such a marker.²¹

Allusion: A literary device intentionally employed by an author to point a reader back to a single identifiable source, of which one or more components must be remembered and brought forward into the new context in order for the alluding text to be understood fully. An allusion is less explicit than a *quotation*, but more explicit than an echo. In this study, a linear marker of five words or less is considered to be an allusion.²²

Echo: A subtle, literary mode of reference that is not intended for public recognition yet derives from a specific predecessor. An author's wording may echo the precursor consciously or unconsciously and/or contextually or non-contextually.²³

Although Nicholas Frederick has seen the need to alter Beetham's definitions for his dissertation,²⁴ for my present purposes Beetham's definitions

20. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 29–32.

21. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 17.

22. *Ibid.*, 20.

23. *Ibid.*, 24.

24. Nicholas Frederick, "Line Within Line: An Intertextual Analysis of Mormon Scripture and the Prologue of the Gospel of John" (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 2013), 12–13. See also his more recent monograph, Nicholas J. Frederick, *The Bible, Mormon Scripture, and the Rhetoric of Allusivity*, Fairleigh Dickinson University Press Mormon Studies Series (Madison, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016).

capture a simple and concise way of describing the phenomenon of intertextuality and textual dependence as I see it occurring in the Book of Mormon's use of the Bible, and he tends to capture many of the nuances noted in other studies on intertextuality and textual dependence in the Hebrew Bible and New Testament.²⁵

The Presence of Malachi in the Book of Mormon

I will begin by examining the claim that the Book of Mormon is dependent on the King James Version of Malachi through comparing the two source- and text-critically. I will then offer ways of interpreting the text's internal claims in light of those findings. This will allow me to focus on the major issues of having the King James Version not only in 3 Nephi, but also in 1 Nephi, 2 Nephi, Alma, and Ether. With this understanding, this paper will provide more examples of the influence of the King James Version on the Book of Mormon that can help us to better understand the book's message, composition, and nature as a literary text.

In his recent PhD dissertation, Nicholas Frederick described the presence of the King James Version in the Book of Mormon by stating that the King James language was invoked to lend biblical authenticity,

25. Many of the studies since Fishbane and Hays have been dependent on either of these two scholars, but more have followed Hays's terms than Fishbane's. There have been a number of studies that have challenged Hays's terminology and criteria, but even those studies use his research. See in particular Charlene McAfee Moss, *The Zechariah Tradition and the Gospel of Matthew*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 156 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 7–12; Marko Jauhiainen, *The Use of Zechariah in Revelation*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, Reihe 199 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 18–36; Shiu-Lun Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans: A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2, Reihe 156 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 5–11; and Patricia Tull Willey, *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 161 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 81–84.

and that Joseph Smith was reliant on the King James Version for his translation. I agree with Frederick. The fact is that King James Version texts are everywhere in the Book of Mormon. This needs to be examined in more detail to fully appreciate and understand the Book of Mormon.²⁶ I will examine thirty-nine verses from the Book of Mormon to establish the extent of their dependence on the King James Version of Malachi. I will compare the King James Version of Malachi with the earliest versions of the Book of Mormon, mainly the printer's manuscript (P) and the first published edition (1830). The original manuscript is unfortunately not extant at 3 Nephi 24–25,²⁷ but I will utilize it for other verses where it is relevant.

I begin my comparison with a formal quotation from the King James Version of Malachi 4:1. The underlined text in all comparisons below indicate places of lexical correspondence between the Book of Mormon and the King James Version. The underlined phrases correspond only to Malachi and are found nowhere else in the King James Version unless otherwise noted. The breaks in the underlining are meant to point the reader to how the language is still similar between the two texts but with slight variation.

1 Nephi 22:15 = Malachi 4:1

BM: For behold, saith the prophet, that the time cometh speedily, that Satan shall have no more power over the hearts of the children of men: for the day soon cometh, that all the proud and they which do wickedly, shall be as stubble; and the day cometh that they must be burned.

KJV: For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.

26. Frederick, "Line Within Line," 30.

27. The extant manuscript of O jumps from 3 Nephi 21:11 to 3 Nephi 26:3. Royal Skousen, ed., *The Original Manuscript of the Book of Mormon: Typographical Facsimile of the Extant Text* (Provo: FARMS, 2001), 524–25.

The entire verse of 1 Nephi 22:15 is dependent on Malachi 4:1. Although not named, the prophet Malachi is formally quoted with the use of the citation formula, “For behold, saith the prophet.” 1 Nephi 22:15 is dependent on the King James Version of Malachi for twenty-seven words. The parallel in Isaiah 47:14, noted by Brant Gardner in his commentary,²⁸ does not come close to matching 1 Nephi 22:15 the way Malachi 4:1 does here. This is consistent throughout the Book of Mormon when a passage of the Book of Mormon, Isaiah 47:14, and Malachi 4:1 are compared and contrasted. This can be seen in the following:

Behold, they shall be as stubble; the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver themselves from the power of the flame: there shall not be a coal to warm at, nor fire to sit before it.²⁹

While there are similarities between Isaiah 47:14 and 1 Nephi 22:15, the Isaiah text does not include anything about “the proud,” those who “do wickedly,” the day that is coming, and Isaiah 47:14 also describes fire burning them up rather than saying the day will burn them like you find in Malachi 4:1 and 1 Nephi 22:15. A close comparison reveals the dependence of 1 Nephi 22:15, as well as several other passages in the Book of Mormon, is on Malachi 4:1 and not Isaiah 47:14. Even if Gardner’s view was accurate, it would still be problematic for the Book of Mormon historically, as Isaiah 47:14 would fall into those chapters of Isaiah (roughly 40–66, but the list also includes chapters 1, 13–14, 24–27, 34–35, and 36–39)³⁰ that were written either during or after the

28. Brant A. Gardner, *Second Witness: Analytical and Contextual Commentary on the Book of Mormon, Volume One: First Nephi* (Salt Lake City: Greg Kofford Books, 2007), 411–12.

29. Isaiah 47:14 (KJV).

30. See Ulrich F. Berges, *The Book of Isaiah: Its Composition and Final Form*, Hebrew Bible Monographs 46 (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2012); and David P. Wright, “Isaiah in the Book of Mormon: Or Joseph Smith in Isaiah,” in *American Apocrypha: Essays on the Book of Mormon*, edited by Dan Vogel and Brent Lee Metcalfe (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 2002), 157–234.

Babylonian exile and are therefore assigned to Deutero-Isaiah. As will be apparent as other verses are explored below, Gardner has the habit of connecting several verses in the Book of Mormon with Isaiah 47:14 where they are instead dependent on Malachi 4:1.

As noted above, Beetham defines a quotation as an intentional, explicit, and verbatim citation of a former text of at least six words or more, and a formal quotation is accompanied by a citation formula.³¹ In light of this criterion 1 Nephi 22:15 is formally quoting Malachi 4:1 by its use of the citation formula “saith the prophet” along with twenty-seven words from the source text. This is one of the most direct connections between the Book of Mormon and the King James Version of Malachi outside of 3 Nephi 24–25, but there are a handful of other formal quotations of the King James Version of Malachi in the Book of Mormon.

1 Nephi 22:23–24 = Malachi 4:1a, 2b³²

BM: 23 for the time speedily shall come, that all churches which are built up to get gain, and all they which are built up to get power over the flesh, and they which are built up to become popular in the eyes of the world, and they which seek the lusts of the flesh and the things of the world, and to do all manner of iniquity; yea, in fine, all they which belong to the kingdom of the Devil, it is they which need fear, and tremble, and quake; it is they which must be brought low in the dust; it is they which must be consumed as stubble: and this is according to the words of the prophet. 24 And the time cometh speedily, that the righteous must be led up as calves of the stall, and the Holy One of Israel must reign in dominion, and might, and power, and great glory.

KJV: 1 For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch. 2 But unto you that fear my name

31. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture*, 17.

32. Gardner does not mention these verses either, which could have possibly altered the way he saw the dependence in v. 15 of this chapter. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 1:414.

shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.

This passage in 1 Nephi 22:23–24 is very similar to that of the previous verse, 1 Nephi 22:15. This is not surprising when one realizes that verses 23–24 are only eight verses away from 22:15, and it appears that there is an extended use of Malachi 4 that subtly runs through the chapter. Along with the quotation formula, “this is according to the words of the prophet,” at the end of verse 23, the phrases that match up are collectively unique to Malachi in the King James Version. These four connections, along with the unique verbiage and context are only found in Malachi and the fact that verse 15 is also explicitly dependent on Malachi, make it certain that 1 Nephi 22:23–24 is dependent on Malachi 4:1a, 2b. According to the criteria explained in the introduction, 1 Nephi 22:23–24 formally quotes Malachi 4:1–2 due to the use of the citation formula and the unique language.

2 Nephi 26:4 = Malachi 4:1b³³

BM: 4 Wherefore, all they that are proud, and that do wickedly, the day that cometh shall burn them up saith the Lord of Hosts, for they shall be as stubble.

KJV: 1b . . . and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts.

This is very similar to the previous two passages. The dependence here is so strong it would be hard to deny that 2 Nephi 26:4 is not dependent on Malachi 4:1, especially considering how 2 Nephi 26:4 uses twenty-five words from the King James Version of Malachi. According to the standard of six or more words, this is an informal quotation, continued into the next verse. However, in a move that would disconnect this passage from Malachi, Gardner has argued that “Nephi purposefully alludes to Isaiah

33. Gardner does not mention the dependence of this verse on Malachi 4:1. See below for further explanation. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:354.

47:14: ‘Behold, they shall be as stubble; the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver themselves from the power of the flame: there shall not be a coal to warm at, nor fire to sit before it.’³⁴

Brant Gardner and John Tvedtnes³⁵ have argued that 2 Nephi 26:4 is dependent on Isaiah 47:14 and other passages³⁶ in Isaiah, Obadiah, and Nahum, but not on Malachi 4:1 because “Malachi lived two centuries after Lehi’s departure from Jerusalem and could not have been known to the Nephites.”³⁷ It becomes clear when these verses are side by side, as they are above, that this explanation must be rejected. Just like the verses previously mentioned, the number of parallels between 2 Nephi 26:4 and Malachi 4:1 far outweigh the parallels found in Isaiah 47:14. This becomes even more clear given the connections between 2 Nephi 26:6b and Malachi 4:1.

2 Nephi 26:6b = Malachi 4:1³⁸

BM: 6b . . . and they shall be as stubble, and the day that cometh shall consume them, saith the Lord of Hosts.

KJV: 1 . . . and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts. . . .

This verse continues the use of Malachi 4:1 in 2 Nephi 26:4 and is further evidence that this section of the Book of Mormon is dependent on Malachi 4. The similarities are the same in this verse in regards to

34. Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:354.

35. John Tvedtnes, “Review of Wesley P. Walters, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon*,” *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon* 4, no. 1 (1992): 223.

36. Tvedtnes points out that “the concept (and much of the wording) in Malachi 4:1 is found in Isaiah 5:24; 33:11; 47:14 (cf. Obadiah 1:18); and Nahum 1:10” (“Review of Wesley P. Walters,” 223).

37. *Ibid.*, 223.

38. Gardner notes that this may be a reference to Malachi 4:1. The inconsistent argumentation of dependence on Isaiah 47:14 and Malachi 4:1 in the Book of Mormon by Gardner is perplexing. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:355.

verse 4 above, and the pronoun “they” is referring back to “they that are proud, and that do wickedly” in verse 4. Therefore, “they” is the equivalent of that part of Malachi 4:1. This entire section of the verse is dependent on Malachi 4:1 for its terminology and context, although the Book of Mormon updates a number of the details in between the verses of 2 Nephi 26:4–9. 2 Nephi 26:6b is dependent on the text of Malachi 4:1. Due to its use of nineteen words from the King James Version of Malachi, 2 Nephi 26:6 informally quotes Malachi 4:1.

2 Nephi 26:9 = Malachi 4:2³⁹

BM: 9 But the Son of righteousness shall appear unto them; and he shall heal them. . . .

KJV: 2 But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings.

Continuing on from where 2 Nephi 26:6 left off, verse 9 picks up in Malachi 4:2. The Christianized view of the “Son” of righteousness, rather than the “Sun” of righteousness, is apparent here, as in other Restoration scriptures that make this change. In this verse, the “Son of righteousness” is “appearing” rather than arising. This is reminiscent of the use of “appeared” in the gospels of Mark and Luke in describing how when “Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to. . .” (Mark 16:9; cf. Luke 24:34). The author of 2 Nephi 26:9 has taken Malachi and updated it, interpreting it in view of these New Testament gospel narratives. The only part of the text that does not seem to match up as nicely here is “unto them” and “unto you that fear my name.” 2 Nephi 26:8 actually describes for us who these people are: “the righteous, that hearken unto the words of the Prophets, and destroy them not, but look forward unto Christ with steadfastness for the signs which are given, notwithstanding all persecutions.” It appears that even

39. Gardner argues for dependence here on Malachi 4:2. The way he discusses it will be reviewed below. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:356–57.

the pronoun “them” is dependent on Malachi 4:2 because they are the righteous, those that “fear my name.”

Due to the use of ten words from the King James Version, 2 Nephi 26:9 informally quotes Malachi 4:2, but the entirety of 2 Nephi 26:4–9 should also be considered as a whole. Collectively, these verses are dependent on Malachi 4:1–2 for fifty-four words. These verses together comment on and expand the beginning of Malachi 4, blending the language and ideas from these verses with language and ideas from the New Testament⁴⁰ and other texts from the Hebrew Bible.⁴¹ While previous commentators like Gardner and Tvedtnes have attempted to take the focus away from the influence of Malachi 4 on this section of the Book of Mormon by pointing to some of these other connections, it is more methodologically sound to incorporate all of them together. Malachi 4:1–2 provides the framing for these Book of Mormon verses, while some of the other biblical texts provide the filler ideas and language all brought together and appropriated in a way similar to how Terryl Givens has noted bricolage in Smith’s work on the Book of Abraham.⁴²

40. Compare 2 Nephi 26:5 (“and they that kill the prophets”) and the sentiment found in the KJV only in the New Testament in Matthew 23:31 (“the children of them which killed the prophets”); Luke 11:47 (“the sepulchres of the prophets, and your fathers killed them”); and 1 Thessalonians 2:15 (“Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets”).

41. Compare 2 Nephi 26:5 (“the depths of the earth shall swallow them up”) with Numbers 16:30, 34 (“the LORD make a new thing, and the earth open her mouth, and swallow them up . . . Lest the earth swallow us up also”) and Exodus 15:12 (“the earth swallowed them”); and 2 Nephi 26:5 (“and mountains shall cover them”) with Hosea 10:8 (“they shall say to the mountains, Cover us”) and Luke 23:30 (“they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us”).

42. Terryl Givens shared this insight in a paper he presented on March 16, 2017 at a conference at Utah State University in Logan, Utah. The conference was called *New Perspectives on Joseph Smith and Translation*. Bricolage comes from the French anthropologist and ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss. See Claude Lévi-Strauss, *The Savage Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 21–35.

2 Nephi 25:13 = Malachi 4:2⁴³

BM: 13 . . . he shall rise from the dead, with healing in his wings. . . .

KJV: 2 . . . shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings. . . .

The dependence here is clear and does not need to be demonstrated any more than providing the parallel above. The addition of “from the dead,” making this about Jesus’ resurrection rather than about describing the sun rising in the sky as Malachi does, alters the context of the scripture. Also, the “Son of Righteousness,” as this phrase is usually rendered in the Book of Mormon, is absent in this passage. If we look to verse 12, we discover that the subject (“he”) is “the Only Begotten of the Father,” which is similar to how the other passages dependent on Malachi 4:2 in the Book of Mormon interpret that verse. Due to its use of seven words from the King James Version of Malachi, 2 Nephi 25:13 informally quotes Malachi 4:2.

1 Nephi 2:23 = Malachi 3:9⁴⁴

BM: 23 . . . that they rebel against me, I will curse them with a sore curse. . . .

KJV: 9 Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me. . . .

The phrase “I will curse them with a sore curse” is dependent on the King James Version of Malachi 3:9 in the phrase, “ye are cursed with a curse.” 1 Nephi 2:23 preserves the literal reading of the cognate accusative found in the King James Version. An example of a modern translation not dependent on the King James Version is the JPS Tanakh, which has

43. Gardner notes the literary dependence (but not direct quotation) here on Malachi 4:2 but argues that this could not have been a direct quotation because Malachi would not have been on the plates. His further arguments will be discussed below. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:331.

44. Gardner makes no mention of the similarity here. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 1:98–99.

rendered the verse as “You are suffering under a curse.”⁴⁵ There is one other verse in the King James Version that has the literal structure of the cognate accusative rendered “cursed . . . curse,” and even has “grievous curse” in comparison to “sore curse,” but the verse does not share the same context with 1 Nephi like Malachi 3:9 does.⁴⁶ The text of Malachi 3:9 is a warning to an entire group, the Israelites of the Second Temple period. In 1 Nephi the warning is against the entire group of Lamanites (presumably also of the Second Temple period, but now on the western hemisphere). If the Lamanites were to rebel against Nephi the Lord would “curse them with a sore curse.” We are to conclude, then, that the text in 1 Nephi 2:23 is dependent on Malachi 3:9 due to similar terminology and context. Due to the looser lexical link, 1 Nephi 2:23 echoes Malachi 3:9.

Ether 9:22 = Malachi 4:2–3

BM: 22 . . . and he even saw the son of righteousness, and did rejoice and glory in his day. . . .

KJV: 2 . . . shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing . . . 3 . . . in the day that I shall do this . . .

The reference to the “son of righteousness,” especially in this eschatological context, in Ether 9:22 cannot be understood without having Malachi 4:2 in the background. We would be left to wonder who this “son of righteousness” is and what tradition the Book of Ether was alluding to. It is clear when one takes into account the fact that each time Malachi 4:2 is referenced in Restoration scripture, the same change to the source is made: “Sun” to “Son.” In this passage, the “Sun” has not only been changed to the familial “Son” but has also been specified as an individual in history. This verse is clearly dependent on Malachi 4:2. Brant Gardner discusses this passage and the changing of the phrase “Sun of righteousness” to “Son of righteousness” in this light: “[This phrase] is

45. Taken from Malachi 3:9 in Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds., *The Jewish Study Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 1273.

46. See 1 Kings 2:8.

either a new term used in the New World, or it is Joseph's phrase that is used in translation, and is the result of his speaking the phrase from Malachi and assuming that it refers to the "son" without checking the spelling. I lean toward this latter possibility."⁴⁷

I agree with Gardner in arguing that this latter possibility is the more probable. The phrase "Sun of righteousness" is specific to Malachi 4:2. Where I differ with Gardner is in how Joseph came to this new spelling, which I will discuss further below. I think Smith was fully aware that the text in Malachi 4:2 was spelled "Sun," and that he altered the spelling because he saw Malachi 4:2 as a prophecy of the coming of Jesus' birth and life.

1 Nephi 3:7 = Malachi 3:1⁴⁸

BM: 7 . . . save he shall prepare a way for them that they may accomplish the thing . . .

KJV: 1 I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me. . . .

This literary connection between the two verses is found in the phrase from 1 Nephi 3:7, "he shall prepare a way," which is similar to Malachi 3:1, which says, "he shall prepare the way," speaking of the messenger the Lord would send before the coming eschaton. This is not merely a semantic similarity or similar terminology one can find throughout the Bible and the Book of Mormon. There are five verses in Ezekiel that share this phraseology, and none of them fit 1 Nephi 3:7 the way that Malachi 3:1 does.⁴⁹

In Malachi, a messenger is being prophesied of in the future tense who "shall prepare the way before me." In 1 Nephi, Nephi is declaring his

47. Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:357.

48. Gardner makes no mention of the similarity here. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 1:103.

49. Cf. Ezekiel 45:17, 23, 24; 46:7, 12.

faith that God “shall prepare a way for them that they may accomplish the thing which he commandeth them.” The only differences are the variants “a way” and “the way,” and “for them” and “before me.” Although this is not grounds enough to argue for direct literary dependence, this passage appears to have provided the conceptual framework for the phrase in 1 Nephi 3:7. Therefore, 1 Nephi 3:7 echoes Malachi 3:1.

1 Nephi 14:17 = Malachi 3:1; 4:1⁵⁰

BM: 17 And when the day cometh that the wrath of God is poured out upon . . .

KJV: 4:1 For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven . . .

BM: 17 . . . in preparing the way for the fulfilling of his covenants . . .

KJV: 3:1 I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me . . . the messenger of the covenant. . .

The dependence here is found in two phrases, “the day cometh,” and “preparing the way for the fulfilling of his covenants.” At first glance, these appear to have little dependence on Malachi, but on a closer reading it becomes apparent that this verse has synthesized Malachi 3:1 together into one phrase, with the beginning of verse 17 taken from Malachi 4:1. Malachi 4:1 begins, “For behold, the day cometh. . .” and shares this phrase with no other verse in the King James Version. Malachi 3:1 reads, speaking again of the messenger, “*he shall prepare the way* before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even *the messenger of the covenant*, whom ye delight in. . .”⁵¹ Similar to 1 Nephi 3:7, this passage probably has no direct literary dependence, but it does seem that 1 Nephi 14:17 is dependent on King James Version Malachi 3:1 and 4:1 in the form that Joseph Smith received the text. 1 Nephi 14:17 echoes both Malachi 3:1 and 4:1.

50. Gardner makes no mention of the similarity here. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 1:250.

51. Emphasis mine.

1 Nephi 17:13 = Malachi 3:1⁵²

BM: 13 . . . and I will prepare the way before you, if it so be that . . .

KJV: 1 . . . my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me . . .

The intertextual connection between these verses with the phrase “will prepare the way before you” is similar to 1 Nephi 3:7 and 1 Nephi 14:17 above. It is dependent on Malachi 3:1, and the only variants found in 1 Nephi are the changes of “shall” to “will” and “me” to “you.” There is only one other verse in the King James Version that shares this terminology, Mark 1:2, which reads “which shall prepare thy way before thee.” The language found in 1 Nephi is closer to Malachi 3:1 than Mark 1:2. Therefore, 1 Nephi 17:13 echoes Malachi 3:1 in the direct use of four words.

Alma 45:13a, 14a = Malachi 4:5

BM: 13a . . . and when that great day cometh . . . 14a . . . that great and dreadful day . . .

KJV: 5 . . . the coming of the great and dreadful day . . .

At first sight Alma 45:13a appears to be only superficially related to Malachi 4:5. The similar terms used are “cometh” and “coming” and “that great day” and “the great . . . day,” but alone this would not be enough to establish textual dependence. It is only when one ignores the verses that were later assigned to the text that we can see the clear dependence here on Malachi 4:5.

Alma 45:14a clarifies the dependence of Alma 45:13a on Malachi 4:5. The phrase “great and dreadful day” is unique to Malachi 4:5 in the King James Bible, and a review of nineteenth-century literature that employs this term shows that many texts that use this phrase are also

52. Gardner makes no mention of the similarity here. See Gardner, *Second Witness*, 1:300.

dependent on the King James Version Malachi.⁵³ The only other place where “great” and “dreadful” are used in a similar construction is found in Daniel 9:4, “the great and dreadful God.” The beginnings of both of these verses are dependent in their terminology on Malachi 4:5, and both echo that verse.

3 Nephi 24–25 = Malachi 3–4

I know of no one who would argue against 3 Nephi 24–25 being dependent on Malachi 3–4, however one defines “dependence.” Besides including a citation formula within the text itself, the chapter heading of the LDS edition of the Book of Mormon has noted that these chapters are a lengthy quotation of Malachi 3–4 since the 1879 edition. This is the most firmly established dependence of the Book of Mormon on the King James Version Malachi and therefore needs no more support here. After analyzing the text-critical data, though, I will argue that 3 Nephi 24 and 25 are dependent specifically on the King James Version of Malachi.

Out of the two full chapters quoted directly from Malachi 3 and 4, the printer’s manuscript of the Book of Mormon text only has eight variants, although it is likely only seven, as will be described below. This is a very low ratio of divergence when compared to the lengthy quotations of Isaiah in 1 and 2 Nephi, and even in comparison to the version of Matthew 5–7 in 3 Nephi. The verses in 3 Nephi 24–25 correspond with the English verse numbers, although they differ in Hebrew at Malachi 3:19 (which never included a fourth chapter), where the English has 4:1. This does not affect my analysis of the Book of Mormon because these chapter and verse numbers were added years after the first publication of the Book of Mormon. I will analyze each of these variants. It will be best to group similar variants to show the frequency of common types.

53. See Isaac Watts, *The Works of Rev. Isaac Watts. D. D. in Seven Volumes, Vol. I: Containing Sermons* (Leeds: Printed by Edward Baines, 1800), 460.

The printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon shares 735 of 740 words in 3 Nephi 24–25 with the King James Version of Malachi 3–4.⁵⁴ This commonality of words is specifically found with the later 1769 edition of the King James Version, whereas if we were to compare the Book of Mormon with the earlier editions of the King James Bible up to 1769, this amount of agreement would not be found, though it would still be relatively close. These 735 words are the same and share the same tense and gender with that of their counterpart in the 1769 King James Version of Malachi 3–4. This means that the printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon version of Malachi, the earliest extant copy of this part of the Book of Mormon, agrees with the King James Version of Malachi 99.32% of the time. On this basis alone one could argue for dependence on the King James Version, but other factors such as the variants need to also be examined before a conclusion can be reached.

Italics

Five of the eight variants between the printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon and the King James Version are based on the italics in the King James Version.⁵⁵ The original King James translators wanted to be careful about the words they inserted in the translation that were not represented in the Hebrew, so they printed those words as regular font instead of the more common text in bold font. The italics vary from

54. To specify, the eight words spelled differently are not all the same as the eight variants being discussed here. The King James Version of Malachi 3–4 has 748 words, and the disparity between the Book of Mormon and King James Version is due to the exclusion of words found in the King James Version. These exclusions will become evident in the discussion.

55. It is commonly believed that the italics originate in the 1611 printing of the King James Version, but this is not necessarily true. Many of the italics that are common to printed King James Versions today were added a century or more after the 1611 edition. They were added by later printers and editors of the text of the King James Version, and most printed editions of the King James Version today are the 1769 edition, including the current LDS edition of the Bible.

printed edition to printed edition in the early print history of the King James Version. Italics are significant for understanding Smith's early scriptural productions not only because they often explain variants but because of the prevailing view in the early nineteenth century about them. W. W. Phelps voiced this view well in an editorial in July 1833 for the *Evening and Morning Star*. After noting the forthcoming edition of the Bible prepared by Noah Webster, Phelps explains, "As to the errors in the bible, any man possessed of common understanding, knows, that both the old and new testaments are filled with errors, obscurities, italics and contradictions, which must be the work of men."⁵⁶ According to Phelps it was common knowledge that italics were grouped together with other "errors" in the Bible that had their origin with "the work of men." Therefore, the italics were an easy target to fix while working on the production of the Book of Mormon, and, in the process, of correcting the scriptures.

In the verses presented from the King James Version below the italics are all original. The first of these variants encountered is in 3 Nephi 24:5. The King James Version includes a clause that is left out in the Book of Mormon. The King James Version of Malachi 3:5 has, "and that turn aside the stranger *from his right*, and fear not me." The 1830 Book of Mormon and P both have, "and that turn aside the stranger, and fear not me." The Book of Mormon excludes "*from his right*." This follows a common approach, although not the rule,⁵⁷ of the lengthy quotations in the Book of Mormon to alter the quotation at the location of many

56. W. W. Phelps, "Errors of the Bible," *Evening and Morning Star* 2, no. 14, July 1833, 108.

57. It is common for the variants between the Book of Mormon and the King James Version to center around the italics in the King James Version, as has been noted in numerous other studies, but many italics are also not removed and were kept in the text of the Book of Mormon. It is important to note that a statistically high number of the variants between the Book of Mormon and King James Version in these sections are centered on italics.

of the italics in the King James Version, especially when there are two or more words in italics.

The second variant based on italics is found in 3 Nephi 24:13. The King James Version of Malachi 3:13b has, “Yet ye say, What have we spoken *so much* against thee?” whereas the 1830 Book of Mormon and P have, “Yet ye say, What have we spoken against thee?” The Book of Mormon simply skips over the italics in the King James Version and leaves out the words as if they were never part of the text.

The third variant based on italics is found in 3 Nephi 24:14. The Book of Mormon has, “It is vain to serve God: and what doth it profit that,” whereas the King James Version of Malachi 3:14 has, “It *is* vain to serve God: and what profit *is it* that.” Here the Book of Mormon changes the italicized “*is it*” to “doth it,” retaining the essential meaning but going back to a more archaic version of the expression “does it.” The King James Version phrasing was a common way to translate Malachi 3:14 in the pre-modern world, as neither the Geneva nor the Bishop’s bibles, both translated in the latter half of the sixteenth century, has this more archaic version of the expression found here in the Book of Mormon,⁵⁸ but rather agree with the “is it” of the King James Version. This verse follows the other variants as previously noted in being based solely on the italics found in the King James Version.

The fourth variant is found in 3 Nephi 24:15. The King James Version has, “yea, *they that* tempt God are even delivered,” whereas the 1830 Book of Mormon and P have “yea, them that tempt God are even delivered.” The Book of Mormon simply changes the plural found in the italics “*they*” into the ungrammatical “them.” What is found in the Book of Mormon does not change the meaning of the verse, although “they” is more grammatical English in this context than “them.” This

58. See *The Bible and Holy Scriptures Conteyned in the Olde and Newe Teftament. Translated According to the Ebrue and Greke, and conferred With the beft tranflations in diuers languages.* (Geneva: Printed at Rouland Hall, M. D. L. X. [1560]); and *The. holie. Bible. conteynyng the olde Teftament and the newe.* (1568).

variant is also to be explained by being altered because of the italics found in the King James Version.

The fifth variant is found in 3 Nephi 24:16. The King James Version of Malachi 3:16 has, “the Lord hearkened, and heard *it*,” whereas the 1830 Book of Mormon and P have, “the Lord hearkened, and heard.” This variant is best explained as a deletion based on the fact that “it” is found in italics in the King James Version.

I have shown how all five of the above variants are based on the italics as found in the King James Version and they are all therefore based on the English version of the text of Malachi. Nothing was different in substance to most of the examples, and the only ones that did change the substance deleted words from the King James Version. A word must be said about the words that the Book of Mormon shares in common with the King James Version that are italicized there but are still found in the Book of Mormon.

In Malachi 3–4 there are twenty-seven words italicized in late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth-century printings of the King James Version (whereas there are twenty-four words in regular font, or italics, in the 1611).⁵⁹ The printer’s manuscript of the Book of Mormon retains nineteen of the twenty-seven italicized words, whereas it alters the text of eight of them. The 1830 Book of Mormon agrees with the King James Version against P in five instances, but never when the changes are related to italicized words. The majority of these italicized words are single words like “is,” “this,” “with,” etc., and highlight the difference in four of the five variants above. The place where we should expect alteration in the Book of Mormon text is at the end of 3 Nephi 24:10, where the King James Version of Malachi 3:10 has, “that *there shall not be room enough to receive it.*” The fact that the Book of Mormon does not alter

59. At Malachi 3:9 the later editions of the King James Version have italics at “Ye *are* cursed . . .” and Malachi 4:4 “*with* the statutes and judgments,” whereas the 1611 King James Version does not have regular font (i.e., italics) for either of these.

this line is surprising but explainable. The mass of variants in this part of Malachi 3:10 would require altering the phrasing completely. It was much easier to allow the phrasing to stay the same than attempt to create new wording when the only recourse Smith had was to the English of the King James Bible. The fact that the language was kept the same also fits into the category of the 735 of the 740 words the printer's manuscript of the Book of Mormon uses directly from the King James Version.⁶⁰

A final note on italics is in order. In comparing P with the King James Version and the 1830 Book of Mormon it becomes clear that E. B. Grandin corrected the text of P toward the King James Version in several places. In 3 Nephi 24:11 Cowdery accidentally left "and" out of "for your sakes, and he shall not destroy." Since Grandin was checking the text of P against a copy of the Bible he corrected the mistake and included "and" in the 1830 edition. Of all the corrections Grandin made for obvious errors in P he left the differences whenever the change was made to an italicized word. He could have easily viewed the variant in 3 Nephi 24:16 as an accident, where "*it*" is left out of P, and included it in the 1830 Book of Mormon. The fact that he left these variants dealing with italics completely alone, even when their grammar was suspicious and similar to other corrections he made, suggests that Grandin had been instructed on what kinds of variants between P and the King James Version to fix and what kinds to leave alone. In this case, since all of the variants he left alone were based on italics, I suggest that he was likely instructed by Joseph Smith, Oliver Cowdery, or Martin Harris to not change the variants between P and the King James Version when they were related to italicized words in the King James Version.

60. This should at least give us pause for applying too freely the idea that italics had as much influence in the Malachi quotations as it does in the Isaiah quotations. But still, the fact that five of the eight (possibly seven, see 3 Nephi 24:10 below) variants occur at the italics is telling for labeling these five dependent on the italics.

Other Variants

Along with the variants influenced by the italics found throughout the King James Version of Malachi 3–4 there are three other variants that need evaluation. The first of these is in 3 Nephi 24:10. In the King James Version of Malachi 3:10 it says, “that there may be meat in mine house.” The Book of Mormon seems to alter this verse slightly when it says, “that there may be meat in my house,” but this is not necessarily true. There might be a better way of explaining the apparent variant.

Although the current LDS edition of the King James Version retains the archaic “mine house,” which appears to be altered in 3 Nephi 24:10 to a more modern “my house,” this variant is already known in printings of the King James Version available in the vicinity of Joseph Smith and his associates. It is known that Smith and Oliver Cowdery purchased a Bible printed in 1828 by H. and E. Phinney in Cooperstown, New York from the E. B. Grandin bookstore in Palmyra, New York on October 8, 1829.⁶¹ Although this exact printing would have been purchased too late to be used while working on the Book of Mormon, in this printing the variant found in the Book of Mormon at 3 Nephi 24:10 is found in Malachi 3:10. The 1827 and 1828 printings both agree with the 1830 Book of Mormon in that they both have “my house.” Therefore, the 1830 Book of Mormon and P follow the spelling in the printed editions of the King James Version in the geographical region that Smith was working in regard to 3 Nephi 24:10 and Malachi 3:10. This is, therefore, probably not a variant but agrees with the printed edition Smith and his associates had at the time of the translation.⁶²

61. Scott H. Faulring, Kent P. Jackson, and Robert J. Matthews, eds., *Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible: Original Manuscripts* (Provo: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2004), 4–5.

62. It is also possible that the scribe could have misheard “mine” for “my,” but this seems unlikely due to the high percentage of exact correspondence between 3 Nephi 24–25 and King James Version of Malachi 3–4.

The second variant is found in 3 Nephi 24:14. The King James Version of Malachi 3:14 has, “and what profit *is it* that we have kept his ordinance,” whereas the printer’s manuscript of the Book of Mormon changes the singular “ordinance” to the plural “ordinances.” This is an interesting alteration because, although the MT⁶³ has the singular *mishmeret* (“obligation” or “ordinance”),⁶⁴ a number of ancient translations such as the Septuagint, Vulgate, and the Targum have the plural reading *mishmarot* (“obligations” or “ordinances”). The plural “obligations” or “ordinances” occurred because of the later association of the term *mishmeret* with the stipulations of the covenants of YHWH. There are other passages where *mishmeret* occurs in this context, for example in such passages as Leviticus 8:35; 18:30; and 22:9.⁶⁵ Although the three ancient text traditions mentioned above (i.e. the Septuagint, the Vulgate, and the Targum) translated “obligation” as “obligations,” the text in the printer’s manuscript would at face value, although the claim is problematic, predate these later traditions and not be aware of the later developments in thought and interpretation of the term *mishmeret*. The singular reading is also verified by 4QXIIa, the Qumran scroll of the Twelve Prophets.⁶⁶ It would follow, then, that the printer’s manuscript of the Book of Mormon alters the English rendering of the King James Version here at 3 Nephi 24:14 to read “ordinances” rather than “ordinance.” E. B. Grandin recognized this variant in P as he was setting the type for the 1830 Book of Mormon, and corrected the text of P to agree with the singular “ordinance” of the King James Version.

The third variant is found at 3 Nephi 25:2 and concerns the confusion between the terms “Sun” and “Son.” This will be described in

63. i.e., The Masoretic Text, or standard Hebrew Bible.

64. See Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol 1. א- ט (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 650.

65. For much of this discussion and more examples, see Hill, *Malachi*, 333.

66. See Eugene Ulrich, et al., eds., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, Discoveries in the Judean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 227.

detail further below. I have shown how one of the eight variants should probably not be considered a variant but dependent on the printed version that was available at the time of the work of producing the Book of Mormon. I have also demonstrated that the other seven variants are all dependent on the English text of the King James Version of Malachi 3–4 and either add or take away a few words based simply on the text that you find there in the King James.

Malachi and the Book of Mormon

I will now examine more closely one of the Book of Mormon pericopes that I earlier established as being dependent on Malachi, Ether 9:22. I will first discuss what the book claims regarding its appropriation of Malachi where it uses it explicitly, namely 3 Nephi. Then I will turn to other places in the Book of Mormon influenced by the King James Version of Malachi.

In 3 Nephi, Jesus visits those who are left in the land after the great destruction, the ones who were the, “more righteous part of the people . . . who received the prophets and stoned them not; and it was they who had not shed the blood of the saints, who were spared.”⁶⁷ These people gathered at the temple in Bountiful when Jesus visited them, presumably about a year after his death.⁶⁸ Jesus first gives commandments on how to baptize and then presents a revised version of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5–7). After a number of subsequent meetings and commands, Jesus explains to the group the importance of scriptures,

67. 3 Nephi 10:12.

68. The destruction after Jesus’ death begins “in the thirty and fourth year, in the first month, on the fourth day of the month,” (3 Nephi 8:5) and then the text goes on to say that “it came to pass that in the ending of the thirty and fourth year, behold . . . insomuch that soon after the ascension of Christ into heaven he did truly manifest himself unto them (3 Nephi 10:18).

especially Isaiah.⁶⁹ He then focuses on making sure they have all of the scriptures he wants them to have. He makes it clear in 3 Nephi 23:6 that there are scriptures that they do not have but need to have when he states, “Behold, other scriptures I would that ye should write, that ye have not.” He then proceeds to instruct them to write down the prophecies of Samuel the Lamanite (which had been spoken to them but had not been written down) and then, immediately following, gives them Malachi 3 and 4 in 3 Nephi 24 and 25.

I have examined the change in 3 Nephi 25:2 (=Malachi 4:2) from the “Sun” rising in the sky to the familial “Son” and have found that it is based on the English language rather than on any Hebrew *urtext*. In the Hebrew the difference is between *shemesh*, “sun,” and *ben*, “son.” These two are semantically incompatible, and it is difficult to imagine accepting the possible argument that the variant is based on a misunderstood scribal reading at some point in the transmission history of the Hebrew text because of the drastic dissimilarity between the two words in Hebrew. The two Hebrew terms simply do not sound alike, but the two terms in English are homophones.

Some scholars have also argued that this change may have been based on Oliver Cowdery’s mishearing the word in the dictation process. For instance, Brant Gardner has said that if we are to assume that the phrase “Son of Righteousness” should always follow Malachi, then it is possible for us to suggest that in 2 Nephi 26:9, 3 Nephi 25:2, and Ether 9:22, Oliver Cowdery actually heard “sun” but wrote “son.” Gardner recognizes that this phrase would not have been on the brass plates because Malachi was written well after the departure of Nephi from Jerusalem. He assumes in his assessment of the evidence that Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery never checked Oliver’s spelling against the

69. 3 Nephi 23:1–4.

spelling found in the King James Version of Malachi before being copied into the original or printer's manuscripts.⁷⁰

There are a number of problems with Gardner's description of the text. He begins by noting the fact that this verse "echoes" Malachi because the phrase "sun of righteousness" is only found there, thus the need that it would "always follow Malachi." Gardner makes the problematic assertion that Ether 9:22 should have "sun" when it is obvious that the use of "Son of Righteousness" is meant specifically as that, the "Son," Jesus, and is actually the interpretive key for understanding Malachi 4:2 in the Book of Mormon. In Ether 9:22 the "Son of Righteousness" is an individual person, and there is no way to understand the verse if we are to change "Son" to "Sun." It would read, "yea, and [Coriantum] saw the Sun of Righteousness, and did rejoice and glory in his day; and he died in peace." The key here is whether the pronoun in the phrase "in his day" is pointing to Coriantum or to the "Son of Righteousness." It applies to the latter far better than the former and provides much greater explanatory power. With Smith's tendency to Christianize the Hebrew Bible,⁷¹ especially whenever he used this phrase from Malachi 4:2, I would argue that this is the most direct evidence that the Book of Mormon deliberately changed Malachi 4:2 from "Sun of Righteousness" to "Son of Righteousness" because of the view that Malachi was predicting Jesus' Second Coming. This explains why in every instance in LDS scripture the text of Malachi 4:2 is changed in this way. If the text of Ether 9:22 were changed to "Sun of Righteousness," instead of

70. Gardner, *Second Witness*, 2:356–57.

71. Thomas A. Wayment, "Intertextuality and the Purpose of Joseph Smith's New Translation of the Bible," in *Foundational Texts of Mormonism: Examining Major Early Sources*, edited by Mark Ashurst-McGee, Robin Scott Jensen, and Sharalyn D. Howcroft (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 74–100. See also Grant Underwood, "Joseph Smith's Use of the Old Testament," in *The Old Testament and the Latter-day Saints*, edited by Carlos E. Asay (Orem, Utah: Randall Book Company, 1986), 381–413.

the form it has always been in throughout its transmission history, there would be no allusion to Jesus even though that is what is clearly meant by the verse.

To argue that this change is somehow based on the brass plates is unnecessary; we have the source in our possession: the King James Version of Malachi 4. It is much easier to explain that Smith and Cowdery Christianized this passage to fit their interpretation of it, expecting ancient prophets to “rejoice and glory in [Jesus’] day” in the way that Coriantum is portrayed as doing here. They did not need to check the spelling because they were aware of the change and its importance to them for understanding Malachi’s prophecies. Even if one were to grant that it is a new term used in the New World, one must wonder how the Nephites came to the same misunderstanding of this verse that later Christians in an English-speaking world would come to a couple of thousand years later. This suggests that all of the variants between 3 Nephi 24 and 25 to Malachi 3 and 4 are based on the King James Version and represent Smith’s engagement with the King James Bible rather than differences based on an earlier Hebrew text.

Those engaged with the academic study of the Book of Mormon’s claims for ancient authenticity should acknowledge that 3 Nephi 24 and 25 are based on the King James Version of Malachi. It should also be noted that these are the only chapters in the Book of Mormon that quote lengthy portions and state that they are directly from Malachi. There are a few examples in the Book of Mormon of the author of the text using a quotation formula when citing Malachi, but this is similar to how Malachi is used in the New Testament in that none of these places use the name Malachi except 3 Nephi 24 and 25.

Directions for Future Work

I have argued that there are many places in the text of the Book of Mormon that are dependent on the text of Malachi both literarily and

textually. Some of these places in the list show direct quotation and exact duplication of the text of Malachi, while others seem to be allusions to or echoes of Malachi. For many exegetes this presents a problem for discussing the historicity of the Book of Mormon, which in many ways has become a deterrent for a critical study of the text. This kind of viewpoint should be abandoned.

For scholars looking critically at the question of the historicity of the Book of Mormon⁷² it is a problem that suggests that the book was at least a fictional story and maybe even a forgery. For apologists it is a problem because, according to a number of them, it works against the historical setting that the book claims. Both parties are right in saying that the Nephites would not have had the text of Malachi, but this does not indicate that the King James Version of Malachi had no influence on the text as it stands today. The Book of Mormon's use of Malachi requires that scholars reexamine the Book of Mormon through the lens of source criticism to understand its compositional development and the meaning of its several parts. Once the sources are located, then the texts can be compared to understand how the source text influenced the writing of the new text and can help to better interpret the Book of Mormon. I have shown that all thirty-nine verses examined, including the variants in 3 Nephi 24–25, are based on the King James Version of Malachi.

Numerous passages in the text of the Book of Mormon are dependent on Malachi, but the Book of Mormon is also dependent on other later texts that the Nephites would not have had. The New Testament is also used in the Book of Mormon. The discoveries made when comparing the use of texts like Malachi, the prologue of John, as in Nicholas Frederick's dissertation, and several others in the Book of Mormon suggest that there is a lot more to be found and a lot of work to be done.

72. Cf. Wesley Walters, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Mormon* (Salt Lake City: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1990).

Theories about the production of the Book of Mormon need to also be reexamined, primarily because almost none of them have ever included extended observations about how the King James Bible was used as a source in the production of the Book of Mormon. This suggests that the “tight” and “loose control” translation theories that Skousen and others have argued before, and even Blake Ostler’s 1987 essay,⁷³ need to be reexamined. Recently, scholars have begun to directly reject Skousen’s theory that Smith saw the exact words of the Book of Mormon on the seer stone in his hat. That was the theme of a recent conference at Utah State University.

One of the findings in my undergraduate honors thesis on the use of Genesis 2–4 in the writing of the Book of Mormon was that the Book of Mormon was not simply dependent on one of the sources of the Pentateuch as had previously been argued,⁷⁴ or even that Joseph Smith’s revision of Genesis 1–6 and the Book of Mormon quotations of these verses had a similar source,⁷⁵ but that the passages in the Book of Mormon that were dependent on Genesis 2–4 incorporated language and ideas from all over the King James Bible. Most of those other texts are found in the New Testament.⁷⁶ My previous studies, along with this research on Malachi and current research that will be published in the future, all suggest that the source of biblical ideas in the Book of Mormon, called the brass plates, was actually nothing more than the

73. Blake T. Ostler, “The Book of Mormon as a Modern Expansion of an Ancient Source,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 20, no. 1 (1987): 66–123.

74. John L. Sorenson, “The ‘Brass Plates’ and Biblical Scholarship,” *Dialogue: A Journal of Mormon Thought* 10, no. 4 (1977): 31–39.

75. Noel B. Reynolds, “The Brass Plates Version of Genesis,” in *By Study and Also By Faith: Essays in Honor of Hugh Nibley*, vol. 2, edited by John M. Lundquist and Stephen D. Ricks (Salt Lake City and Provo: Deseret Book and FARMS, 1990), 136–73.

76. Colby Townsend, “Appropriation and Adaptation of J Material in the Book of Mormon” (unpublished undergraduate honors thesis, University of Utah, 2016).

King James Bible. The author of the Book of Mormon is well-versed in the language, tropes, motifs, stories, and ideas found in that English edition of the Christian Bible and incorporated aspects of it that were unique to an early-nineteenth-century setting in western New York.

One thing is certain: the Book of Mormon is much more dependent on the Bible in its later, English canonical form, and therefore much more “biblical” than is often noted by students of the text. By employing recent comparative, text-critical methods that have been used to compare the New Testament and Hebrew Bible, this study shows that the Book of Mormon is, without doubt, dependent on the King James Version of Malachi and suggests that the author of the Book of Mormon was situated in a time and place that allowed the English Bible to influence the composition of the Book of Mormon.