

NEW DISCOVERIES CONCERNING

THE BIBLE

AND

CHURCH HISTORY

Dr. Hugh W. Nibley
Professor of History and Religion

THE OLD TESTAMENT TODAY
THE NEW TESTAMENT TODAY
THE REDISCOVERY OF THE CHURCH
THE NEW CONCEPT OF SCRIPTURE
"REVELATION" NO LONGER A NAUGHTY WORD
"NEW ORTHODOXY" AND THE TREND TO LITERALISM

Education Weeks
1963
Extension Publications
Adult Education and Extension Services
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah
Price 15 cents

18.47
NEW DISCOVERIES CONCERNING THE BIBLE
AND CHURCH HISTORY

The religious picture has changed rapidly in recent years, especially since World War II. The nature of the change can be illustrated by a few quotations from leading authorities. Italics are ours unless otherwise indicated.

THE OLD TESTAMENT TODAY

Evolution is "out":

Cyrus Gordon: "The beginnings of Israel are rooted in a highly cultural Canaan where contributions of several talented peoples (including the Mesopotamians, Egyptians, and branches of the Indo-Europeans) had converged and blended. The notion that early Israelite religion and society were primitive is completely false. Canaan in the days of the Patriarchs was the hub of a great international culture."

G. E. Wright: "One of the remarkable results of archaeological research during the period between the two Wars was the sudden emergence of the Patriarchal Age of Biblical History as one which could be fitted within an actually discernible period in the history of Western Asia."

A. Parrot: One-hundred years ago in Mesopotamia "the concrete historical background of the Old Testament was discovered. . . . Today the Old Testament World itself is being discovered. Who would deny today that one can understand the Canaanitish background without the Ras Shamra texts? The story of Abraham's migration is literally supported by the Mari Tablets. These and the Nuzi Tablets make frequent mention of the Habiri, the Benjamin people in migration, the people of David. In the Mari texts the Benjaminites are described using fire-towers for signaling, exactly as in Jeremiah 6:1."

C. L. Woolley: "To most people this picture of the elaborate conditions of domestic life at Ur will come as a surprise and must seriously affect their conception of the patriarch" (Abraham--a highly civilized man).

C. L. Wooley: "I suppose we know more about ordinary life in Egypt in the 14th century before Christ than we do about that of England in the 14th century A. D."

W. F. Albright: Archaeology now shows (1) that the Patriarchal stories do NOT belong to the period 900-700 B. C., but to the actual time ascribed

them, many centuries earlier, (2) "that the alleged henotheism and evolution of Hebrew religion is a myth," (3) that the prophets were social reformers. . . . "It is clear that the substantial historicity of biblical tradition has been vindicated to an extent which few prejudiced bystanders could well have deemed possible a generation ago."

beginning to end, only one gospel:

F. Albright: "Neither biblical tradition itself nor archaeological science justifies the sharp distinction currently made between the religious beliefs of ancient Israel (i. e., in the age of Moses) and the corresponding beliefs of Elijah, Amos and Isaiah."

Wildberger: "Today we are in the process of revising our picture of pre-Exilic prophecy, which is NOT a new step in the development of Israel's faith . . . but comes from Israel's standing tradition," when it was written at the time and place of Isaiah."

Haldar: There is "no definite line of demarcation" between various ages of revelation in Israel. "It follows that the evolutionary view of the Old Testament prophets cannot be accepted; instead, as there is no reason to assume that the 'literary' prophets present a phenomenology unlike that of the cult prophets in general, every stress must be laid on continuity."

Rowley: "That the prophets were not merely preachers of righteousness, but foretellers of the future, is plain to every reader."

Gordon: "The magnificent structure of the Old Testament high criticism is not to be brushed aside; but its individual results can no longer be accepted unless they square with the Hebrew text as we can now understand it in the light of parallel literatures . . . in the Bible lands."

A. Spenser: Archaeology has "acted as a brake on the Higher Criticism," showing that "none of the Pentateuchal and other early historical sources of the Old Testament invented its material. . . . (they) cannot be charged with any kind of fabrication."

v reactionaries;

Gordon: "The unedifying conclusion of all such study (higher criticism) is that nothing is authentic. That this type of teaching could go on in our age of discovery when biblical scholarship is so exciting is, so to speak, a perverse miracle."

W. F. Albright: "Even today the majority of Old Testament scholars follow blindly in the trail of Wellhausen, assuming a three-fold evolution of biblical literature through the early poems and sagas, the prophetic phase, and the legal phase."

C. Gordon: "Though Bible scholars live in an age of unprecedented discovery, they stand in the shadow of nineteenth-century higher criticism. . . . Now the conservative mind often latches onto higher criticism even though archaeology has rendered it untenable. . . . (They are) devoted to JEDP: the badge of inter-confessional academic respectability. . . . I am at a loss to explain this kind of 'conviction' on any grounds other than intellectual laziness or inability to reappraise. . . . A professor of Bible in a leading university once asked me to give him the facts on JEDP. I told him; . . . he replied; 'I am convinced by what you say but I shall go on teaching the old system.' When I asked him why, he answered: 'Because what you have told me means I should have to unlearn as well as study afresh and rethink. It is easier to go on with the accepted system of higher criticism for which we have standard textbooks.' What a happy professor! He refuses to forfeit his place in Eden by tasting the fruit of the tree of knowledge."

unknown book:

C. F. D. Moule: "New Testament research has gone forward with overwhelming intensity. . . . The sheer quantity of the MSS available makes the editing of Classical texts seem almost child's play beside the size and complexity of the New Testament apparatus."

K. W. Clark: "The present generation stands at the beginning of a new cycle, in the search for the original Greek New Testament. . . . The discoveries that mark our time may be expected to reveal ultimately a new meaning; and each new product of research to assume its place in a new pattern. . . . The critic is sobered by the realization that the best critical text so far achieved now holds little assurance of being the original text. . . . The textual critic is called upon today to establish not the critical text but many critical texts. . . . Variants in the New Testament text are often laden with theological significance, and may have theological motivation. . . . Textual theory appears to have reached an impasse in our time."

C. H. Dodd: "This disquieting document (Revelations) has caused much searching of hearts in recent criticism. . . . It is one of many indications that the Johannine riddle will be solved only after the point of the entire Johannine corpus has been discovered."

C. C. McCown: "Thirty or forty years ago . . . there was much talk of the 'assured results' of literary-historical ('higher') criticism. . . . Now . . . biblical scholarship . . . must fight for its life. . . . Our plight in the world today demands . . . the keen re-examination and appraisal of past results in the light of new methods and new archaeological, textual, paleographical, and historical discoveries." For 400 years the Greek New Testament has been in the hands of Christian scholars. . . . For 75 years scholars have been presenting their most brilliant ideas. . . . But, not only between the continent and America, but within the American group, differences are sharper than ever . . . largely because of the failure of our scholars to attain assured and agreed results."

W. F. Albright: Recent discoveries show (1) "that the New Testament picture is contemporary, and christology is NOT a later development." (2) John is NOT Stoic or Mandaean. (3) "All previous treatments of Gnosticism must be thoroughly revised." (4) The Dead Sea Scrolls show "That the usual second-century date for much of the New Testament, especially John, is fallacious." These discoveries abolish "the common view that Jesus was a teacher of ethics who

represented the highest level then reached by Judaism, that later Christology is mainly the work of Paul". . . . "This represents a volte face of such drastic character that it may well require several decades for the majority of unprejudiced scholars to accept it."

Farewell to the "gentle teacher":

H. Riesenfeld at the New Testament Congress at Oxford in 1957 exploded "a bomb-shell": ". . . the tradition of the sayings and deeds of Jesus must be traced back to Jesus Himself." Christology was produced by "neither mission preaching nor the communal instruction of the Primitive Church, but the teaching and purpose of Jesus." Until now "the opposite view has been held and in some circles has been exalted into the position of an accepted doctrine," i.e. the Christology was a product of evolution.

A. Leaney: "If this is exasperating, it is also unavoidable: there is no statement in the New Testament about Jesus which is not about the Christ of faith. The attempt to discover the historical figure around whom so many incredible legends have gathered, and then to give him his proper respect as one of the great teachers of mankind, is an attempt doomed to failure for the simple reason that the evidence which we possess knows no such person. . . . If we try to make him into a teacher we find to our dismay that the Sermon on the Mount is NOT a sermon, nor is it an ethic for everyday life; it . . . summons the latter-day elders of the people God once more to obedience to the covenant. . . ."

H. Riesenfeld: "When Jesus proclaimed his gospel he did not preach abstract religion or moral thoughts but presented himself as the centre of the coming kingdom of God. . . . The centre in all christology is Jesus Christ . . . because he himself has created christology in its very kernel."

T. W. Manson: "It is easy to laugh at those who a couple of generations ago, saw in Jesus a good 19th century liberal humanist with a simple faith in a paternal deity. It is less easy to see the joke when the Jesus of history is a twentieth-century existentialist, a kind of pre-existent Heidegger."

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE CHURCH

W. Pauck: There is a "rediscovery of the 'church' in our time. . . . Christians have been compelled to understand themselves again, like their predecessors of old, as a 'peculiar people.'"

F. C. Grant: "Christianity was not a social revolution disguised as a cult, perhaps as a 'mystery religion.' It was a religion, pure and simple; with a cult; with a body of doctrine."

H. Riesenfeld: "About half a century ago it was believed that a key had been found to the main question of the New Testament"--it was a Mediterranean mystery cult.

V. Taylor: Schweitzer "has compelled scholars to revise their understanding of the Kingdom of God as a slowly evolving order of society and this conception as the essence of the teachings of Jesus." Instead, Christianity was eschatological.

N. A. Dahl: "The rediscovery of the importance of eschatology within the New Testament has been one of the most outstanding achievements of historic theology. . . . we have learned to see the Church as an 'eschatological community.'" . . . In eschatology, "Salvation is conceived not only as a counterpart to the beginnings of the world, but still more as a parallel to the primeval times of the people." The Gospel was explained in terms not only of eschatology (the ultimate purpose and plan of life) but of protology, "conforming to the creation of the world. . . . The positive correlation of 'eschatology' and 'protology' held a firm position within the ancient Church. . . . The parallelism between Adam and Christ is carried through even in details."

S. Brandon: "For many decades under the aegis of the liberal tradition of scholarship, this task was undertaken with fervent conviction, and great was the knowledge amassed by such methods of research about Primitive Christianity. But in time this process of investigation into Christian Origins has gradually revealed itself to be a journey ever deeper into a morass of conjecture about the imponderables which lie behind or beyond the extant literary documents."

H. Cadbury: "Today the 'Church' is seeking for authority which will have the sanction of history and which thus will render a service toward providing a norm for modern interdenominational unity."

-7-

R. M. Grant: "The ultimate problem, I suppose, is one of authority; the authority of revelation, the authority of Scripture, the authority of the Church." . . . The present foundation is very shaky, based on "the study of the Gospels, with its search for the historical Jesus who turns out to be either a deluded apocalypticist or the product of early Christian reinterpretation. . . . Is there a way out?" . . . Perhaps someone can combine a Catholic feeling for tradition with a Protestant sense of freedom, without either disdain or excessive enthusiasm for the past."

J. Mullenburg: "Thus the question, Who is Israel? stands at the frontier where the question is asked Who is Jesus? and the answer of Christians is to be comprehended out of the answer which is given to the former question, Who is Israel?"

M. Simon, a Roman Catholic, in his book Verus Israel attempts to prove that his Church is the real Israel, but has grave doubts and misgivings in the process--the continued corporate existence of the Jews he finds most baffling.

V. Dobschutz: (1929) "Fifty years ago the general view prevailed that Jesus had nothing to do with the founding of a Church, etc., the Christian community arising spontaneously and gradually developing into the Christian Church." There was good historical evidence for this, but equally good evidence in the New Testament that Jesus DID found a Church. The solution is now given by H. J. Schoeps: there WAS a Church but it is NOT the Christian Church that the world knows--that came later.

H. J. Schoeps: Suggests that there was a Church of Jesus Christ but that it disappeared in ancient times: "Were they not after all the true heirs, even though they passed away?"

THE NEW CONCEPT OF SCRIPTURE

J. Reider (1937): "A remarkable transformation has been going on in Bible criticism of recent years: the formerly well established position of the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen school is beginning to give way," as scholars now "deny the cogency of source division in the Hexateuch and the necessity of reducing its age."

mistakes of men":

H. W. Clark: "We are often reminded today that there is no infallible manuscript or recension." Between 1930 and 1955 there appeared "at least 45 independent translations of the New Testament." . . . Any substantial effort to improve the basic critical text must 'mark time' until the whole complex of textual studies reveals a new integrating pattern."

K. Stendahl: "Instead of pure original over against interpolated and distorted copies we are faced with traditions . . . all of them organically related to the ongoing life of the people."

J. H. Eaton: Isaiah is NOT "a confusing amalgam of greater or smaller fragments from many sources." The critics who believe in the unity of Isaiah have just as good evidence on their side as have the fragmentizers. (The classic example of source division was Isaiah.)

E. M. Good: ". . . If we must await the time when Biblical scholars happen to come with all the right guesses in them, what will we do in the meantime on Sunday morning? Every translation is provisional. . . . The Revised Standard Version rests on a better reconstruction of the text than does the King James Version. . . . But a translation is always also an interpretation. . . . NO translation of the Bible into English will ever be more than a provisional translation."

G. W. Bromiley: "A first point is the obvious one that human . . . authorship is also assumed for all books of the Bible. 'Holy men of God spake' is quite definitely stated of the writers of the Old Testament. These men used ordinary media. They adopted or adapted known literary genres. . . . As the Lord Jesus Christ himself took flesh, so the written word was clothed in the form of human writings."

D. C. Blackman: "The Word of God is in the words of the Bible, but it is not to be identified with them . . . but interpreted out of them. . . . The Bible is NOT itself revelation but is the record of revelation."

-9-

R. M. Grant: "Under such circumstances the preservation of any authentic texts seems almost miraculous. The needs of doctrinal theology . . . resulted in a distortion of the historical materials. . . . Genuine and false documents were so thoroughly mixed that they could not be disentangled for more than a millennium." (Cf. D.C. 91.)

C. Torrey: "Outside books? By what authority? The authority (to declare some books Scripture and others not) was duly declared, but it continued to be disputed . . . down even into the 19th century. . . . A new terminology is needed. . . . the current classification . . . as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is outworn and misleading, supported neither by history nor by present fact."

"REVELATION" NO LONGER A NAUGHTY WORD

S. V. McCasland (1954): "The return to ideas of inspiration and revelation may be put down as one of the marked trends of our biblical scholarship of the last decade."

G. W. Bromley: "The doctrine of inspiration continues to be in many ways the critical issue underlying all other issues in the Church today."

E. G. Selwyn: "Terms such as 'transcendent,' 'supernatural,' 'transsubjective' have been used to describe the new order of being which the Gospel unveils and the new quality of experience which it has introduced; and though the scientific naturalist... may boggle at them, they are indispensable."

H. D. McDonald: "The fundamental question of all theological reconstructions is 'What do we mean by revelation?' . . . It is being answered in a way that sounds very different from traditional formulations. . . . One thing, however, is certain. Behind these modern ideas of revelation stand a deliberate renunciation of the 'traditional' doctrine and a departure from what the Church has from the first believed concerning special revelation."

C. N. Cochrane: The greatest contribution of the Ancient Christian Church was "faith in the God of revelation." This put an end to the "search for causes" that had preoccupied the philosophers until then.

A. Van den Born: "Of course it is highly discouraging that not a single aspect of biblical prophetism can be explained by means of our western rationalism and psychologism, but so matters are situated and we shall have to submit to it."

B. M. B. Reardon: Nineteenth-century liberalism is passé. "Our current theology insists upon the truths of divine transcendence and on 'objective' revelation. Revelation, we are told, is something more than . . . the progressive self-realization of Spirit in history. . . ." The conventional view of religious experience sees "nothing other than the embodiment of a capacity rooted in human nature itself." On this view its interest is primarily psychological and ethical." We can no longer call it religious."

"NEO-ORTHODOXY" AND THE TREND TO LITERALISM

O. Cullmann: "The historical character of salvation, which Bultmann regards as unacceptable to the modern mind . . . is not a secondary element, but it is the essence of the thought of the New Testament. . . . We must maintain the 'scandalon' of the historical event, the 'foolishness of the cross.'"

E. Kraeling: "False . . . is the spiritualization of the Old Testament ideas in the interest of their better utilization for religious purposes."

S. Mowinckel: "One fails to appreciate the peculiar character of Israel or Jewish religion if one does not take into account its close relationship to real history and its experiences." (Italics are Mowinckel's.)

M. Burrows: "I do not want my eschatology de-eschatologized. . . . I do not want to read other philosophies out of the gospel in order to read my own into it. I do not want to read anything into it. I want to understand it. Only so can I tell what it may mean for me."

J. R. W. Scott: ". . . Are we to regard lightly the Scriptures to which he gave his reverent assent? Can we repudiate what he (Christ) embraced?"

W. C. Van Unnik: "According to me we must first listen to what the New Testament had to say then before we can hear what it has to say now. . . ."

R. Maré: "Today we are reproducing what the Primitive Christians must have done. But it is not enough to find out what the original Christians believed--we must make our beliefs coincide with theirs in order to understand them." This is the direction of research today.

O. Cullmann: "In interpreting the first Christian documents by way of the philosophical approach of the individual existence, we ascribe to their authors a preoccupation which, in any case, is not primary for them, and we make mythical and timeless what they regarded to be real and temporal."

A. Nygren: "It is not the New Testament that needs to be demythologized, but our modern view of Christianity."

J. F. Walvoord: "If a literal view of the temple and the sacrifices

be allowed, it provides a more intimate view of worship in the millennium than might otherwise be afforded."

F. A. M. Spencer: By accepting the literal return of Christ, we remove the strain "of having to contort his message, ignoring a considerable portion of it and making unwarranted deductions from other parts, to suit our preconceptions. It gives a sense of relief, of illumination, of enlargement. We begin to see now. The world has NOT reformed itself or allowed itself to be reformed by God in love. But then Christ did not say it would. . . . Yet in what way could God most adequately reveal himself to humanity? Surely through a human person. . . . Are we to hope that increasing evangelistic ardour and ecclesiastical efficiency will produce in the near future what preachers and prophets and pastors have NOT succeeded in accomplishing during all the centuries since Christ appeared on earth--namely the general conversion to living faith in God, needed to forestall the creeping degeneration and maybe certain destruction with which mankind is threatened?"

C. Gordon: "When literal meaning is brushed aside as poetic license in order to make room for predilection, prejudice, theory or outside parallels, the results are bad, although they may gain wide credence for a long time."

C. S. Lewis: "Either this man (Jesus) was, and is, the Son of God; or else a madman or something worse. You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit on Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But don't let us come with any patronising nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He didn't intend to."

G. C. Berkouwer: "We speak rather glibly about the self-evidence of the Gospel; we talk about the sword or the Spirit. But we do not entertain the expectation that something is actually going to happen by the power of the Spirit. . . . Do we still believe in the usefulness of our theological labors? . . . Is our polemic with liberal theology only a game we are playing?"

W. F. Albright: Of all the world religions ONLY Christianity "can be said to have a completely historical orientation; characteristic of the compelling force of this orientation is the fact that its two most important offshoots, Islam and Mormonism, continue to exhibit marked historical tendencies. Mormonism actually possesses an alleged historical authentication in the form of the Book of Mormon, purporting to give the ancient history of the New World in imitation of the Bible." (Christianity is the ONE "completely historical" religion, and Mormonism is the one completely historical Christian faith!)

Literary Style Used in Book of Mormon Insured Accurate Translation

Dear Mr. _____

The editor of the Church News has forwarded to me your question about the Book of Mormon and the King James Bible. I welcome this opportunity to try to clear up that and a number of related points.

Readers of that valuable periodical Christianity Today have been treated to a number of lively discussions of the Book of Mormon in recent issues. To me the most significant aspect of the various attacks on that book has been their concentration on the philological aspects of the problem.

All the old "scientific" objections seem to have fallen by the way, so that today we are back where we started, with heavy emphasis on the relationship of the Book of Mormon to the Bible, specifically to the King James Version. The main arguments, past and present are these:

1) For many years the most crushing argument against the Book of Mormon was that it pretended itself the Word of God, right beside the Bible. Since the 17th century the Doctors of the Church had argued that since the Bible is the Word of God, and God is perfect, the Bible itself must be perfect, and therefore complete. This no longer holds today; the discovery of other ancient and holy texts leads such devout scholars as F. M. Cross to exclaim: "It is as though God had added to his 'once for all' revelation." But where does the Bible itself ever claim 'once for all' revelation? Nowhere. As Prof. C. M. Torrey points out, our Bible as we have it is the result of picking and choosing by men who claimed no inspiration for themselves, yet on their own authority decided what should be considered 'revelation' and what should be labelled apocryphal or "outside" books.

right guesses in them, what will we do meantime on Sunday morning? Every translation is provisional . . . a translation is always also an interpretation. Any translation of the Bible into English will ever be more than a provisional translation." The title of Good's article is, "With All Its Faults"—and these men are talking about the Bible! It was because the Book of Mormon recognized these now well-known facts of scripture, that it was assailed for a century as the most outrageous blasphemy.

3) The next most devastating argument against the Book of Mormon was that it actually quoted the Bible. The early critics were simply staggered by the incredible stupidity of including large sections of the Bible in a book which they insisted was specifically designed to fool the Bible-reading public. They screamed blasphemy and plagiarism at the top of their lungs, but today any Biblical scholar knows that it would be an extremely suspicious circumstance if a book purporting to be the product of a society of pious emigrants from Jerusalem in ancient times did not quote the Bible. No lengthy religious writing of the Hebrews could conceivably be genuine if it was not full of scriptural quotations.

These were once the three commonest arguments against the Book of Mormon. Since they have been silenced by the progress of discovery, the emphasis has now shifted to two other points, (a) that the Book of Mormon contains, to quote another writer in Christianity Today, "passages lifted bodily from the King James Version," and (b) that it quotes not only from the Old Testament but from the New Testament as well. Your own question I leave to the last.

(4) As to the "passages lifted

EDITOR'S NOTE

The Church News recently received a letter from an interested non-member of the Church making the inquiry about why the Prophet Joseph Smith, in translating the Book of Mormon, did not use contemporary English instead of using the "King James English" as found in the Bible.

We forwarded this letter on to Dr. Hugh Nibley of the Brigham Young University Department of Religion, asking him to prepare the answer. Dr. Nibley's reply, published herewith, is worth the reading of every Latter-day Saint.

reason why it should be followed. When Jesus and the Apostles and, for that matter, the Angel Gabriel quote the Scriptures in the New Testament do they recite from some mysterious Urtext? Do they quote the prophets of old in the ultimate original? Or do they give their own inspired translations? No, they do not. They quote the Septuagint, a Greek version of the Old Testament prepared in the 3rd Century B.C. Why so? Because that happened to be the received standard version of the Bible accepted by the readers of the Greek New Testament. When "holy men of God" quote the scriptures it is always the received standard version of the people they are addressing.

We do not claim that the King James Version of the Septuagint are the original scriptures—in fact nobody on earth today knows where the original scriptures are or what they say. Inspired men have in every age been content to ac-

tures to them in any other form so far as their teachings were correct.

(5) What is thought to be a very serious charge against the Book of Mormon today is that it, a book written down long before New Testament times and on the other side of the world, actually, quotes the New Testament! True, it is the same Savior speaking in both, and the same Holy Ghost, and so we can expect the same doctrines in the same language.

But what about the "Faith, Hope and Charity" passage in Moroni 7:45? Its resemblance to I Corinthians 13 is undeniable. This particular passage, recently singled out for attack in Christianity Today, is actually one of those things that turns out to be a striking vindication of the Book of Mormon. For the whole passage, which scholars have labelled "the Hymn to Charity," was shown early in this century by a number of first-rate investigators working independently (A. Harnack, J. Weiss, R. Reitzenstein) to have originated not with Paul at all, but to go back to some much older but unknown source: Paul is merely quoting from the record.

Now it so happens that Moroni also is peculiarly fond of quoting from the record. It is he who, for example, reminds his people of an old tradition about the two garments of Joseph, telling them a detailed story which I have found only in a thousand-year-old commentary on the Old Testament, a work still untranslated and quite unknown to the world of Joseph Smith. So I find it not a refutation but a confirmation of the authenticity of the Book of Mormon when Paul and Moroni both quote from a once well-known but now lost Hebrew writing.

(6) Now as to your question, "Why did Joseph Smith, a 19th Century American farm

thous" in their loftier passages.

For that matter, we still pray in that language and teach our small children to do the same; that is, we still recognize the validity of a special speech set apart for special occasions. My old Hebrew and Arabic teacher, Prof. Popper, would throw a student out of the class who did not use "thee" and "thou" in construing "This is the word of God!" He would cry indignantly, "This is the Bible! Let us show a little respect; let us have a little formal English here!"

Furthermore, the Book of Mormon is full of scripture, and for the world of Joseph Smith's day the King James Version was the Scripture, as we have noted; large sections of the Book of Mormon therefore had to be in the language of the King James Version—and what of the rest of it? That is scripture, too!

One can think of lots of arguments for using "King James English" in the Book of Mormon, but the clearest comes out of very recent experience. In the past decade, as you know, certain ancient non-Biblical texts, discovered near the Dead Sea, have been translated by modern, up-to-date American readers. I open at random a modern Protestant scholar's modern translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and what do I read? "Thine is the battle, and by the strength of thy hand their corpses were scattered without burial. Gollath the Gittite, a mighty man of valor, thou didst deliver into the hand of thy servant David. . . ."

Obviously the man who wrote this knew the Bible, and we must not forget that ancient scribes were consciously archaic in their writing, so that most of the scriptures were probably in old-fashioned language the day they were written down—to efface that solemn antique style by the