



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *Joseph Smith, Mormonism and Enochic Tradition*

CIRILLO, SALVATORE

#### How to cite:

---

CIRILLO, SALVATORE (2010) *Joseph Smith, Mormonism and Enochic Tradition*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/236/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Salvatore Cirillo  
Research MA  
Durham University  
Department of Theology  
September 30, 2009

# Joseph Smith, Mormonism and Enochic Tradition

*This thesis is a result of my own work. Material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated. The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published in any format, including electronic and the Internet, without the author's prior written consent. All information derived from this thesis must be acknowledged appropriately.*



## CONTENTS

CONTENTS .....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	6
PREFACE .....	7
ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>10</b>
A UNIQUE ARGUMENT .....	10
Faith in Context .....	13
History as Theology.....	13
Methodology and Approach .....	14
<b>CHAPTER ONE.....</b>	<b>17</b>
FOUNDATION AND BACKGROUND.....	17
1. The Book of Enoch .....	17
1.1 Early Enoch .....	23
1.2 Enoch in Europe .....	25
1.3 Enoch in Britain.....	29
2. The Book of Moses.....	33
2.1 Joseph Smith, Jr.....	33
2.2 Oliver Cowdery .....	41
2.3 Sidney Rigdon .....	43
2.4 The Book of Moses Examined .....	47
3. Conclusion .....	49
<b>CHAPTER TWO.....</b>	<b>51</b>
ACCESS TO MATERIALS .....	51
1. Nibley’s Approach to Access .....	52
2. Nibley’s Argument Regarding Access .....	53

2.1 Too Busy to Read .....	54
2.2 The Learned and Disinterested .....	61
2.3 The Disdainful Church .....	63
2.4 American Libraries and Freethinkers .....	66
2.5 A Later Appearance.....	73
2.6 Stressing the Point .....	74
2.7 Ignorant No More .....	76
3. Quinn Responds.....	77
4. Conclusion .....	79
<b>CHAPTER THREE.....</b>	<b>80</b>
SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITIES AND INFLUENCE .....	80
1. Nibley's Poor Comparisons .....	81
2. An Argument for Substantial Similarities .....	85
2.1. Son of Man .....	86
2.2. Enoch and Noah .....	91
2.3. Mahujah, Mahijah, and Mahaway .....	94
3. Re-Assessing Authorship.....	106
4. Conclusion .....	109
<b>CHAPTER FOUR .....</b>	<b>110</b>
BEYOND NIBLEY .....	110
1. Smith, Codename Baurak Ale .....	111
2. Smith, Codename Enoch.....	112
2.1 Smith the Prophet and Priest .....	112
2.2 Smith Transformed.....	113
2.3 Smith Ordained.....	115
3. Smith's New Jerusalem, Enoch's Zion.....	115
3.1 Zion Defined.....	116
3.2 Zion and Living in America .....	117
3.3 Zion and Death .....	120

4. Conclusion .....	123
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>124</b>
ENOCH IN MORMONISM EXPLORED .....	124
This Thesis.....	125
Future Considerations.....	127
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>cxvii</b>
Books/Journals.....	cxvii
Reference .....	cxl
Websites.....	cxlii

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my family for their support and encouragement throughout this process, Suzie McCleave, John Scarpaci, Claudia Cirillo, Rocky Payne and Robina and Philip Hutton. I should like to thank Esther Tang and William Bachilla who afforded me the opportunity to pursue an M.A. in the first place. I owe a great deal to Esther and William for their initial assistance with research and special thanks to William for his tireless efforts with editing. I am most grateful to Professors Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Douglas J. Davies for their expertise, keen interest and feedback. Professor Stuckenbruck's initial idea to pursue the Mormon perspective on Enoch, his enthusiasm for Enoch and his continued generosity of spirit has inspired this effort. Professor Davies' general curiosity, piercing questions and kind nature helped nurture what was initially a fledgling interest in Mormonism. Both supervisors have been generous with their extensive knowledge, engaging dialogue, guidance, and material support and time. In expressing my gratitude I also wish to take the appropriate responsibility for all the interpretations and arguments in this thesis.

## PREFACE

The greatest difficulty in producing this thesis has been accessing first hand materials related to Enoch prior to and including the work of Richard Laurence in 1821. Durham University Library offered a fine starting point from which to expand, with general texts in the main library and a few key texts found in the Routh Collection. The British National Library provided considerable assistance and many of the books that were contemporary with Joseph Smith (including a copy of every Laurence edition of 1En produced in the nineteenth century). The Suzzallo Library at the University of Washington provided an extended number of books on early Mormonism and Freemasonry that helped to round out key areas of the argument. Finally, the extensive online collections from libraries throughout the United States and Britain, specifically the efforts of Google in digitizing books for mass consumption and easier access, The Library Company of Philadelphia and numerous others, without whom this work would not have been possible

.



## ABBREVIATIONS

1En	1 Enoch
2En	2 Enoch
3En	3 Enoch
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
AB	Astronomical Book
BAb	Book of Abraham (Included in the Pearl of Great Price)
BD	Book of Dreams (aka the Dream Visions)
BE	Book(s) of Enoch
BG	Book of Giants
BoM	The Book of Mormon: Another Testament of Jesus Christ
BMo	Book of Moses (Included in the Pearl of Great Price)
BP	Book of Parables (aka the Similitudes)
BW	Book of Watchers
D&C	The Doctrine and Covenants of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints
EE	Epistle of Enoch
EPE	Extract of the Prophecy of Enoch (Included in the Book of Moses, 6:23-8:3)
JST	Joseph Smith's Translation of the Bible
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
PGP	The Pearl of Great Price
TTP	The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs

# Joseph Smith, Mormonism and Enochic Tradition

## INTRODUCTION

### A UNIQUE ARGUMENT

*But these newly translated [Enoch] pieces add one genuinely new bit of information to our store—something that is probably the most objective test yet of Joseph Smith’s prophetic powers. —Nibley<sup>1</sup>*

Mormon scholar Hugh Nibley believed he could prove the divine status (or “bona fides”) of the Mormon Prophet Joseph Smith through Smith’s writings on Enoch in the Book of Moses. Nibley’s argument is summarised as follows: 1) the Mormon prophet Joseph Smith was divinely inspired in 1830 to write an ‘extract of the prophecy of Enoch’; 2) Smith had no prior knowledge of or access to other emerging accounts of the ancient Book of Enoch; and, 3) given the numerous parallels between the ancient Book of Enoch and Smith’s own extract of the prophecy of Enoch found in the Book of Moses, the only explanation is that divine revelation must have occurred.

Hugh Wander Nibley (1910-2005) was a highly revered Mormon scholar and apologist. His published works on Enoch in the 1960’s and 1970’s were in excess of 1,000 pages and in 1986 these works were compiled into a single book called *Enoch the Prophet*. At the time of Nibley’s writing he was only aware of a single printing of the Book of Enoch in English that would have been available prior to Joseph Smith writing his extract of the prophecy of Enoch (EPE). This single printing, Richard Laurence’s translation of the Ethiopic account of 1 Enoch (1En), was published in Britain in 1821. However, Nibley argues that Laurence’s work was inaccessible by Smith and thus any similarities, of which there are many, are the result of Smith having received divine revelation. D. Michael Quinn, former Mormon and historian, notes that in light of new evidence of which Nibley was unaware, his “emphatic

---

<sup>1</sup> Hugh Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1986), 277

statements must be modified.”<sup>2</sup> A reconsideration of Nibley’s argument and a better understanding of the role of Enoch in Mormonism is the aim of this paper.

This study will attempt to demonstrate that through Smith’s access to materials from the Book of Enoch and with substantial similarities between the extract of the prophecy of Enoch and the Book of Enoch, Joseph Smith was influenced.

Chapter One, **Foundation and Background**, will trace the origins of Enochic materials and will include the efforts of George Syncellus, James Bruce, Richard Laurence and a handful of others who maintained an interest in the Book(s) of Enoch (BE) throughout the past millennia. By tracing the history of the Book of Enoch, specifically through Britain and Europe, this discussion can begin to address Nibley’s concern about the amount of Enochic materials available prior to Smith’s writing the EPE in 1830. Detailing the reception of Enochic literature will provide a foundation for asserting that Enoch materials were available to Smith.

In addition to tracing Enochic traditions, it is important to give background information on Smith, his companions and those who participated in the formation of the extract of the prophecy of Enoch. Thus this chapter will also recount the lives of Joseph Smith, his cousin Oliver Cowdery, and early Mormon Church elder Sidney Rigdon amongst others. Understanding the lives of Smith, Cowdery and Rigdon provides the necessary context for framing how the Book of Moses (BMo), which includes the extract of the prophecy of Enoch (EPE), was produced. As the EPE provides the fullest account on Enoch in Mormonism and is the basis for Nibley’s argument it requires further analysis into its formation.

The theme of Chapter One is to provide the reader with the necessary background information on Mormonism and an accurate foundation for Enoch from which to engage with Nibley’s argument.

Chapter two, **Access to Materials**, will directly respond to Nibley’s argument that Smith had no access to Laurence’s 1En. This chapter will consider Laurence’s work, other materials and ways in which Smith may have come to know about 1En specifically and the BE generally. It will begin with a critique of Nibley’s approach and method and then review his argument before directly addressing each of his seven points against access. Quinn’s work

---

<sup>2</sup> D. Michael Quinn, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, Revised and Enlarged Edition (USA: Signature Books, 1998), 191

*Early Mormonism and the Magic World View* (1998) provided a brief response to Nibley's argument and a point from which to expand.

The theme of Chapter Two is to produce evidence that Smith was able to access Enoch materials, including Laurence's 1821 translation of 1 Enoch.

Chapter Three, **Substantial Similarities and Influence**, will consider Nibley's use of parallels between the EPE and the BE and analyse substantial similarities that he overlooks. Nibley's argument requires that both no access to the BE and parallels between the BE and EPE exist to prove Smith's divine status. Although this chapter will argue that parallels did in fact exist, it will consider whether Nibley's approach to parallels is valid. Not only will this chapter consider parallels but whether there exist substantial similarities that prove Smith had knowledge of the BE. Following substantial similarities will be a summary of a recent Stanford University study, which re-assesses the authorship of the Book of Mormon (BoM) through quantitative methods (i.e. a stylometric approach utilising 'Delta' and 'NSC' techniques). This study is relevant to the current thesis as it considers whether Smith's production of the BoM was influenced, and what implications this might have had for the Book of Moses.

The theme of Chapter Three is to provide evidence which expands and improves upon Nibley's parallels to provide proof of substantial similarities between the BE and EPE.

Chapter Four, **Beyond Nibley**, will consider Smith's interest in Enoch after the completion of the EPE in 1831. Further, this chapter will address what impact Smith's interest in Enoch continued to have on Mormonism. Unlike the previous two chapters, Chapter Four is not a direct response to Nibley's argument, although indirectly, through the example of Smith's interest, it will provide further support for the argument that Smith was indeed influenced. Also, this chapter will offer insight into Enoch in Mormonism beyond his place in scripture.

The theme of Chapter Four is to provide a fuller understanding of how Enoch influenced Smith and Mormonism after the completion of the EPE.

## **Faith in Context**

Hugh Nibley assumes, from the outset, that Joseph Smith is divinely inspired. This assumption informs Nibley's argument throughout and makes it difficult to address his argument without an appeal to faith. I do not make the same assumption, nor do I attempt to disprove this assumption. I recognise that, for many Mormons, faith walks hand in hand with the context of Smith's life and so any academic exercise devoid of such faithful considerations is itself out of context. However, the discipline of the study of religion, for our purposes here, is to investigate the process whereby Smith acquires his scriptural truth and not to question the truth of that scripture. Although indelibly linked, it is not within the scope of this thesis to consider the implications of Enochic influence on Smith for the Mormon faith. Additionally, casting light on the possible sources for the Book of Moses and extract of the prophecy of Enoch does not undermine their value. Defining the nature of Smith's divine revelation with or without influence is not the aim of this thesis and I will, therefore, leave that to systematic Mormon theologians and apologists to resolve. My aim is to advance the hypothesis that Smith was influenced while refraining from concerns based on faith.

## **History as Theology**

I have borrowed the phrase 'History as Theology' from a section title in Douglas J. Davies' book, *The Mormon Culture of Salvation*.<sup>3</sup> In it Davies discusses the transitioning nature of Mormon theology in recent decades, from Mormon's using history as a mode of discourse for engaging in religious truth to the current state of Mormon theology as a more formal discipline. In other words, Mormon scholars, like Nibley, once engaged with Mormon history as other Churches might engage with theology. This concept of sacred history is understandable given that, unlike so many ancient religions, Smith's founding of the Mormon Church occurred in a relatively well documented and literate age. As Mormon historian Klaus J. Hansen states, in his 1981 work:

They [Mormons] have found in the writings of Joseph Smith a world view and a guide for their own lives so consistent and satisfying that they are able to resist mere empirical evidence, relying rather on a kind of moral spiritual empiricism that confirms the truths of

---

<sup>3</sup> Douglas J. Davies, *The Mormon Culture of Salvation: Force, Grace and Glory*, (Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003), 11

Mormonism regardless of the caveats raised by secular scholars who, lacking the spirit of revelation, are able to dispense only the ‘learning of men.’<sup>4</sup>

For obvious reasons, I have chosen to produce a work that relies upon strict empirical evidence in spite of the lack of spirit. Contrary to Hansen’s assessment, I have chosen to approach this argument in a strictly historical manner as I am convinced that history has its place in Mormonism and, regardless of its relationship to theology, that history provides a better understanding of Smith.<sup>5</sup> In addition, current Mormon scholarship is far more receptive to critical evaluations than was the case at the time of Hansen’s assessment.

### **Methodology and Approach**

This thesis will engage with Mormon produced books, primarily because it seems that Mormons make up the largest group of people writing about Mormonism. Although, the process of historical analysis is always questionable, as the biases of the historian must be considered, the evidence should exhibit the best possible account of the events regardless of the source material employed (whether Mormon or non-Mormon). Therefore, when an accurate account of the history, or in some cases the only account, is provided by non- or anti-Mormon books I will use them.

Other than discussing the relatively new method of stylometry, I think it is somewhat unnecessary to engage in an academic discourse as to the nature of varied methodologies and how each affects this work. Suffice it to say, this thesis is a practical exercise in understanding and gauging the measure of influence, if any, on an historical person and record. Unfortunately, methodological concepts and terminology have become disciplines in

---

<sup>4</sup> Hansen suggests this ideology is the result of a once empirically based religious movement shifting over time to become one in which empirical evidence (e.g., anthropological evidence supporting Smith’s claim that there were large scale tribal wars in North America) is lacking. Klaus J. Hansen, *Mormonism and the American Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981), 12-13; 32

<sup>5</sup> An example of this shift in History over Theology is evident in a relatively recent argument which once questioned whether or not Smith had participated in treasure hunting and magic, yet now questions the degree of that participation. In no small part, then BYU Professor and Mormon D. Michael Quinn provided the substantial case for an historical evaluation of treasure hunting and magic over and against vehement denials of this fact by pre-eminent Mormon scholars like Hugh Nibley. Today Mormon scholars like Richard L. Bushman recognise that Smith did participate in treasure hunting and magic yet argue that he did so with hesitation or with every intention to change the minds of those with whom he sought treasure. Even Mormon apologist William J. Hamblin in a FARMS review of Quinn’s book dismissed magic and treasure hunting as fraudulent, whilst equally acknowledging the use of magic divining tools by Smith for divine purposes. Such a concession over the use of any such tools was once inconceivable to earlier studies.

and of themselves and stand as a hindrance to the process. Therefore, when necessary I will briefly explain the use of academic methods to ensure clarity throughout.

Further, when discussing method one must be sure to define the terms.

Chapter Three includes a stylometric study of the Book of Mormon (BoM). Stylometry is a statistical method of analysing a text to determine its author. I have chosen to summarise this Stanford University study of the BoM as I believe it is indicative of what will be the future of exegesis and is the inspiration for my exegetical approach. Like the Stanford study, the aim of this thesis is a practical understanding of Smith and the historical record. Given the limited space, the complexity of the topic and the seemingly endless detail and context, I will attempt to avoid commentary on any religious implications. Finally, when discussing method one must also define the terms.

The term ‘plagiarism’ is not helpful in the present discourse. Plagiarism, concerning Smith’s writings, fails to account for multiple concerns including how plagiarism would be defined in the 1830s and today, how ownership of written material would be defined given that in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century no laws were in place to prevent publishers from re-printing books without permission and in how one defines plagiarism with respect to materials believed by some to be divinely inspired. Since ‘plagiarism’ invokes negative connotations, I will instead use the term ‘influence’ to offer a more accurate description of what may have occurred. The term ‘influence’ answers each of the aforementioned concerns as it has no strict legal definition. The breadth of the term allows for discerning the state of conscious or unconscious reception (which admittedly can also apply to plagiarism) as well as implying rather specifically that one person was affected through behaviour, opinions, or writings by the actions, products or processes of others. Although not something I will address in this thesis, the concept of divine revelation in light of influence raises rather interesting theological questions. Does the act of prophecy equate to plagiarism of God by Prophets? If divinely inspired Enoch materials are rewritten, retransmitted or directly quoted in more recent divinely inspired works are those works (new or old) somehow diminished? Is influence even applicable when divine revelation is evident or claimed?

Finally, from the time Eber D. Howe first argued influence in *Mormonism Unveiled* (1834) to the most recent study at Stanford University on *Reassessing Authorship of the Book of Mormon using Delta and Nearest Shrunken Centroid Classification*, the arguments against the validity of the Mormon assumption of divine inspiration have focused on the Book of



Mormon and indirectly upon Smith. These works have attempted to argue that key portions of the Book of Mormon were influenced by different external sources or even the result of additional writers. Mormon apologists, however, consider these various scholars' methods, sources and speculation to be unfounded and inconclusive. Yet arguments for influence persist and quantitative studies provide further methods for considering seriously questions about whether Smith was influenced. Aside from this ongoing debate, the goal of this thesis is merely to change one's mind about the possibility of influence having occurred in the specific case of Smith's extract of the prophecy of Enoch in the Book of Moses. Additionally, this thesis will attempt to offer a better understanding of the relationship between Smith, his extract of the prophecy of Enoch, early Mormonism and ancient Enochic traditions.

## CHAPTER ONE

# FOUNDATION AND BACKGROUND

*Remember, Joseph Smith did give us a book of Enoch in chapters 6 and 7 of the book of Moses. I've written over a thousand pages on it, and I haven't even scratched the surface. –Nibley<sup>6</sup>*

Enoch's value, the impact of the tradition which formed around him and his scriptural significance are best understood by tracing the history of Enochic traditions over the past millennia. Enochic tradition refers to the transmission and dissemination of knowledge of Enoch. This transmission occurred in a variety of ways including through oral, ritual and written form. This study will emphasize the written form of transmission for two reasons; it is more probable that Smith was dealing with a written form and, tracing oral and ritual forms is difficult given that many of the events in question occur prior to 1830 when limited knowledge about such forms of tradition existed.<sup>7</sup> This written form is the accumulation of three books 1 Enoch (1En), 2 Enoch (2En) and 3 Enoch (3En) which will be referred to collectively throughout as the Book(s) of Enoch (BE).

### 1. The Book of Enoch

Having passed from the collective memory of the world and the general knowledge of the Judeo-Christian consciousness, the BE, and to a lesser extent the biblical person Enoch, remained in the shadows of history until the modern era. The BE (specifically 1En) was able to escape its earlier Christian canon condemnation and be restored to the status it once held in Second Temple Judaism due to the work of theologians like R.H. Charles and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, Charles' efforts are inconceivable without the earlier

---

<sup>6</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 3

<sup>7</sup> Many of these oral transmissions and ritual expressions are only known through the written form.

work of James Bruce and Richard Laurence who in turn owe their efforts to the work and interest of others during the Renaissance and Enlightenment periods. Although interest in Enoch was limited during these two periods, at various points between the sixteenth and early nineteenth centuries the topic of Enoch is discussed far more regularly than one might expect (as will be noted later). To understand fully the restoration of Enochic materials prior to the writings of Joseph Smith, one must first understand the origins of those materials. It is generally accepted that the BE is an expansion<sup>8</sup> of the brief account of Enoch in Genesis:

**5:21** When Enoch had lived for sixty-five years, he became the father of Methuselah. **22** Enoch walked with God after the birth of Methuselah for three hundred years, and had other sons and daughters. **23** Thus all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years. **24** Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him.<sup>9</sup>

An expansion was inevitable given how brief and unqualified this verse is, as well as the major theological questions it raises regarding Enoch's shorter than average life expectancy as an antediluvian patriarch,<sup>10</sup> his having "walked with God,"<sup>11</sup> and his not dying,<sup>12</sup> all curiosities of some significance. In addition to providing a more complete understanding of scripture, Jews have always been equally interested in the application of scripture through the Law. Prior to the third century BCE, a strict adherence to the Law (that which was given to Israel by God through Moses) and to the works and wisdom of the Prophets (who remind Israel to adhere to the Law) was the focus. This emphasis was transformed during the Second Temple period, 516 BCE-70 CE<sup>13</sup> (an era book marked by the rebuilding of Solomon's Temple, ca. 520-516 BCE and the Temple's destruction by the Romans, circa 70 CE). Just prior to this time a new trend began in which the Old Testament (OT) writings ceased (circa 400 BCE), the Law was secured, and the prophets diminished. The Second Temple Jews in response to this trend produced a series of writings meant to address contemporary concerns about the Law and works of the prophets. These expository writings were often attributed to persons from scripture, like Enoch, and were themselves often

---

<sup>8</sup> Although arguments persist that suggest the Genesis account of Enoch is in fact a contraction of an earlier and much longer Enoch tradition.

<sup>9</sup> NRSV, *The Holy Bible*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 5

<sup>10</sup> Excluding Noah, there are nine patriarchs from Adam to Lamech with an average life span of 847 years. Given Enoch lives only 365 years and that the next shortest life span is 777 years old and given the significance of the number 365 in relation to the solar year (as Enoch is argued to have brought astronomy to the world), this was indeed a phenomenon which needed to be explained.

<sup>11</sup> Noah is the only other biblical person who 'walked with God' (Genesis 6:9) and what is meant by such a phrase is still debated.

<sup>12</sup> Elijah is the only other biblical person who is translated to heaven without tasting death (2 Kings 2:1-11).

<sup>13</sup> According to the Book of Ezra (6:14-15), the Second Temple dedication occurs in 516 BCE.

regarded, by some, as scripture. It is during this Second Temple Period that the first non-biblical text on Enoch was produced.

Works produced during this era are often referred to as pseudepigraphal or apocryphal but as Loren T. Stuckenbruck points out in his forthcoming work, these terms are fraught with difficulties.<sup>14</sup> Stuckenbruck provides a history of the terms from “late antiquity through the post-reformation era”<sup>15</sup> and argues that Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha are designations not contemporary with the collections of the Second Temple Period to which they are applied and in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls need to be rethought. Accordingly, Apocrypha (or hidden things, namely books) and Pseudepigrapha (or books falsely attributed), under the designations OT Apocrypha and OT Pseudepigrapha “are not descriptive and do not always reflect the way they (and the concepts underlying them) were sometimes used in antiquity.”<sup>16</sup> Hence, these terms fail to define the full complexity of these books and as is the case with the designation ‘falsely attributed,’ they unfairly assign a negative value to the work itself. However, Stuckenbruck argues that these works, including 1En (amongst many others), were held in the highest regard during their early formation.

1En, or *The Book of Enoch* (not the same as the term BE employed here), is the most complete account of Enoch currently known and is the oldest of three works attributed to Enoch. 1En, so named by Charles, refers specifically to the Ethiopic (Ge’ez) accounts even though Enochic traditions also exist in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Aramaic. At least 60 manuscripts and countless fragments exist for 1En. The structure of the work is traditionally broken into five sections (written by different authors at different times). According to Ariel Hessayon the books span three centuries from 200 BCE to the end of the first century BCE.<sup>17</sup> J.T. Milik (a contemporary of Nibley’s) suggests we refer to each of the five sections independently as the *Books* (plural) of Enoch.<sup>18</sup> Each section has evolved through the centuries going through changes in format, content, language and agenda that make identifying an ‘original’ section of Enoch and the order of those sections, difficult. This evolution has resulted in new traditions and the inclusion or exclusion of portions of the BE,

---

<sup>14</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha” in John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.) *Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010)

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid*, 1

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid*, 1

<sup>17</sup> Ariel Hessayon, ‘Og King of Bashan, Enoch and the Books of Enoch: Extra-Canonical Texts and Interpretations of Genesis 6:1-4,’ in Hessayon, Ariel and Keene, Nicholas (eds.) *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2006), 9

<sup>18</sup> Jozef T. Milik (ed.), with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976)

ultimately producing a much larger Enochic tradition, with greater confusion for Enoch scholars. There are currently 108 chapters in most compilations of 1En, but they are not fixed, and given the clear difficulty in emphatically stating which works are original, the debate about how chapters, verses, and words might best be ordered or whether they should be included at all, is ongoing.

Dating the text becomes critical in arguing for the inclusion or exclusion of any given section. Scholars generally accept that the earliest sections of 1En, 91:12-17; 93:1-10; 12:16 are from the Pre-Maccabean period in the third century BCE and the latest, chapters 1-5, occur in the first century CE. The content of these sections, historical events mentioned, as well as carbon dating help provide scholars with clues for determining when a particular passage might have been produced. The influence of Enochic ideas and themes on other materials proves how highly influential 1En was on Second Temple Judaism and later Christianity. Its influence can be found in *the Book of Jubilees*, *the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs* (TTP), *the Assumption of Moses*, *2 Baruch*, *4 Ezra*, *the Damascus Rule*, *the Genesis Apocryphon*, *The Epistle of Barnabas*, *The Assumption of Moses*, *The Apocalypse of Peter*, *The Book of Giants* (BG) and the writings of Jude amongst others, in addition to the writings of numerous Christian Church fathers.<sup>19</sup> While many of these books were available in early America, the emphasis remains on the BE as the most likely source of influence for Smith.<sup>20</sup>

1En is dense with content, thus providing extensive material for influence. Using Hessayon's structure,<sup>21</sup> 1En can be broken down in five parts as follows: part one is chapters 1-36 which is called the Book of Watchers, it contains chapters 1-5, The Oracular Introduction which discusses the final judgment in the eschatological era; chapters 6-11, The Shemihazah narrative in which the leader of the fallen angels descends to corrupt the earth and have intercourse with the daughters of men; chapters 12-16, Enoch's Ascent to Heaven, vision and intercession with God on behalf of the fallen angels; chapters 17-19, Enoch's first journey is a tour of the earth and sheol; chapters 20-36, Enoch's second journey continues over the earth and he sees where the fallen angels will be bound. Part two or chapters 37-71 is called the Similitudes of Enoch aka, The Book of Parables (book three) discusses the Son of Man, the Elect One, the Righteous One and his judgment on the wicked and righteous; this book also espouses secrets from heaven, the resurrection of the righteous and further punishment of the

<sup>19</sup> Including, but not limited to, such significant names as Jerome, Tertullian, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, Augustine, etc.

<sup>20</sup> In time, however, an examination of these other texts may shed more light on the current discussion.

<sup>21</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 9

fallen angels. Part three, chapters 72-82, make up what is known as the Astronomical Book aka, The Book of the Heavenly Luminaries which concerns astrological matters such as the calendar, the solar year and recent cosmic events. Chapters 83-90 is called the Book of Dreams (part four) and consists of two visions (for the earth and for Israel) from Enoch, prior to the flood, which recounts the coming flood and its punishment of the wicked, the coming Messiah, more on the fallen angels and in chapters 85-90 uses animal imagery as symbolic representations of the various persons in the visions. Part five, chapters 91-107 known as The Epistle of Enoch contains an account of ten consecutive weeks of events, fragments of additional works in which Enoch passes along his knowledge on holy tablets to his son Methuselah and Enoch's other children, with further discussions on the righteous, the wicked and their final judgment. Chapter 108 is the concluding discourse and is an editorial conclusion meant to draw together the various parts of 1En with some cohesion. The content of this book is fairly well known and the basis for numerous other accounts and writings.

Although our oldest and best known account of 1En remains the primary focus for modern scholars, two further adaptations and additions to the Enoch accounts are currently receiving increased attention. Known quite succinctly as 2En (from the Slavonic tradition) and 3En (from the Hebrew tradition) these later works are not as old or as well known as 1En, but go through a similar evolution and expansion of traditions. The numbering structure of 1, 2 and 3 Enoch imply a sense of order and value within the 3 works.<sup>22</sup>

2En or *the Book of the Secrets of Enoch* is extant in Slavonic. Currently there are at least ten complete manuscripts and various fragments. This work incorporates two recensions of 1En and the general consensus is that the physically shorter version is more likely to be original. 2En scholar Andrei A. Orlov notes the importance of distinguishing between a recension and simply a different version, as 2En is a recension (i.e. has been edited or revised) of 1En and appears to be the work of one author. 2En's primary influence is Jewish mysticism which was subsequently influenced by Second Temple Pseudepigrapha. Orlov suggests that the biggest obstacle in relating the Jewish Mystical Traditions and Slavonic Pseudepigrapha is the complex nature of the Slavonic language. He further sees 2En (the Apocalypse of Abraham and the Ladder of Jacob) as a transitional work between apocalypticism (in Enochic

---

<sup>22</sup> The numerical distinctions may prove in time to inaccurately reflect Enochic traditions and their order with the help of evolving dating and a better understanding of transmission.

Literature) and Mysticism (in Rabbinic Merkabah and Hekhalot).<sup>23</sup> Francis I. Andersen argues that although both accounts are attributed to Enoch “it is hard to find any passages in *2 Enoch* which can be proved to be derived substantially from *1 Enoch*” since many of the motifs and themes of both books were in general circulation.<sup>24</sup> The narrative content of 2En proceeds with chapters 1-68, which follow Enoch through the seven heavens, and chapters 69-73, which discuss Enoch’s successors. The entire text celebrates and emphasizes God as the sole-creator. According to Andersen, the content is generally to do with those who fear God as having the highest virtue (2En 43:3) and covers subjects such as the creator-God, simple but strict ethical rules, speculations about the cosmos and astrology, and practices of making a sacrifice. He suggests that the authors take themselves too seriously and are part of a fringe sect.<sup>25</sup> Andersen also suggests that the focus of 2En is on an antediluvian God over the God of Abraham and Moses, a God whose descriptions “border on the ridiculous, although [they are] intended to be reverent and awesome”<sup>26</sup> and a sect which believes that “any disrespect for any human being is disrespect for God himself.”<sup>27</sup>

The complexity of 2En’s evolution is common amongst each of the Enoch accounts. Argued by some to have come from a Greek original, no known Greek accounts of 2En remain.<sup>28</sup> Milik attributed the work to a Byzantine Monk in the ninth century, although today that dating is disputed.

3En, or *the Hebrew Enoch*, is also known as *Sepher Hekhalot* (the Book of the Palaces) and is, according to Philip Alexander, an “account by R. Ishmael of how he journeyed into Heaven, saw God’s throne and chariot, received revelations from the archangel Metatron, and viewed the wonders of the upper world.”<sup>29</sup> 3En breaks down as follows: chapters 1-2, the ascension of Ishmael; chapters 3-16, the exaltation of Enoch (one manuscript made up of only chapter 3-15 is called the Elevation of Metatron); chapters 17-40, the heavenly household; and chapters 41-48, the sights of heaven, specifically cosmology, eschatology, and psychology. It has been suggested that 3En is a compilation piece, made up of a group of

<sup>23</sup> Andrei A. Orlov, *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 105

<sup>24</sup> Francis I. Andersen, ‘Second Book of Enoch,’ in David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. II, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 519

<sup>25</sup> Francis I. Andersen, ‘2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,’ in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1983), 96

<sup>26</sup> Andersen, ‘Second Book of Enoch,’ 519

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid*, 97

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid*, 93

<sup>29</sup> P. Alexander, ‘3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,’ in James Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1983), 223

smaller individual units with their own traditions. However, 3En is still smaller than 1 and 2 Enoch. The original language was most likely Hebrew and as Alexander suggests, “there is no reason to suppose that the work has been translated into Hebrew from another language.”<sup>30</sup>

Finally, the most important aspect of the Enochic tradition is its scope. 1En is a large part of that tradition and is composed of smaller sections. One of these sections, the Book of Watchers (BW), is made up of five smaller components that were each “in the hands of a series of authors, redactors, and tradents.”<sup>31</sup> As theologian Annette Yoshiko Reed points out, we should not “draw a straight line from Aramaic fragments from Qumran to the Ethiopian collection.”<sup>32</sup> Her larger point is that the formation of 1En is not simply the evolution of one work translated multiple times and is not formed in the same way one might expect a modern book (post printing press) to be formed. Given the scale of the corpus of Enoch writings in question, it should be noted from the outset that the following effort to trace Enochic materials is the result of the best scholarship available to date, but is not necessarily representative of all that was known about Enoch (and the materials attributed to him) during these times.

### *1.1 Early Enoch*

Although the number of early Church fathers who reference or recount Enoch is vast, the New Testament (NT) contains only one direct quote from 1En which is found in St. Jude. Jude. It states:

**14** It was also about these that Enoch, in the seventh generation from Adam, prophesied, saying, ‘See, the Lord is coming with tens of thousands of his holy ones, **15** to execute judgement on all, and to convict everyone of all the deeds of ungodliness that they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things that ungodly sinners have spoken against him.’<sup>33</sup>

Enoch scholar Daniel Olson says of Jude:

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid*, 225

<sup>31</sup> Annette Yoshiko Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 58

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid*, 21

<sup>33</sup> Jude 14-15



The Jude quotation is only the most obvious example of the respect Enoch enjoyed among New Testament authors, many of whom make free use of its ideas, assuming all the while, as Jude does, that their readers are already familiar with the book.<sup>34</sup>

For our purposes here, the Enochic tradition begins in the mid eighth and early ninth centuries with George Syncellus who, according to William Adler in *Time Immemorial*, composed a history of the world from creation to the time of Tarasius for the patriarch of Constantinople (Tarasius 784-806). Adler says of Syncellus, “like many other Byzantine chronographers, he is often more adept at compiling sources and excerpts than he is at analysing or accounting for them.”<sup>35</sup> As Syncellus’ sources became available first hand, interest in his work faded. However, Syncellus’ contributions and the use of his works by a large majority of Enochic commentators provided an unequalled source of BE material well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Syncellus even quoted sources that he disagreed with or thought to be without credibility, this speaks to the breadth of his compiled works. Adler suggests Syncellus’ motives might be “a fondness for cataloguing sources, or a simple desire to parade erudition.”<sup>36</sup>

Syncellus was heavily reliant upon early Christian chronographers, Julius Africanus (late second, early third centuries), Eusebius of Caesarea (263-339 CE), and two fifth century monks Panodorus and Annianus whom Syncellus himself identifies as his key authorities. Adler notes of Syncellus that “his works cite in abundance excerpts from chronicles of Egyptian and the near east hermetic literature, as well as Jewish and Christian Pseudepigrapha.”<sup>37</sup> Although significant for many other reasons Adler states,

No less sensational were Syncellus’ extracts from Jewish pseudepigrapha. Undoubtedly stirring the greatest excitement were the citations from *1 Enoch*, both because of the putative antiquity of the work and because of the apparent influence that this book had once exerted in the early church.<sup>38</sup>

Syncellus includes full quotes from 1En 6:1-9:5; 9:1-10:15; 26:9-25; 15:8-16:2; 26:26-27:7; 72-82 and “up until the discovery of the Ethiopic witnesses to 1 Enoch Syncellus’ three excerpts from the Book of Watchers were the single most important testimony to this

<sup>34</sup> Daniel C. Olson, *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills, Texas: Bibal Press, 2004), 1

<sup>35</sup> William Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography From Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989), 7

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*, 7

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*, Book Jacket

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid*, 6

work.”<sup>39</sup> It is clear that his dependence on Panodorus and other Alexandrian chroniclers is likely to have provided Syncellus with his excerpts; hence he was not, in most cases, dealing with Enochic manuscripts themselves but rather another, earlier chroniclers’ copies of these works. It was as if he were quoting a quote.

Ariel Hessayon, editor of *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*, provides a history of the BE in Europe in which he briefly accounts for Syncellus’ impact. Hessayon states:

Syncellus’s chronicle was the most important witness to the Greek version of the Book of Enoch until the late nineteenth century when a fifth- or sixth-century mutilated manuscript was discovered in a Christian grave at Akhmîm (Codex Panopolitanus) containing two corrupt copies of the Book of the Watchers.<sup>40</sup>

In addition to Syncellus, Hessayon accounts for Enoch fragments in circulation prior to or contemporary with Syncellus, including: a fourth century papyrus codex found in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (containing 1En 97:6-107:3); a late 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> century tachygraphical (ancient shorthand or medieval cursive) manuscript in Greek (containing 1En 89:42-9) found in the Vatican Library and later deciphered in 1855; and a sixth or seventh century Coptic manuscript (containing 1En 93:3-8) discovered in an Antinoë cemetery in 1937.<sup>41</sup> Hessayon goes on to note the myriad of paraphrases and allusions to the BE which include angels (often by name), giants, and sons of God (amongst others). It is likely that the impact of Enochic materials generally, and Syncellus’ accounts specifically, is far greater than previously imagined. Although some scholarship exists which retraces the reception of Enochic literature, until an extensive investigation occurs, this thesis can only account for some of the possible Enoch sources available in Smith’s time.

## *1.2 Enoch in Europe*

On the reception of Enochic literature it would seem there are only two exemplary works. In 1922 Nathaniel Schmidt produced a brief article that traces the history of Enoch manuscripts and books through Europe to Schmidt’s own time. His article, *Traces of Early Acquaintance in Europe with the Book of Enoch* states, “to what extent the literature ascribed to Enoch was

---

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid*, 81

<sup>40</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 30

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid*, 30

known in Europe during the early Christian centuries cannot be determined with certainty.”<sup>42</sup> However, what is clear according to Schmidt is that prior to the beginning of the humanist period (circa 1400) knowledge did exist of the Syncellus excerpts, Latin fragments, Hebrew Enoch (although exclusively in Jewish circles) and the secrets of Enoch in the Slavonic traditions. For the most part, however, “mediaeval Europe seems to have been ignorant of the works ascribed to the antediluvian patriarch.”<sup>43</sup> Schmidt’s account of those key individuals responsible for continuing the reception of Enochic literature was the only work available to Nibley whilst he was writing on Enoch. However, this thesis benefits from the more recent work by Hessayon (2006). Although he draws heavily from Schmidt’s work, Hessayon provides more detail, better structure, and a further engagement with the content of these works and persons.

Although both Schmidt and Hessayon trace Enochic works prior to the 15<sup>th</sup> century, it is improbable that works produced before the arrival of Gutenberg’s printing press (circa 1450) would have been available to Smith and his companions. Hence, this history of Enoch materials will begin in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

The Italian Renaissance Philosopher Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-94), who in his work *Apologia* discussed having purchased, for a hefty sum, a group of seventy books which he identified as the seventy books of Ezra, “relates how Pope Sixtus IV had made great efforts to have them translated, and that at his death three of them had been rendered into Latin.”<sup>44</sup> Schmidt notes that Gaffarel in 1651 presents extracts from the BE in his account of Mirandola’s first manuscript, hence ‘it is possible’ that Mirandola owned a copy of the Hebrew Enoch and ‘not inconceivable’ that he also owned a copy of the Ethiopic Enoch.<sup>45</sup> According to Hessayon, “Seventeenth-century sources citing supposedly contemporary testimony maintained that Pico had purchased a copy of the Book of Enoch.”<sup>46</sup> In addition, Mirandola owned a 14<sup>th</sup> century commentary on the Pentateuch that “contained expositions upon Enoch’s translation, his prophetic books, the sons of God and the daughters of men, the fallen angels, the brevity of man’s life and the giants.”<sup>47</sup> Mirandola also noted the

---

<sup>42</sup> Adler, *Time Immemorial*, 44

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid*, 45

<sup>44</sup> Nathaniel Schmidt, ‘Traces of Early Acquaintance in Europe with the Book of Enoch,’ in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 42 (1922), 46

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid*, 47

<sup>46</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 22

<sup>47</sup> Hessayon is citing Jacques Gaffarel’s *Codicum Cabalisticorum manuscriptorum*, (Paris, 1651), 22. *Ibid*, 23

Hebraic secret theology that finds Enoch transformed into the angel *Shekinah* (the Divine Presence).<sup>48</sup>

Like Mirandola, scholar Johann Reuchlin (1455-1522) denounced the magic and ignorance which was pervasive in the Book of Solomon and the BE. In 1494, Reuchlin published *De Verbo Mirifico*, in which he directly references the BE, although he believed the work (which was for sale) was likely a forgery based on Josephus. However, not everyone believed as Reuchlin did, Schmidt states, “Simon, the Jew, [who] does not question the possible survival of some such books as that of Enoch” but declares he is unable to purchase seventy books like Mirandola “among which it may have [had] a place.”<sup>49</sup> Later in his 1517 *De Arte Cabalistica* Reuchlin mentions how the BE (amongst others) were cited by “men worthy of faith.”<sup>50</sup> “

One such man of faith was Frenchman, Guillaume Postel (1510-81), a linguist, Cabbalist, and a religious Universalist who declared, “Enoch’s prophecies made before the flood were preserved in the ecclesiastical records of the Queen of Sheba, and that to this day they were believed to be canonical scripture in Ethiopia.”<sup>51</sup> The Enochic account was accorded canonical status in the Ethiopic Bible and is a source for the *Kebra Nagast*. According to Hessayon:

Based on the Queen of Sheba’s legendary visit to Solomon (1 Kings 10:1-13), the epic *Kebra Nagast* or ‘Glory of the kings’ tells of their affair, the birth of their son Menelik and his theft of the Ark of the Covenant, which he brought to Aksum, the new Zion. Conflating Enochic and Koranic traditions ... the hundredth chapter narrated the angel’s fall. Assuming the mind and body of men, the rebel angels descended amidst the children of Cain. After playing musical instruments to accompany dancing they enjoyed an orgy with the daughters of Cain ... Their surviving offspring split open their mothers’ bellies and came forth by their navels. They grew to be giants, whose height reached the clouds.<sup>52</sup>

Rome had a large Ethiopian community and a monk from this community encountered Postel in 1546 and according to Postel, explained the meaning of the BE.<sup>53</sup> According to Schmidt, Postel “was actually shown a copy of the Ethiopic Enoch in Rome and had its contents

---

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid*, 23

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid*, 46

<sup>50</sup> Schmidt, *Traces of Early Acquaintance*, 46

<sup>51</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 23

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid*, 20-21

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid*, 20

explained to him by an Abyssinian priest.”<sup>54</sup> An English Protestant exile named John Bale (1495-1563) reaffirmed that Enoch’s work was held in Ethiopia, in the Queen of Sheba’s ecclesiastical archives. Supposedly begun by the Queen of Sheba, this collection included, “The writings of Enoch copied out of the stones wherein they were engraven, which intreat of Philosophie, of the Heauens and Elements.”<sup>55</sup>

According to Hessayon, French Humanist Nicolas Claude Fabri de Peiresc’s (1580-1637) contact Capuchin Gilles de Loches, had recently returned (July 1623) from a seven year excursion in Levant where he studied Oriental languages and attempted to procure manuscripts for Peiresc. Loches provided Peiresc with a list (but no actual manuscripts) of the rare books he had seen and the list included *Mazhapha Einock* (or the ‘Prophecie of Enoch’). Through a second contact, Peiresc acquired what he referred to as the ‘Revelations of Enoch’ in 1636.<sup>56</sup> Peiresc asked Loches to translate the text, which Peiresc believed to be the same as the one Loches had seen and reported. Unfortunately, Peiresc died in 1637 before Loches had even begun the task of translating (a task which Loches completed before his own death). According to Schmidt, there can be no doubt that this work was indeed the BE or contained long excerpts from it.<sup>57</sup> The work was sold to Cardinal Jules Mazarin (1602-1661), when he acquired a large part of Peiresc’s library.

One of Peiresc’s French contemporaries, the religious leader, scholar and Protestant convert Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609) had acquired, in June of 1602 an extract of Syncellus’ *Chronography*, which had since been tucked away in the library of Catherine de Medici. Scaliger dismissed Syncellus as silly and his mutilated work (the result of the extracts he had been sent) as incoherent, and yet simultaneously could not deny some real value in Syncellus’ work. Scaliger published *Thesaurus Temporum* in 1606 and included in it some notes from Syncellus’ account of the BE. According to Hessayon, “Syncellus had been brought to the scholarly world’s attention”<sup>58</sup> thanks to the efforts of Scaliger who simultaneously helped restore a greater interest in the BE.

Enochic scholarship continued to grow. Dutch jurist Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) alleged having done some work on the Greek version of the BE. In 1637, Athanasius Kircher found

<sup>54</sup> Schmidt, *Traces of Early Acquaintance*, 50

<sup>55</sup> Hessayon includes the original spelling and is citing Luis de Urreta’s *Historia Ecclesiática, Política, Natural, y moral des los grandes y remotes Reynos de la Etiopia* (Valencia, 1610), 103-7 and Samuel Purchas’ *Purchas his Pilgrimage* (1613), 567. Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 25

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid*, 26-27

<sup>57</sup> Schmidt, *Traces of Early Acquaintance*, 51

<sup>58</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 32

a Greek fragment of the BE in a monastic library in Sicily which he printed with a Latin translation. Meanwhile, back in Paris, Jacques Goar (1601-53) went about editing Byzantine texts based on a codex in the Bibliothèque Royale. Further still, Hessayon states, “Thomas Bang’s *Cælum Orientis et prisca mundi triade* (Copenhagen, 1657) provided the most exhaustive discussion yet” on the BE.<sup>59</sup> Peiresc found a Syncellus manuscript in the Vatican and made every effort to copy and publish it. And finally, Job Ludolf (1624-1704) had a Dominican friend transcribe a copy of Peirsec’s so-called ‘*Mazhapah Einock*’ which he declared was a fake. Having been misinformed or simply unknowledgeable about what he had seen, Ludolf’s zeal in denouncing the work as a fraud left a negative impact for decades, leaving many to believe that such a book did not actually exist. That is until a Scotsman returned with proof of the reality and existence of the BE.

### *1.3 Enoch in Britain*

Enochic material progressed differently in Britain than it had on the European continent. In fact as early as 1242, the Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste had translated a Greek manuscript on *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (TTP) into Latin, a work which would later be rendered into English. According to Hessayon, “In England Protestant antipathy to doctrines based upon unwritten traditions continued to inform the majority of responses to Enoch’s prophecy.”<sup>60</sup>

However, Britons like John Donne (who rails against the BE’s canonicity), Thomas Manton (who suggested Jude’s use of Enoch was divine), John Edwards, Thomas Tomkinson (who notes its influence on the TTP) and Theaurau John Tany had commented extensively on Enoch.<sup>61</sup> In addition, John Dee noted occultist, alchemist, hermetic philosopher and Queen Elizabeth I’s consultant, was so certain of the truth of Enoch having received divine mysteries that he developed his own angelic language to code that truth, which has yet to be deciphered.<sup>62</sup> Hessayon even notes the impact of the BE in John Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, as well as the impact it had on the Quakers.

---

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid*, 33

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid*, 34

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid*, 33-37

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid*, 24

In 1698, a German-born Englishman, Johan Ernest Grabe (1666-1711) issued *Spicilegium SS. Patrum, ut et Hæreticorum* (Oxford, 1698-99). The work included an edition of the TTP as well as a Greek version of Syncellus's excerpt of the BE, with a parallel Latin translation and notes.<sup>63</sup> The Enoch fragments were rendered into English as *The History of the Angels and their Gallantry with the Daughters of Men* in 1715.

According to Hessayon, Grabe contemporary and German scholar Johann Albert Fabricius (1668-1736) in his *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (Hamburg and Leipzig, 1713-23) marked the:

... culmination of research at that date on the Books of Enoch, containing selections from the writings of Postel, Dee, Scaliger, Drusius, Grotius, Bang, Mader, Pfeiffer, Vockerodt, Ludolf, Grabe and others. Fabricius was followed by the most extensive treatment yet of the subject in English, William Whiston's *A Collection of Authentick Records Belonging to the Old and New Testament* (2 parts, 1727-28). This included 'Extracts out of the First Book of Enoch, concerning The Egregori', as well as: A Dissertation to prove that this Book of Enoch, whose Fragments we have here produc'd was really genuine, and was one of the Sacred Apocryphal or Concealed Books of the Old Testament.<sup>64</sup>

This account by the English theologian William Whiston (1667-1752) was somewhat exceptional for its time and yet Whiston's acclaim derived not from his work of Enoch but rather from his translation of *Josephus's Antiquities of the Jews*.

For most of modern scholarship, Enoch was considered lost by some, non-existent by others but in 1773 Scotsman James Bruce, of Kinnaird (1730-1794), known as the Abyssinian traveller returned with proof of the BE after an extensive excursion through North Africa and specifically Ethiopia in an attempt to find the source of the Blue Nile. During Bruce's travels he acquired from Ethiopia three copies of 1En in manuscript form which were separated and deposited in the Paris Library, the Bodleian at Oxford and one which he kept in his private library in Scotland.<sup>65</sup> From these travels, Bruce produced a seven volume book in 1790, recounting his travels, discoveries and work. The seven volume series offers a brief account of 1En and having resided in Ethiopia for some time Bruce seems capable of his own translation. He discusses the manuscripts' history and travel, and then moves on to the BE's

---

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid*, 39

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*, 40

<sup>65</sup> James Bruce, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile, in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, & 1773*, The Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged, Vol. II, (Edinburgh: Printed by George Ramsay and Company, 1813), 412-413

content and offers a few quotes. He begins by quoting verses 14-15 in the Epistle of Jude, stating these verses are “word for word the same, in the second chapter of the book.”<sup>66</sup> He continues with an account of the wicked giants who feast on everything from animals to corn, all men’s labour and finally on man himself who cries out to God to punish these giants. God responds by sending a flood. Bruce suggests that this account of the giants makes up about “four or five of the first chapters”<sup>67</sup> and ends his reading as his “curiosity led me not further. The catastrophe of the giants, and the justice of the catastrophe, fully satisfied me.”<sup>68</sup> Bruce concludes by discussing Dr. Woide who reviewed the manuscript in Paris and notes that Woide (like Bruce himself) found the actual content of 1En abhorrent.

The Coptic scholar Dr. Charles Godfrey Woide was an assistant librarian at the British Museum before his death in 1790. This would have meant that another account of Enoch was known to have existed, although in a different language, prior to 1830. Accordingly Schmidt notes:

It is fair to conclude that before Bruce brought back from Abyssinia three copies in 1773 Ethiopic Enoch had been seen by Guillaume Postel, Gilles de Loches, Claude Peiresc, and even Job Ludolf; and that it may have been in the library of Pico della Mirandola and at least heard of by Johann Reuchlin.<sup>69</sup>

Furthermore, by 1808, Alexander Murray produced an *Account of the Life and Writings of James Bruce*.<sup>70</sup> In the appendix, Murray lists the Ethiopic manuscripts that Bruce brought back from Habbesh including the Book of Enoch, for which Murray provides additional footnotes. Murray states, “the book of Enoch was originally written in Greek, probably by some Alexandrian Jew.”<sup>71</sup> Murray briefly recounts the “90 Kefel, or chapters”<sup>72</sup> of the book of Enoch. He first frames the discussion by noting the long held tradition in the East that attributes much of the evil in men from fallen angels. He also notes the Abyssinian story of the angels’ offspring, a race of giants, whose lawless actions provoke God’s vengeance. Both traditions exist in the Book of Enoch and according to Murray make up the first 18 chapters, which Bruce translated. Having grown weary of the content of the book, Bruce apparently

---

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, 413

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid*, 416

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid*, 416

<sup>69</sup> Schmidt, *Traces of Early Acquaintance*, 52

<sup>70</sup> Alexander Murray, *Account of the Life and Writings of James Bruce of Kinnaird, Esq., F.R.S., Author of Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile, in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772 & 1773* (Printed by George Ramsay and Company: Edinburgh, 1808), 297-299

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid*, 298

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid*, 298



does not translate any further.<sup>73</sup> Murray, however, notes the content of the remaining chapters as follows: in chapters 18-50 Enoch is led by Uriel and Raphael through a series of visions; chapter 52 Noah, who is appalled by the wickedness of mankind, is informed by his great-grandfather Enoch of the coming flood which will wipe out mankind; chapter 59 continues the story of the fallen angels; and in chapters 62-70 Enoch recounts his vision to his son Methuselah only to recapitulate his statements from earlier pages. Murray ends by noting that:

The remaining 20 chapters are employed on the history of the deluge, Noah's preparations for it, and the success which attended them. The destruction of all flesh, excepting his family, and the execution of Divine vengeance on the angels and their followers, conclude this absurd and romantic work.<sup>74</sup>

Murray provides yet another account, albeit brief, of the book of Enoch. Thus, given the inclusion of Dr. Woide's work and numerous others mentioned earlier, it is clear that Schmidt's study (the study which Nibley used) on the available Enochic materials in Europe prior to 1830 is very limited. Furthermore, after Woide in 1800, Antoine Isaac, Baron Silvestre de Sacy (1758-1838), a highly regarded Orientalist and linguist, produced a partial Latin translation of 1En<sup>75</sup> from the manuscript Bruce left in the Paris Library.<sup>76</sup> And F.T. Rink, a German scholar, published the first full translation of Bruce's Parisian manuscript in German a year later.

However, it is the Archbishop of Cashel and Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, Richard Laurence (1760-1838) who is best known as the translator of the Ethiopic Enoch (1En). Laurence's translation is credited by many for having restored Enoch in the modern world (often with a note about the travels of James Bruce as a precursor). Having completed a work on the Ascension of Isaiah two years prior, in 1821 Laurence finally published his *The Book of Enoch, the prophet: an apocryphal production, supposed for ages to have been lost; but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia: now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian library*. His work was published by Oxford University Press and marks a turning point for modern Enoch scholarship. A second edition was issued in 1832, (a further printing was issued in 1833), and a third edition in 1838 (including a new preface from Laurence shortly before his death). In 1883, yet another edition was released, with an

---

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid*, 299

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid*, 299

<sup>75</sup> 1En 1:1-32:6

<sup>76</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, v

introduction by the famed American theologian from Andover, Lyman Abbott (1835-1922). Laurence's book is the foundation for Nibley's argument against access.

## 2. The Book of Moses

According to the Mormon scholar Kent P. Jackson,

In some ways, the Book of Moses can be considered the most significant part of the JST [Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible], because it has contributed more distinctive Latter-day Saint doctrine than any other part of that work. It has stood since the beginning of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as one of the doctrinal cornerstones of the Restoration and as an enduring testimony to the divinely inspired work of Joseph Smith.<sup>77</sup>

A better understanding of the BMo requires in part a fuller engagement with the scribes. It is important to provide some background as to who they were and what access they may have had to prior works on Enoch. However, the inclusion of these scribes in this discussion does not assume the BMo was the result of collaboration. The following sections will proceed in a timeline narrative form and will primarily address the lives of Joseph Smith and the BMo scribes and early church elders, Sidney Rigdon and Oliver Cowdery. Emphasis will be given to the education and intelligence of the individuals involved and their knowledge and access to books, as well as other events and persons of note which may illuminate otherwise yet unconsidered possibilities.

### 2.1 *Joseph Smith, Jr.*

Joseph Smith Jr. was born in the town of Sharon, in Windsor County, Vermont on December 23, 1805 to Joseph Smith Sr. and Lucy 'Mack' Smith. Historian John L. Brooke suggests,

The Smiths of Topsfield were predisposed to witchcraft belief and metallurgical dreams; the Macks of Lyme lived in a religious milieu of visions, healing miracles, and sectarian

---

<sup>77</sup> Kent P. Jackson, *The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts* (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2005), 1

perfectionism. The marriage in 1796 of Joseph Smith Sr. and Lucy Mack in Tunbridge, Vermont, brought both streams of familial culture into a single household.<sup>78</sup>

Joseph Smith was one of nine children. The eldest, Alvin died suddenly on November 19, 1823 (at age 26). The next brother, Hyrum, was one of Joseph's closest companions, a later Mormon Church elder and martyr who was murdered alongside Joseph in jail in June of 1844. Joseph's other siblings, Samuel Harrison, William, Don Carlos, and his sisters Sophronia, Catherine and Lucy do not play a prominent role in this present work. Between 1803 and 1811, the Smiths moved seven times in and around Sharon, over a distance no greater than five or six miles.<sup>79</sup> In 1811 the family moved to Lebanon, New Hampshire for a year (roughly twenty miles away). They returned to Vermont a few years later only to migrate to New York in 1816. Famed Smith biographer and Mormon Richard L. Bushman says of this move that, "the Smiths broke entirely free of the network of family and friends"<sup>1</sup> when migrating to New York.

The multiple Smith family migrations contribute to a widely held belief by Mormons that Smith had limited formal education and hence was ignorant. Smith's lack of formal education remains a hotly debated topic and significantly contributes to the assertions that he was ignorant. In her 1853 biographical sketches of Smith, Lucy Mack Smith writes that he was, "much less inclined to the perusal of books than any of the rest of our children, but far more given to meditation and deep study."<sup>80</sup> This suggests that a perusal of books occurred in the Smith household and that Smith did indeed participate in study, a concept which seems entirely contradictory to other claims made by Lucy. In addition, Mormon H. Michael Marquardt states in his book, *The Rise of Mormonism: 1816-1844*, that Smith's "lack of formal schooling sometimes yielded the erroneous impression that he was illiterate."<sup>81</sup> Erroneous indeed, as between 1811 and 1816 Bushman says of the education of Smith, "Joseph Jr. probably had enough schooling from Deacon Jonathan Finney in Royalton to learn his letters. If not, his father could teach him,"<sup>82</sup> Smith Sr. having been a teacher in Sharon during the winter and farmer during the summer would likely have schooled his own children. It is said of Smith Sr., "The father of the family was above the average in

---

<sup>78</sup> Brooke argues quite convincingly that in addition to traditional views of the religious fervor sweeping early America, hermeticism hugely impacted Smith and Mormonism. John L. Brooke, *The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology 1644-1844* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 129

<sup>79</sup> Richard L. Bushman, *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Vintage Books, 2007), 19

<sup>80</sup> This may in fact be the first claim about the level of education of Smith. *Ibid*, 35

<sup>81</sup> H. Michael Marquardt, *The Rise of Mormonism: 1816-1844* (USA: Xulon Press, 2005), 34

<sup>82</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 20

intelligence.”<sup>83</sup> Smith himself, although limited in his formal education was hardly ignorant thanks to his parents, but disagreements persist. Dr. John Stafford, a Smith family neighbour states, “Joseph Smith was a real clever, jovial boy ... [but] Joe was quite illiterate. After they began to have school at their house, he improved greatly.”<sup>84</sup> Many of Smith’s early employers often spoke of his wise ways in dealing with other workers, “... because of the influence that boy [Smith] had over the wild boys of the neighbourhood”<sup>85</sup> and, “To tell the truth, there was something about him they could not understand. Some way he knew more than they did, and it made them mad ... he acted not with the wisdom of man, but with the wisdom of God.”<sup>86</sup>

The Mormon sources are themselves in conflict as to the degree and nature of Smith’s education and intelligence. Historian D. Michael Quinn states that “it is necessary to acknowledge that Joseph Smith’s mother began the Mormon apologist claim that her son was indifferent to books.”<sup>87</sup> How does indifference to books equate to ignorance? Mormons, it would seem, prefer Smith being portrayed as ignorant. Historian Klaus J. Hansen states:

In order to strengthen the argument for divine inspiration, Smith and his early followers emphasized the notion that he was an unlearned lad who could not possibly have written the book on his own, thus ironically providing critics with a convenient handle.<sup>88</sup>

Although, both Mormons and non-Mormons alike have made claims for and against the level of intelligence of Smith (as the question of formal education is rarely debated within Mormon circles as little to no education is assumed), neither side has been able to conclude his level of intelligence with any certainty. The inability to conclude is for good reason as the answer has, for Mormons, heavy theological consequences. An ignorant Smith who writes extensively without formal education and intelligence is a sign of God’s divine revelation (as no other possibility arises in the mind of the faithful). The opposing idea, it would seem, suggests an intelligent Smith and potential collaborators, independent of God, producing a work of incredible enormity and depth as the result of their own ability (even less of a possibility for the faithful). Accordingly, the assumption of an intelligent and capable Smith, whether divinely inspired or not, would seem to be an impossibility. Mormon apologists, like

---

<sup>83</sup> Hyrum L. Andrus and Helen Mae Andrus, *They Knew the Prophet: Personal Accounts From Over 100 People Who Knew Joseph Smith* (USA: Covenant Communications, Inc., 2004), 1 (Mrs. Palmer)

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid*, 4 (Dr. John Stafford)

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid*, 1 (Mrs. Palmer)

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid*, 3 (Thomas H. Taylor)

<sup>87</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 192

<sup>88</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 10

Nibley, understandably assume divine intervention over capable intelligence, but the evidence tends toward an intelligent and capable Smith. Mormons like Bushman continue to state things like, “None of the neighbors noted signs of learning or intellectual interests beyond the religious discussions in a juvenile debating club”<sup>89</sup> This is simply untrue, as a reference by one of Smith’s later employer’s, Josiah Stowell Sr.’s son, states that he recalls attending a year of school with Smith.<sup>90</sup> Quinn is also adamant that the concept of an ignorant Smith is simply a myth and argues rather adeptly about the nature of the highly literate society in which Smith grows up.<sup>91</sup> In fact evidence of Smith’s continued interest in learning and his quest for knowledge occurs even after his Book of Mormon (BoM) and BMo are published, Hugh Nibley’s daughter, Martha Beck recounts how:

... my progenitor was the personal dentist of the prophet Joseph Smith himself ... [and] also instructed Brother Joseph in German, Hebrew, and Jewish mysticism. Under his tutelage, the prophet began spicing up his speeches and proclamations with concepts from the Kabbalah.<sup>92</sup>

This does not indicate someone without ‘signs of learning or intellectual interests’ and although these events occur after he formally becomes a prophet, it speaks to an interest which, given the evidence, is not new. Bushman himself also accounts for this personal dentist (Joshua Seixas) as follows:

In 1835 the Church hired Joshua Seixas to teach Hebrew to the elders. Joseph joined the classes along with everyone else. The inspired translator of the Bible and the *Book of Mormon* received instruction from a professor, as if he wanted to blend conventional learning with his own specific gifts.<sup>93</sup>

Bushman is assuming that becoming a prophet sparked in Smith an interest in learning. This ‘blend’ assumes a desire to learn that seems incompatible with an ignorant Smith. Furthermore, this desire to learn is evidence of a character trait that seems to consistently appear throughout Smith’s life, rather than after his encounter with God. Ultimately, the assumption of ignorance<sup>94</sup> transformed by divine purpose fails to address occurrences of early brilliance, evidence of early learning and a desire to learn by Smith. These traits coupled

---

<sup>89</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 72

<sup>90</sup> It is unclear from Marquardt’s writings whether or not Smith leaves after a year of school or if Stowell leaves after a year of schooling with Smith. Marquardt, *The Rise of Mormonism*, 69

<sup>91</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 179-93

<sup>92</sup> Martha Beck, *Leaving the Saints: How I Lost the Mormons and Found My Faith* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2005), 34 -35

<sup>93</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 142,

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid*, 142

with access to learned persons and centres of information relates a different understanding of Smith's character than that which Mormon's wish to accept.

Access to learned persons and centres of information are evident in Smith's life as early as 1811 when his brother Hyrum, age eleven, began attending school at Moor's Academy. Moor's Academy was associated with and located near Dartmouth College in Hanover, New Hampshire. Dartmouth College was initially founded by the Rev. Eleazar Wheelock to educate Native Americans and when chartered by King George III its principal emphasis was educating and instructing Native Tribe and English youths.<sup>95</sup> Hyrum attended class at Moor's with a few Native Tribe youths and, according to Richard K. Behrens, also attended the Academy with Lyndon Smith. Lyndon Smith was the son of Ethan Smith the author of *View of the Hebrews*<sup>96</sup> and pastor to Oliver Cowdery (noted cousin of Joseph Smith and BMO scribe).<sup>97</sup> Additionally, Hyrum and Joseph's cousin Stephen Mack (son of Lucy Mack's eldest brother)<sup>98</sup> attended Moor's Academy during the same period.<sup>99</sup> According to Behrens, "In the fall of 1812, however, the outbreak of Typhus (typhoid) brought tragedy to the entire Connecticut River Valley,"<sup>100</sup> and Moor's Academy attendance records for 1813 make clear that Hyrum was removed from the academy for at least one year to attend to his ill younger brother Joseph. According to Behrens, whilst caring for Joseph, Hyrum passed on to Smith a varied degree of information which he learned at Dartmouth and that helped to inform Smith's world views. These views would later have a "significant influence on the LDS Church."<sup>101</sup> Behrens states:

Hyrum's education at Moor's school provided a tutor for unschooled Joseph. Hyrum's exposure to Dartmouth's theology, cosmology, ancient language studies, architecture, Ethan Smith's son Lyndon, and Solomon Spaulding's nephew James Spaulding from Sharon, Vermont, who was attending the Medical School, all provided discussion material for tutoring Joseph during his long recovery from leg surgery that kept Joseph at home on crutches until the Smith family reached Palmyra. The future development of Mormon

<sup>95</sup> 'Dartmouth.edu,' Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.dartmouth.edu/home/about/history.html>

<sup>96</sup> A book argued by some as a source for Smith's BoM.

<sup>97</sup> Richard K. Behrens, "Dreams, Visions, and Visitations: The Genesis of Mormonism" in *The John Whitmer Historical Association Journal*, Vol. 27, (2007), 177

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid*, 175

<sup>99</sup> Fellow classmates also included Solomon Spaulding's (sometimes spelled Spalding) cousin James. A rather infamous Dartmouth graduate, Solomon Spaulding authored *Manuscript Found* in 1812 (yet another book purported to have provided inspiration for the BoM) and noted by Behrens as having been discussed by two of Spaulding's relatives attending Dartmouth College at the time. *Ibid*, 175

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid*, 176

<sup>101</sup> Richard K. Behrens, "Dartmouth Arminianism and Its Impact on Hyrum Smith" in *The John Whitmer Historical Journal*, Vol. 26, (2006), 179

Doctrine so parallels the Dartmouth Lectures that it is hard not to perceive their stimulating possibilities.<sup>102</sup>

In 1816, having suffered destitution as the result of Joseph's medical bills and an unending winter of destroyed crops in Vermont,<sup>103</sup> the Smith family joined a migration of Vermonters who left the state in droves and proceeded to Palmyra, New York, three-hundred miles away.

In addition to Hyrum's schooling of Smith whilst suffering through typhus (for three years Joseph used crutches when he was not weak in bed),<sup>104</sup> Smith's world view was equally impacted by the revival. The Second Great Awakening which had occurred in and around New England from the 1790s to the 1840s produced a series of revivals throughout the region which had reached a fevered pitch. For instance, according to Behrens, in Dartmouth in 1814-1815 "Hyrum also witnessed ... [what] Dartmouth President John Wheelock characterized as Zion arriving with the greatest outpouring of the spirit that he had ever witnessed,"<sup>105</sup> as well as in Palmyra, shortly after the Smith's arrived Bushman states, "Joseph Sr. felt the appeal of the Palmyra revivals, as he had in 1810-11 in Vermont."<sup>106</sup> Hansen notes "the Second Great Awakening ... convulsed western New York in the 1820s to such an extent that it was called the burned-over district" as the revivals moved and raged as quickly and fiercely as fire in that area.<sup>107</sup> Since 1808 the Baptists had a meetinghouse in Palmyra, but from 1820-23 three more meetinghouses were constructed (Presbyterians, Methodists, and the Society of Friends). Smith says of the revival "... my mind at times was greatly excited, the cry and tumult were so great and incessant."<sup>108</sup> He goes on to acknowledge the impact of the revival on his own thoughts resulting in his seeking answers directly of God, and "... in going to inquire of the Lord was to know which of all the sects was right, that I might know which to join."<sup>109</sup>

In the spring of 1820, seeking an answer to the question of which religion to follow Joseph proceeded to a clearing in the woods near his house and at the age of 15 received his first vision (a similar story is earlier attributed to one of Hyrum's classmate at Moor's Academy in

---

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid*, 179

<sup>103</sup> Mount Tambora in the Dutch East Indies erupted in 1815 emitting so much debris into the stratosphere that sun light was reflected back into space, cooling much of the North West hemisphere. Hansen, *Mormonism*, 1

<sup>104</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 21

<sup>105</sup> Behrens, *Dreams, Visions*, 177

<sup>106</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 36

<sup>107</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 57

<sup>108</sup> 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009, [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:9

<sup>109</sup> 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009, [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:18

1814-15).<sup>110</sup> Although Smith relates his vision to a Methodist preacher who scorned him and dismissed his vision as having come from the devil, Smith does not record this ‘First Vision’ until 1832.<sup>111</sup> Smith would later write, “I soon found, however, that my telling the story had excited a great deal of prejudice against me among Professors of Religion.”<sup>112</sup> These ‘professors’ are assumed to have been local church leaders.<sup>113</sup> Not sufficiently impacted by his first vision to warrant real change Smith continued to lead an ordinary life. His second vision in 1823, however, would be different. Bushman states:

This time all the accounts agree on the burden of the [second] message. If Joseph initially understood the First Vision as his conversion, similar to thousands of other evangelical conversions, this vision wrenched Joseph out of any ordinary track.<sup>114</sup>

The vision Smith saw in the fall of 1823, at the age of 17, was of Moroni,<sup>115</sup> the last member of a tribe of Nephites who were destroyed in Ancient times in North America. According to Smith, Moroni buried in the Hill Cumorah gold plates on which Smith would find the history of ancient North American people and a fuller, eternal gospel by Christ, who had appeared to the tribe. Moroni appeared twice more to Smith that night, recounting the same message, with a few additions, and would appear again the next day to Smith’s father after Smith had fainted whilst working on the family farm. Father and son went to the hill, located in nearby Manchester, and attempted to recover the gold plates (which would have inscribed on them the account of the BoM), the breastplate (to secure the Urim and Thummim), and the Urim and Thummim (to decipher the plates). During the recovery Smith was tempted by greed (and the adversary, Satan) and was told not to return until he was 21 years old.<sup>116</sup>

For the next two years the family worked, attempting to secure a plot of land on which they would build a new house. Smith worked as a treasure seeker for Josiah Stowell Sr. for much of 1825, having worked with him in a similar capacity since 1822, when Smith had acquired magic seer stones.<sup>117</sup> Smith had been known in the area for his ability to spot treasure in the

---

<sup>110</sup> The classmate was Levi Spaulding, a relative of Solomon Spaulding. Behrens, *Dartmouth Arminianism*, 174

<sup>111</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 39

<sup>112</sup> ‘LDS Scriptures Online,’ Accessed 24 July 2009 [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:22

<sup>113</sup> Hansen rightly points out the degree to which Smith claims persecution by these ‘professors of religion’ have turned up little evidence, whereas his persecution after 1830 is well documented. Hansen, *Mormonism*, 23-24

<sup>114</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 44

<sup>115</sup> Although in 1838 Smith would recall the name of the angel as Nephi. Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 44

<sup>116</sup> Hansen notes that it is this emphasis on physical evidence which is not contrary to science of the day and hence impacts Mormon cosmology. Hansen, *Mormonism*, 42

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid*, 3



ground with the stones.<sup>118</sup> Stowell's farm was about 140 miles south-east of Smith's home in Palmyra. It was on one of these treasure seeking expeditions that Smith and Stowell stayed with the Hale family in Harmony. One daughter, Emma Hale, caught Smith's eye and would later become his wife.<sup>119</sup> Difficulties with the Smith family farm brought Joseph home in November and by December of 1825 financial difficulties had reached an unyielding point. The family debt forced the Smiths to sell their farm to a nearby neighbour, Lemuel Durfee, "a local Quaker landholder,"<sup>120</sup> who permitted the Smith family to stay on as tenants until 1829.

During most of 1826, Smith was in southern New York attending school and working for Stowell in Bainbridge and with Joseph Knight Sr. in Colesville.<sup>121</sup> Bushman states, "Joseph returned to Manchester in the fall of 1826 to comply with Moroni's instructions to report at Cumorah every year on September 22."<sup>122</sup> Smith promptly returned to the Knight home in Colesville in November and by January Smith had returned to Bainbridge where he would be visited by Emma Hale. Shortly thereafter the two eloped in Bainbridge and on January 18, 1827 Smith married Emma Hale (who would remain with him until his death). On September 22, 1827, Smith and his wife obtained the BoM golden plates. Faced with a growing distrust of their neighbours, Joseph and Emma moved to Harmony, Pennsylvania in December 1827, hiding the gold plates in a bean barrel for safe keeping. By 1828 Smith began translating the BoM with Martin Harris. Having frequently worked with the Harris family in Palmyra, Smith asked his mother to invite Martin Harris over as an aid. Harris would later receive his own vision and believed through discussions with the Smiths that the work he was being asked to help pay for was indeed the work of the Lord.

Finally, on April 5<sup>th</sup> 1829, Smith's cousin Oliver Cowdery, then aged twenty-three, appeared at the home of Smith's parents.<sup>123</sup> John L. Brooke states, "But as Mormon historians rarely note, this was not a chance relationship but an old connection ..."<sup>124</sup> Cowdery was almost immediately set to assist Smith with transcribing the plates. By June, 1829 the BoM was completed and it would be published in March of the following year. Brooke says of Smith during this time:

---

<sup>118</sup> *Ibid*, 3

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid*, 4-5

<sup>120</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 47

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid*, 52

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid*, 53

<sup>123</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner's Fire*, 133

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid*, 134 cf. Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 35

Announcing that his revelations restored the primitive apostolic church and opened the Kingdom of God on earth, Smith claimed to have brought forth not simply a new church but a new dispensation, fully equivalent to the dispensations of Moses and Christ ... He laid claim to the authority of Enoch and Elijah, the biblical prophets who were carried bodily into heaven by divine power.<sup>125</sup>

Smith and his new religion had come of age and begun the long journey toward recognition and establishment. From Smith's First Vision in 1820 until his publishing of the BoM and founding of the Church of Christ in 1830 there exist far more details about his life. However, for the sake of brevity this account of Smith will suffice in responding to the arguments set forth in Chapters Two and Three.

## 2.2 Oliver Cowdery

Little is known about Oliver Cowdery prior to his meeting Smith in April, 1829. Mormon Larry E. Morris offers in his article, *Oliver Cowdery's Vermont Years and the Origins of Mormonism* what is likely the fullest account available on Cowdery prior to 1829.

Cowdery was one of eight children born to William Cowdery and Rebecca Fuller on October 3, 1806 in Wells, Vermont.<sup>126</sup> Almost two decades earlier, in 1787, William and his wife Rebecca moved to Wells where Rebecca's sister and brother-in-law Rufus and Huldah Fuller Glass resided.<sup>127</sup> According to Morris, "the Cowdery Rufus Glass homes were just a mile apart, giving the eight children in each family a good chance to get well acquainted with their cousins."<sup>128</sup> Both William Cowdery and Rufus Glass owned land on which they probably raised cattle and sheep, planted hay and grain, and tapped maple trees for syrup.<sup>129</sup>

Early in 1809 the Cowdery family moved to Middletown, Vermont. On September 3, just a month prior to Cowdery's third birthday, his mother Rebecca died at the age of forty-three, believed by many to have been the result of tuberculosis.<sup>130</sup> Historians disagree as to what happened next. Morris notes one historian's view that Cowdery went to stay with his Aunt Huldah Fuller Glass from 1809 to 1813, as the most likely scenario. Morris cites an 1810

---

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid*, 3

<sup>126</sup> Larry E. Morris, 'Oliver Cowdery's Vermont Years and the Origins of Mormonism,' *BYU Studies* 39, no. 1(2000), 108

<sup>127</sup> *Ibid*, 107

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid*, 109

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid*, 109

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid*, 110

census record for William Cowdery that lists only one male child under the age of ten, although Cowdery and his older brother Lyman were both under ten.<sup>131</sup> The same census records for the Glass family indicate one male child under ten, when Glass had no boys under that age by 1810.

Six months after the death of his wife Rebecca, William Cowdery married Keziah Pearce Austin on March 18, 1810. Keziah was a widow from a respected family from Poultney, Vermont. In addition to one child from Keziah's previous marriage and William's eight (possibly minus Oliver), the two had another three daughters together. Later that year William and his new wife moved to western New York and, according to Morris, Oliver remained with his aunt.

In 1813, Oliver Cowdery, now aged seven, watched both his aunt Huldah and uncle Rufus succumb to typhoid fever (the same fever which incapacitated Joseph Smith) and die within two weeks of one another.<sup>132</sup> Morris suggests William Cowdery's return to Middletown, Vermont with his family in 1813 or 1814 was because of the deaths of his in-laws. Oliver would have seen much change from 1813-16 as his family returned with a step mother, and a step brother and with the birth of three half sisters. Also, in 1814 Cowdery's older brother Warren moved to Freedom, New York with his new wife Patience. The following year Cowdery's siblings Dyer, Erastus and Sally joined Warren and his wife in New York. In 1818, the remaining Cowdery family moved once more to Poultney, Vermont (a few miles west of Middletown) and the former residence of Oliver's step-mother.

Little else is known about Cowdery's activities prior to 1828. Morris offers a reconstruction of the events based in a summary of Cowdery's life written by his half sister Lucy Cowdery Young, she states:

Now in regard to Oliver he was born in the Town of Wells in the state of Vermont [...] when he was three years of age Father married my Mother she resided in the Town of Poultney so Oliver was brought up in Poultney Rutland County Vermont and when he arrived at the age of twenty he went to the State of New York where his older brothers were married and Settled and in about two years my father moved there.<sup>133</sup>

---

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid*, 110

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid*, 111

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid*, 107, citing Lucy Cowdery Young to Brigham H. Young, March 7, 1887, Archives Division, Historical Department, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City

Morris goes on to place Cowdery in school in Wells, Vermont in 1821 and 1822 near where the family resided (according to a local history of the town).<sup>134</sup> However, Morris is unclear with whom Cowdery resides during his schooling. Given the limited knowledge about Cowdery generally, it is difficult to determine his level of formal education. Morris states that “William Cowdery was a literate man who emphasized his children’s education. At least four of his six sons became either Doctors or Lawyers.”<sup>135</sup> According to Lucy in 1825 (although even her account is disputed) Cowdery left for Western New York. It seems nothing else is known until April 1829 when, according to Mormon accounts, Cowdery first meets Smith and begins his work as a scribe on the BoM.

The Encyclopedia of Mormonism notes that Cowdery learned about Smith’s convictions of the ancient record whilst boarding with Smith’s parents in 1829. Cowdery began working as a scribe for Smith on April 7, 1829 and continued until June when they finished the translation.<sup>136</sup> Cowdery continued to assist Smith and between June of 1829 and June of 1830 (when both men began the BMo) Cowdery supervised the printing of the BoM, gave speeches on Mormonism, received revelation, helped restore the first priesthood (Doctrine & Covenants [D&C] 27:8), assisted Smith with the founding of the Church and a myriad of other duties.<sup>137</sup> Cowdery was in many ways second only to Smith in his importance in the early church.

### 2.3 Sidney Rigdon

According to famed Rigdon biographer and Mormon, Richard S. Van Wagoner, Sidney S. Rigdon was born February 19, 1793, near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on a farm in a small town called St. Clair Township. One of four children, Sidney grew up in a labour intensive environment. Rigdon’s parents, William Rigdon and Nancy Bryant Rigdon had arrived in the newly settled and still relatively dangerous area a few years earlier.<sup>138</sup> Van Wagoner says that William, “viewed idleness as wicked. Book learning, aside from common school

---

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid*, 112

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid*, 111

<sup>136</sup> Richard Lloyd Anderson, ‘Oliver Cowdery,’ in Daniel H. Ludlow (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Scripture, Doctrine, and Procedure of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Vol.1 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), 335

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid*, 337-38

<sup>138</sup> Richard S. Van Wagoner, *Sidney Rigdon: A Portrait of Religious Excess* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1994), 4

education obtained at the nearby log school during the winter, was deemed unacceptable.”<sup>139</sup> However, he notes that “Rigdon seemed propelled from an early age to avoid the sweat, dirt, and menial labor of the farmstead.”<sup>140</sup> Rigdon believed differently and it was said of him that “he began borrowing books from whomever would lend them”<sup>141</sup> to quench his “insatiable thirst for reading”<sup>142</sup> which was only compounded by the fact that he “enjoyed an impressive memory and could recall ‘everything that he read.’”<sup>143</sup> Although little is known about Rigdon’s early life prior to 1817, it is clear that he was an avid reader from a young age and that he had a great deal of interest in books.

Van Wagoner says, “by this time, [circa 1817] and possibly much earlier, Sidney had recognized religion as a way out of the dreary, moribund life of farming.”<sup>144</sup> Baptized on May 31, 1817, at age twenty-four, into Peters Creek Baptist Church; many of the Church leaders doubted the sincerity of Rigdon’s claims to have had a direct inspiration. Rigdon stated of his conversion years later, “when I joined the church I knew I could not be admitted without an experience: so I made up one to suit the purpose, but it was all made up, and was of no use.”<sup>145</sup> Rigdon’s conversion begs the question, what type of character did he have? According to Van Wagoner, “while Rigdon had a humble, compassionate side, he was also opportunistic and mean-spirited as he single-mindedly sought the esteem he craved.”<sup>146</sup>

The Rigdon family connections to the Baptist Church were so strong that three of Rigdon’s cousins (and later Campbellite converts with Rigdon) were Baptist Pastors. As a result of these strong ties to the Baptist church, Rigdon received a theological apprenticeship, likely set up by one of his cousins. Rigdon resided with the Rev. Andrew Clark, as no actual seminaries existed at the time in Pennsylvania.<sup>147</sup> Rigdon would later say of his experience with Clark that it was, “a perfect paradise of books and intellectual companionship.”<sup>148</sup> On August 4, 1819 Rigdon’s apprenticeship ended and shortly thereafter he left for the Western Reserve in Ohio where he remained until 1822.

---

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid*, 4-5

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid*, viii

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid*, 5

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid*, 5

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid*, 5, 12, citing an article by Karl Keller which in turn cites the writings of Rigdon’s son John Wickliffe Rigdon (from pre-1900), who wrote a yet unpublished book about his father which is currently in the LDS churches archives.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid*, 8

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid*, 8 cf. J.H. Kennedy, *Early Days of Mormonism* (London: Reeves and Turner, 1888), 64

<sup>146</sup> *Ibid*, 8

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid*, 9

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid*, 10

The next decade of Rigdon's life was heavily shaped by his relationship with Alexander Campbell.<sup>149</sup> Campbell and his father Thomas were Scottish immigrants who had come to America years earlier and founded the Disciples of Christ or Campbellites.<sup>150</sup> Campbell and his follower's emphasized a reformed church through baptism by immersion, a restoration of the ancient order of things and "a radical commitment to the New Testament doctrines and practices."<sup>151</sup> This restorationist view (often referred to as Christian Primitivism) was held by Mormons and Campbellites as "both groups believed in an apostasy from Christianity"<sup>152</sup> but Mormons differed by investing in Smith a divine authority.<sup>153</sup> According to Hansen:

Unlike Campbell and most other "primitivists," however, Smith did not stop at that point, but in a new scripture called the Book of Moses he insisted on going back even further in time, to a simple and Edenic past that had its beginnings with Adam and that had seen realization even after the Fall of the holy city of Enoch, which, because of its perfection, had been removed from this earth to God's glory.<sup>154</sup>

Rigdon once heard Campbell speak and journeyed to meet him in the summer of 1821. By 1822 Rigdon returned to Pittsburgh to become the pastor of the First Baptist Church.<sup>155</sup> In 1824, Rigdon's forced resignation resulted in his spending the next two years working as a tanner. During those years Rigdon still preached and travelled extensively and in 1826 became pastor of a Baptist Church in Mentor, Ohio.<sup>156</sup>

In 1830, Joseph Smith sent Parley P. Pratt and a few other Mormon missionaries to Ohio with a copy of the newly published Book of Mormon (BoM). Pratt, a former disciple of Rigdon's, returned to his old parish with the BoM and offered Rigdon a copy. After two weeks alone with the BoM Rigdon was converted and in October 1830 he moved, along with many members of his congregation, to Fayette, New York where Joseph Smith resided. Upon Rigdon's arrival in Fayette and meeting with Smith, Rigdon was immediately baptised. His meteoric rise in early Mormonism resulted in his being a consultant to Smith, a scribe, president, and a Church elder (among other things). Van Wagoner states:

---

<sup>149</sup> Campbell denounced Mormonism and dismissed Rigdon for converting. The result is that Campbell's impact on Rigdon's life is not acknowledged by Rigdon. *Ibid*, 30

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid*, 26

<sup>151</sup> Richard L. Bushman, *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 180

<sup>152</sup> In fact, these strong similarities may explain why years later Rigdon and his followers had such a rapid conversion to Mormonism. *Ibid*, 182

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid*, 180

<sup>154</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 27

<sup>155</sup> Van Wagoner, *Sidney Rigdon*, 27

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid*, 29

The window of opportunity, during which Rigdon achieved co-equal billing with Joseph Smith, lasted from 1831-39. During this era he and the prophet, both gifted visionaries, jointly developed the church's infrastructure and its governing agenda.<sup>157</sup>

So impressive was Rigdon's impact on Smith that he suggested and had approved an idea to publish Church doctrine over and against the objections of fellow Mormons who were concerned that the content of the doctrine would insult local non-Mormon residents and isolate the newly relocated Mormons.<sup>158</sup> In addition, Rigdon encouraged Smith to educate his young church members and formed the School of the Elders (sometimes called the School of the Prophets) in which Rigdon was made principal instructor. Rigdon taught reading and writing, English grammar, advanced studies in theology, Church history, and ancient languages.

From his conversion in 1830, until his death in 1876 at the age of 83, Rigdon was a Mormon. And after the death of Smith and his brother Hyrum in 1844, Rigdon and Brigham Young vied for the position of Smith's successor. Young won the debate and Rigdon left the Church shortly thereafter with a group of his own followers to create a faction of Mormonism, which he headed for his remaining years.

One cannot deny the importance of Rigdon to the development of Mormonism generally, and of the extract of the prophecy of Enoch (EPE) specifically. Although more is known about Rigdon than Cowdery, Rigdon remains the more enigmatic person of the two. An avid reader with access to books and tracts, a religious seeker with often questionable character, an educated man, and an articulate and charismatic speaker, Rigdon was a force. Yet Nibley does not consider Rigdon's role in the development of the EPE or as someone who may have influenced Smith's ideas about Enoch. For obvious reasons, Nibley believes that Smith is solely responsible for the EPE and had not considered the alternative that a role player like Rigdon may have participated in the process of influence and possibly revelation. David Whitmer a contemporary of Smiths and one of the Three Witnesses to the BoM wrote of Rigdon:

Rigdon was a thorough Bible scholar, a man of fine education, and a powerful orator. He soon worked himself deep into Brother Joseph's affections, and had more influence over him than any other man living. He was Brother Joseph's private counsellor, and his most intimate

---

<sup>157</sup> *Ibid*, 160

<sup>158</sup> *Ibid*, 160

friend and brother for some time after they met. Brother Joseph rejoiced[,] believing that the Lord had sent to him this great and mighty man S[i]dney Rigdon, to help him in the work.<sup>159</sup>

Van Wagoner further states:

That Rigdon could have been merely ‘Sidney the Scribe,’ a penman whose sole function was to take down dictation, is implausible ... any [one] ... could have served as clerk, but only Rigdon could have functioned as a scribe in the historical Jewish sense of the word: ‘a man of learning; one who read and explained the law to the people.’<sup>160</sup>

Finally, it is important to note that unlike the Spaulding-Rigdon debate –which aims to place Solomon Spaulding’s *Manuscript Found* into the hands of Rigdon, who in turn supplies Smith with a copy which he uses to produce the BoM –the current discussion does not require proof of Rigdon having known Smith prior to writing the extract of the prophecy of Enoch (EPE) as is the case with the Spaulding-Rigdon theory and the BoM. Rigdon was a scribe during the writing of the EPE; therefore, any argument for (or against) Rigdon influencing Smith during the writing of the Book of Moses (BMo) need not first prove that both men knew one another. Given Rigdon’s penchant for all things ancient, his access to books, indeed his religious knowledge, it is no wonder that the EPE is, as Nibley suggests, uniquely positioned to attest to the bona fides of the prophet.

#### 2.4 *The Book of Moses Examined*

Independent historian and research consultant to the Mormons, H. Michael Marquardt states:

In October 1829 Oliver Cowdery purchased a large leather bound edition of the King James Version of the Bible (KJV) at Egbert [often Ebert] B. Grandin’s Bookstore in Palmyra, New York. At the time Smith was residing in Pennsylvania ... This printing included the Apocrypha. This KJV 1828 Bible became the textual basis for the revision. Inscribed on the fly leaf is the following: The Book of the Jews And the property of Joseph Smith Junior and Oliver Cowdery Bought October the 8<sup>th</sup> 1829 at Egbert B Grandin's Book Store Palmyra Wayne County New York.<sup>161</sup>

<sup>159</sup> *Ibid*, 73 citing David Whitmer, *An Address to All Believers in Christ* (Richmond, MO: David Whitmer, 1887), 35

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid*, 73 citing *Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary of English Language* (New York City: Prentice Hall Press, 1979), 1,630

<sup>161</sup> Marquardt, *The Rise of Mormonism*, 326



From this book, Smith produces, with Oliver Cowdery, Emma Smith, Martin Harris and Sidney Rigdon, the Joseph Smith Translation of the Bible (JST). Modern Mormon scripture is made up of three holy books; the BoM, composed from the ancient golden plates found by Smith in the ground and mostly transcribed by Cowdery; the Doctrine and Covenant (D&C), a collection of declarations and divine revelation contemporary with Smith's own time, and the Pearl of Great Price (PGP), a selection of materials revised as needed by the church and related to faith and doctrine. Each of these three works, the BoM, D&C and the PGP is a continued revelation meant to complete the message from the Bible (not the JST Bible).

The BMo, one of the books that make up the PGP, is believed to have been a revision of the Old Testament (OT), the result of a revelation given to Smith beginning in June of 1830 and ending March 7, 1831.<sup>162</sup> This revelation occurs just two months after the founding of Smith's Church of Christ (April 6, 1830) and the publication of his BoM (March 1830). The entire process produced 466 large manuscript type pages and employed four scribes in the first eight months. We know from marginalia the dates and specific passages of each scribe. Oliver Cowdery begins with Moses 1:1 to 5:43 (June through October 1830). John Whitmer takes over the duties of scribe continuing through to Moses 6:18 (October 21, through November 30, 1830)<sup>163</sup> when Emma Smith begins penning Moses 6:19-52 (sometime between November and December). Whitmer resumes his duties after returning from a personal matter and completes 6:53-7:1 (in early December 1830). In late October 1830, Rigdon travelled from Kirtland, Ohio and upon his arrival in Fayette, New York (where Smith was) Rigdon was baptised "by revelation, [and] took over the scribal duties"<sup>164</sup> of the BMo beginning in December 1830. The work was completed by Smith and Rigdon in February 1831, after Smith received revelation in December of 1830 to move the church to Kirtland, Ohio, which they did in January of 1831. The BMo was completed in February of 1831, but was not published until the following year. All told the EPE was transcribed within five months from October of 1830 through February of 1831.<sup>165</sup>

Mormon scholar Kent P. Jackson says the writings were inked on paper roughly sixteen by thirteen inches in dimension that were folded and stitched in the middle to form booklets

---

<sup>162</sup> Officially this end date (March 7<sup>th</sup> 1831) marks the point at which Smith is commanded to begin working on a new revelation for the New Testament. Richard D. Draper, et al, *The Pearl of Great Price: A Verse By Verse Commentary* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 2005), 12-17

<sup>163</sup> D&C, 47:1

<sup>164</sup> Draper, *The Pearl of Great Price*, 13; D&C, 35:20

<sup>165</sup> According to Hansen the 'major portion of the BoM was completed in 90 days, after Cowdery began as scribe, which raises questions about why the BMo took so much longer to produce. Hansen, *Mormonism*, 16

roughly eight inches wide by thirteen inches tall. Old Testament Manuscript 1 (OT1) is the original dictated text and according to Jackson, “in general, Joseph Smith’s scribes wrote without using punctuation, which sometimes makes it difficult to interpret the intended meaning of his words.”<sup>166</sup> He further notes that although other works are “punctuated heavily by later hands,” OT1 is not one of these. Difficulties arise when Smith commands John Whitmer to transcribe a duplicate copy of OT1 which he completes by April 5, 1831. This second manuscript, Old Testament Manuscript 2 (OT2), becomes the copy on which Smith continues his revelations, yet in the summer of 1831 Oliver Cowdery would receive further dictation and revisions from Smith that he records on OT1 (which had not been updated by the further revelations of OT2). The eventual existence of the PGP and in turn the BMo (a variation of OT1, OT2, and additional revisions including an OT3 revised by Rigdon)<sup>167</sup> is the result of one man, according to Jackson, Elder Franklin D. Richards, who whilst serving a mission in England compiled a pamphlet of choice selections of Smith’s revelations, narrations and translations.<sup>168</sup> However, James R. Harris argues in his, *Changes in the Book of Moses and Their Implications upon a Concept of Revelation*, that the most complete versions are not often the earliest and the effort to correct translations from apostates is an attempt to return to the truly ancient and accurate prophetic message.<sup>169</sup> Hence, inspired revision or restoration is acceptable, making it difficult to discern when revision and restoration is inspired and which manuscripts are used to produce the BMo as it is now known. Bushman notes, that in 1831 Smith was instructed to shift his focus, from the Old to the New Testament, “aided by Sidney Rigdon.”<sup>170</sup> However, this shift away from the BMo was not the end of Enoch’s role in Mormonism (this will be addressed in Chapter Four).

### 3. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter was threefold: first, to provide a background to the key texts involved in the transmission of the Enochic tradition including 1En, 2En, 3En; second, to engage with role players in the EPE, primarily Smith, Cowdery and Rigdon and provide insights into their character types, education and intelligence; and third, to offer material evidence of works on

---

<sup>166</sup> Jackson, *The Book of Moses*, 6

<sup>167</sup> James R. Harris, “Changes in the Book of Moses and Their Implications upon a Concept of Revelation,” in *BYU Studies* 8, no. 4, (1968), 8

<sup>168</sup> Jackson, *The Book of Moses*, 1-2

<sup>169</sup> Harris, *Changes in the Book of Moses*, 8

<sup>170</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 142

Enoch which were in circulation prior to Smith's writing of the EPE and which represent a larger engagement with Enoch than has been previously suggested by Nibley. Although less evident, this chapter has also set about establishing responses which link directly with Nibley's argument as we will see in Chapter Two.

It is worth reiterating that although the works of Hessayon and Schmidt have greatly contributed to our knowledge of Enochic tradition, they too fail to grasp the extent to which possible texts, manuscripts, or pamphlets on Enoch were available in Britain, Europe and early America. Also, the extensive writings on Joseph Smith fail to yield the type of relatively definitive answers one might expect from an historical account of such a well known and documented figure as considerations to religious matters and often anti-religious matters tend to affect the historical picture. Ultimately, in responding to Nibley much of the historical picture will become clearer.

## CHAPTER TWO

### ACCESS TO MATERIALS

*Because I accept the unlikely appearance of otherworldly beings to an American farm boy, I cannot deny the earthly possibility that young Joseph Smith had knowledge of published works. In my view, the available evidence moves such access beyond probability –to fact. –Quinn<sup>171</sup>*

As discussed in the introduction, Nibley’s argument for Joseph Smith’s divine status rests on Smith’s extract of the prophecy of Enoch (EPE) in the Mormon Book of Moses (BMo). Nibley argues that while Smith’s EPE has many parallels with the Book of Enoch (BE), Smith would have had no access to these writings (Laurence’s 1En in particular), thus divine inspiration occurred. Here we will discuss that in fact Smith and his companions would have had access not only to Laurence’s 1En, but many of the other writings which Enochic material influenced.

Nibley’s seven point argument is quoted extensively throughout this chapter so as to avoid any distortion, and with the help of D. Michael Quinn, this chapter aims to move this discussion of access to materials, “beyond probability –to fact.” This chapter will proceed in three sections; first, “Nibley’s Approach” will consider his methodology and techniques applicable to his argument against access, second, “Nibley’s Argument Regarding Access” will show that Smith or his companions, through direct or indirect means, had motive and/or cause to access materials related to Enoch which did in turn influence the writings of the prophecy of Enoch in the BMo and, third “Quinn Responds” will consider Quinn’s contributions and argument, even though his work will also be used extensively throughout as a counter point to Nibley. It should be noted that in this chapter, responses to Nibley’s

---

<sup>171</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 193

argument often focus on Laurence's 1En. This is due to Nibley's own focus on 1En. However, one should be mindful of the other materials related to and influenced by the BE (i.e., *the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *the Book of Giants*, *the Book of Jubilees*, et al), discussed in Chapter One, which may have been available to Smith.

### 1. Nibley's Approach to Access

Hugh Nibley, like many Mormons, believes that Joseph Smith's "access" to BE materials is the result of revelation. According to Mormon scripture Moses edited a book of remembrance, which was written by Adam, added to by Enoch and later translated by Smith.<sup>172</sup> In this account, Smith had no copy of the book of remembrance as it no longer existed in a physical form at the time of his revelation.<sup>173</sup> Mormons further believe that Smith's translation from the book of remembrance is an extract of a fuller prophecy of Enoch. The remaining portions of Enoch's prophecy "are to be testified of in due time."<sup>174</sup> Nibley argues that most critics of Smith miss the point. He states:

Almost all of the time and energy of critics has been expended in vain attempts to show that Joseph Smith did not translate correctly from certain manuscripts, or that such manuscripts did not exist. This has been a red herring, since nobody has been able to prove yet that Joseph Smith claimed to be translating from any specific known text.<sup>175</sup>

Here, Nibley is framing the foundation of his argument that Smith is translating his EPE from Enochic writings that are known to and possessed by no one other than Smith himself. Further, Nibley offers no names or references for the "critics" mentioned nor would he need to as he is simply setting up a case against "writing materials used," "language in which it was written," and "method of translation."<sup>176</sup> His aim is to force the conclusion that the only way to verify the authenticity of Smith's writings is to compare them to other ancient "authentic" accounts.<sup>177</sup> Unfortunately, Nibley does not define what it means to be an ancient authentic account. He merely assumes that Smith's EPE is an ancient authentic account that

---

<sup>172</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 91-92 cf. BMo 6:45-46

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 92

<sup>174</sup> Lewis R. Church notes in the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* that the BE is not the fulfillment of this testimony. Lewis R. Church, 'Book of Enoch,' in Ludlow, (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 460 cf. D&C, 107:57

<sup>175</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 92

<sup>176</sup> *Ibid.*, 93

<sup>177</sup> *Ibid.*, 93-94

when compared with other such accounts, will simultaneously validate Smith's EPE and the other ancient works.

## 2. Nibley's Argument Regarding Access

Nibley begins his argument by providing a history of the BE that is jumbled, reliant upon Schmidt (the only account tracing the history of Enochic materials available to Nibley), and that incorporates aspects of all three accounts (1En, 2En, and 3En). Nibley further emphasises parallels between the EPE and ancient texts and offers a seven point argument against Smith knowing about Laurence's translation. The following is a summary of Nibley's seven point argument.

*A Busy Year.* In 1830 Smith was too busy to have read Laurence's translation. Having founded the Church, published the BoM, managed missionaries and received further revelation, the "twenty-four-year-old farmer in upstate New York" could not have possibly read a 216 page translation with footnotes. Additionally, any access to 1En would have "left its mark on any work derived from it."<sup>178</sup>

*The Learned and Disinterested.* "Nobody in the learned world paid much attention to Laurence's Enoch"<sup>179</sup> and as such a general ignorance about this translation was pervasive. The implication being that if the learned were disinterested, Smith had no chance of knowing about the BE.

*The Disdainful Church.* "The Christian Ministry of all denominations neither liked Laurence's Enoch nor wanted it."<sup>180</sup> Nibley goes on to provide a detailed analysis of how this dislike of all things Enoch by Christians has occurred since the beginning of the Christian era.

*American Libraries and Freethinkers.* Furthermore, Enoch was not even used by those "freethinkers [who] might have exploited the so-called absurdities of Enoch against the Christians."<sup>181</sup> Hence, even the mystics, Gnostics, Masons and Rosicrucians could not,

---

<sup>178</sup> *Ibid*, 106

<sup>179</sup> *Ibid*, 106

<sup>180</sup> *Ibid*, 107

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid*, 109

according to Nibley, bring themselves to include Enoch in “their list of inspired prophets” or use the Enochic corpus in their own traditions.

*A Later Appearance.* Laurence’s translation of the Ethiopic Enoch was *rare* in America and Americans are generally unaware of its existence prior to 1840, when American Moses Stuart produces a study of the translation. According to Nibley “The thing was virtually unobtainable in this country. And why not? Its only appeal was as a religious book, but the religious were all against it.”<sup>182</sup>

*Stressing the Point.* Given that Laurence’s work was the only ancient translation of Enoch available at the time of Smith’s writing, and that both the BE and EPE have significant parallels, Nibley believes this to be proof of Smith’s revelation being divinely inspired. Nibley also suggests that further parallels, unidentified in Laurence’s 1821 edition, but included in Smith’s writings and known to Enoch scholars during the time of Nibley’s writing (in the 1970s) is further proof that divine revelation is evident.

*Important No More.* Finally, Nibley claims that the prophecy of Enoch as it is known to Mormons “most nearly corresponds to what modern scholars view as the authentic original material of Enoch’s book.”<sup>183</sup> Nibley is suggesting that Smith replicates a core story from the Enoch corpus that was known only to the rest of Enoch scholarship a century after Smith died.

The following is a recounting of and response to each of Nibley’s seven points against Smith having known about or being influenced by Laurence’s 1En.

### 2.1 Too Busy to Read

To ensure accuracy Nibley is quoted in full, so as to address each of his points properly. He states:

1830 was a busy year for the Prophet Joseph; it saw the founding of the Church, the publication of the Book of Mormon, the sending of missionaries, much coming and going under persecution and pressure. It was also a banner year for revelation, including a sizable part of the Book of Commandments and the book of Moses. But for study? for research? for

---

<sup>182</sup> *Ibid*, 110

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid*, 113

carefully digesting and critically exploiting a document like Laurence's Enoch, 214 pages long with a forty-eight-page introduction and footnotes? Any dealing with such a text would have left its mark on any work derived from it. All that work by a twenty-four-year-old farmer in upstate New York who had just produced a Book of Mormon without any footnotes at all? Hardly! Laurence's 1821 text only got into the hands of a few scholars in Europe and England, and they gave it scant notice; what would be the likelihood of a copy reaching Joseph Smith? By what grapevine? Who would transmit it and why?<sup>184</sup>

Nibley's point assumes the following four critical concerns, 2.1.1) that Smith was entirely too busy in 1830 to have allotted time to the study of one book, 2.1.2) that such a work would have left an undeniable footprint on Smith's own work (addressed in Chapter Three), 2.1.3) that a farmer like Smith was incapable of such work (already addressed in Chapter One) and, 2.1.4) that only a few elite people accessed the BE in Europe and England and as such, a farmer in upstate New York would not have had access to the circulation of this type of book.

### 2.1.1 One Year, One Book

Nibley here assumes that Smith could only have read Richard Laurence's 1821 printing of 1En in 1830. Nibley does not consider that Laurence's 1En was published nine years earlier, giving Smith a further nine years in which to have read the book prior to writing his EPE in 1830. Also, Nibley fails to consider that Smith's companions (rather than only Smith) might have read the BE and that there were other accounts of the BE available to read, not just Laurence's 1En. This last point begs the question, what is the nature of Smith's revelation? What role do scribes play in that revelation? And can revelation be influenced by Smith's (or his companions) own experiences?

For the purposes of this thesis one must assume that prior personal knowledge does inform prophecy (or the argument would end). As to whether the scribes play a part in revelation, Mormon scholar Terryl L. Givens in his work, *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* states, "though Joseph Smith was the only person authorized 'to receive revelations and commandments [for] this church' (D&C 28:2), he was not a systematic thinker or writer"<sup>185</sup> and hence:

---

<sup>184</sup> *Ibid*, 106

<sup>185</sup> Terryl L. Givens, *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 87



The church having its own press and cadre of educated, articulate leaders, individuals soon emerged who assumed the task of ordering and packaging Joseph's teachings and revelations into something approaching a theology or doctrinal system.<sup>186</sup>

Although Givens is suggesting Smith's revelations were handled by others he avoids altogether the extent of that handling. But Givens claim is insufficient in answering the question of whether the scribes engage in revelation. Factually, we know of one such scribe who does, Oliver Cowdery. The Doctrine and Covenants (D&C) states:

**6:20** Behold, thou art Oliver and I have spoken unto thee ... **25** And, behold, I grant unto you a gift, if you desire of me, to translate, even as my servant Joseph ... **27** And now I command you ... assist in bringing to light, with your gift, those parts of my scriptures which have been hidden because of iniquity.<sup>187</sup>

Although this is a reference to Cowdery translating the BoM specifically, it could be argued that his ability to receive revelation could have been applied elsewhere. The D&C states:

**8:1** Oliver Cowdery, verily, verily, I say unto you, that assuredly as the Lord liveth ... even so surely shall you receive a knowledge of whatsoever things you shall ask in faith, with an honest heart, believing that you shall receive a knowledge concerning the engravings of old records, which are ancient, which contain parts of my scripture which has been spoken by the manifestation of my Spirit.<sup>188</sup>

Given that Cowdery both receives revelations and assists in transcribing the BMo, it is conceivable that he also contributes to it. To what end must a scribe receive revelation, if not to assist in the revelation itself? The D&C says often that 'revelation [is] given through Joseph Smith the Prophet to' whomever,<sup>189</sup> and yet when speaking of Smith and Rigdon, this phrase reads "revelation given to Joseph Smith the Prophet *and* Sidney Rigdon"<sup>190</sup> (emphasis mine). And D&C 37:1 states of Smith and Rigdon, "BEHOLD, I say unto you that it is not expedient in me that ye should translate any more until ye shall go to the Ohio ..." As 'ye' indicates plurality, if Smith does not act alone in transcribing or receiving revelation then Nibley's claim that Smith was too busy in 1830 must also apply to Rigdon, Cowdery and any

---

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, 87

<sup>187</sup> D&C, 6:20, 25, 27

<sup>188</sup> D&C, 8:1

<sup>189</sup> D&C, to Parley P. Pratt, 32; to Extra Thayre and Northrop Sweet, 33; to Orson Pratt, 34; to Edward Partridge, 36; to James Covill, 39;

<sup>190</sup> D&C, 35; 37; 40

other scribe involved in revelation, as well as accounting for each person over the course of nine years.

Finally, Nibley's first point fails to consider that Smith was an avid reader and that the simple task of reading a singular book is not impossible.

### 2.1.2 Evidence of Influence

Nibley asserts that Laurence's translation would have left an undeniable footprint on Smith's work. This will be fully considered in Chapter Three.

### 2.1.3 An Incapable Farmer?

As discussed in Chapter One a depiction of Smith as an intelligent person is more accurate than a view of him as somehow other than that. Nibley strongly argues that although Smith was able to publish his five-hundred page BoM, establish and found the Church of Christ, he lacked the time, " ... for study? for research? for carefully digesting and critically exploiting a document like Laurence's Enoch, 214 pages long with a forty-eight-page introduction and footnotes?"<sup>191</sup> Quinn states quite emphatically:

Beyond the Bible [which Lucy Mack Smith claims Smith never read], there is compelling evidence that Joseph Smith's mother was not accurate in describing his youthful indifference to books ... he later quoted from, referred to, and owned numerous books which were advertised in his neighborhood as a young man.<sup>192</sup>

The 'evidence' in favour of an unintelligent, unread Smith is not credible. It is clear that Smith *did* read, and *was* capable of processing information from a book regardless of any view which might suggest otherwise. Furthermore, Hansen notes that Smith's mother was impressed with Smith's vivid imagination and ability to provide "the most amusing recitals that could be imagined. He would describe the ancient inhabitants of this continent, their dress, mode of traveling, their buildings, with every particular; their mode of warfare; and also their religious worship. This he would do with as much ease, seemingly, as if he had

---

<sup>191</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 106

<sup>192</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 192

spent his whole life among them.”<sup>193</sup> An incredible account, it would seem that beyond study Smith was capable of not only processing information, but imagining it also. Hansen states, “In the opinion of some non-Mormon scholars, in fact, his religious imagination may well have lifted him into the realm of genius.”<sup>194</sup> Smith’s imagination, his ability to tell vivid stories and process information makes the idea of an ignorant farm boy difficult to accept. Hence, as was noted earlier, “in order to strengthen the argument for divine inspiration, Smith and his early followers emphasized the notion that he was an unlearned lad who could not possibly have written the book on his own.”<sup>195</sup> Ironically, this idea has strong parallels with Enoch’s character in the BMo as Enoch says of himself, “I have found favor in thy sight, and am but a lad, and all the people hate me; for I am slow of speech; wherefore am I thy servant?”<sup>196</sup> In this way, Smith perpetuates a persona that not only strengthens the argument for divine inspiration, provides critics with a basis to argue Smith’s character flaws, but also offers insight into Smith’s view of Enoch (discussed more in Chapter Four).

#### 2.1.4 Access to Books

In addition to stating that Smith was too busy and assuming that he worked alone, Nibley adds, “all that work by a twenty-four-year-old farmer in upstate New York ... Hardly!”<sup>197</sup> The implications are three-fold (if one includes the matter of his intelligence); first, that an American farm boy could not have read a book or accessed one; and second, that upstate New York was somehow devoid of literature. Both are entirely misleading. Nibley’s assessment of Smith’s condition may have been correct had Smith lived prior to 1776. But according to David Jaffee although rural households of mid eighteenth century America had limited access to resources, including books:

... in the decades after the war for independence [there emerged] a newly decentralized system of production [making] peddlers ... uniquely equipped by their geographical mobility

---

<sup>193</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 14 citing Lucy Mack Smith, *Biographical Sketches of Joseph Smith the Prophet and His Progenitors for Many Generations* (Liverpool, 1853), 87

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid*, 15

<sup>195</sup> *Ibid*, 10

<sup>196</sup> BMo 6:31

<sup>197</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 106

to link manufacturers who had goods to sell with consumers who had farm surpluses to exchange.<sup>198</sup>

Jaffe argues that the result of this new mobility of goods and greater access by rural citizens is a dual transformation of commerce and culture. These peddlers were often fondly referred to, amongst neighbouring farmers, as ‘Yankee Peddlers.’ And although a local exchange of goods and a continued consumption of one’s own resources occur, “the colonial peddler entered into this complex network of exchange by extending the range of the distribution system.”<sup>199</sup> Quinn notes that one peddler between 1809-1810 “sold \$24,000 worth of books”<sup>200</sup> which Quinn estimates, given the cost of ranging from mere pennies for a book with pages in the hundreds, to upwards of 75 cents for “fine editions,” that this peddler sold about 25,000 books to farmers in a single year. This is only *one peddler* and only *one year*, and is suggested by Quinn to not have been a stellar year of sales. The extensive exchange of books during this period is beyond conception to most modern minds. These peddlers, numbering in the thousands,<sup>201</sup> enabled the greater region of New England (primarily) to participate in a system of trade between big cities and rural areas that sold tens, if not hundreds of thousands of books annually. Hansen also notes that, as a result of the shifting economy of agriculture, a transportation revolution was born, which resulted in “an increase in physical mobility, providing many Americans, like the Smiths, both with the encouragement and the means for pulling up stakes for greener pastures ...”<sup>202</sup> It is the combination of mobility, peddlers and access that enabled this book culture to flourish.

James Raven in his work the *Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade* adds to Jaffee’s assessment of peddling and a larger book trade:

One of the most under-studied aspects of the development of leading bookselling firms in the eighteenth century is their courting of colonial customers, often with the greatest difficulty. Eagerly requested new publications and second-hand, often antiquarian books, together with the unsaleable remnants of booksellers’ stock, were all sent down in crates to the holds of London ships ... [to be sent to] American colonies stretching from New England to the West Indies [which] provided an even richer market for English exporters. From 1700 to 1780, 45

---

<sup>198</sup> David Jaffee, ‘Peddlers of Progress and the Transformation of the Rural North, 1760-1860’, in *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Sep., 1991), 512

<sup>199</sup> *Ibid*, 514

<sup>200</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 21, citing James S. Purcell, “A Book Pedlar’s Progress in North Carolina,” *North Carolina Historical Review* 29 (Jan 1952), 15

<sup>201</sup> *Ibid*, 21 citing J.R. Dolan, *The Yankee Peddlers of Early America* (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, 1964), 81

<sup>202</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 46

per cent of all English book exports by volume departed for the British Colonies in North America, including the West Indies.<sup>203</sup>

The result is a large number of books, ‘often antiquarian,’ present in the colonies prior to 1776. This coupled with an increased barter system and an emerging peddling society meant that not only were books present but available for exchange. That somehow upstate New York and rural farmers were exempt from access to this influx of books is not the case. Raven continues, “Between the mid-seventeenth and the early nineteenth century, most books in British America were published in and purchased and shipped from London,”<sup>204</sup> and that, “many colonial customers had no choice but to import their books; some also enjoyed the social distinction achieved by ready access to new and antiquarian books from London.”<sup>205</sup>

In addition, the colonies had begun to increase their own production of books. Prior to 1750 the colonies had no publishing houses to speak of. By 1800, however, imprints found in more than 300 editions of the *English Short Title Catalogue* (from 1473-1800) show that the top ten cities for book production include London in first, Boston and Philadelphia in fourth and fifth respectively, ahead of Oxford in sixth, New York in eighth and Cambridge in ninth.<sup>206</sup> This statistic is astonishing. Inside of 50 years, just prior to 1800, three American cities had begun to publish on a scale rivalling Oxford and Cambridge, both of which had been publishing since the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries respectively. The immense growth of publishing in America and the huge influx of materials from Britain, among other countries, led to an explosion in access to books and literature, and an expansive outcropping of library systems prior to and during Smith’s lifetime (an argument I will return to in response to Nibley’s fourth point). Quinn states:

On the basis of published book catalogs printed in America from 1693 to 1800, Robert B. Winans noted that it is a misconception ‘to judge what Americans read largely by what American printers printed, whereas the majority of books read in America were printed in and imported from England or Europe.’<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> James Raven, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1450-1850* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), 144

<sup>204</sup> *Ibid*, 144

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid*, 145

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid*, 150-51

<sup>207</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 17 citing Robert B. Winans, *A Descriptive Checklist of Book Catalogues Separately Printed in America, 1693-1800* (Worcester, MA: American Antiquarian Society, 1981), viii

And of these a large majority represented English and European books from as early as the 15<sup>th</sup>, 16<sup>th</sup>, and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>208</sup> As noted in Chapter One, Enochic materials were circulating precisely in these centuries and in Britain and Europe. The fact that millions of books were in circulation prior to and during Smith's early and adult life, leaves little doubt that books were accessible.

## 2.2 *The Learned and Disinterested*

In his second point Nibley highlights the relevance of Enoch to Smith's contemporaries. Nibley states:

Nobody in the learned world paid much attention to Laurence's Enoch. As we have seen, after its publication the 'zeal for the cause of this long sought relic of antiquity appears to have expired for a long time in England ... In France the Book of Enoch scarcely awakened a sensation.' Even when the expedition of Napier to Magdala brought more Ethiopian manuscripts back to England, and the German missionaries whom he rescued brought yet more of them to Germany, those documents were promptly forgotten.<sup>209</sup>

In fact, the claim that somehow the BE was never picked up by the learned community is easily refuted by simply reading Laurence's opening paragraph in the preface of his 1838 edition:

This and my other translations from the Ethiopic have excited *so much curiosity* in Germany, as to attain distinct notices and analyses of them from Dr. F. Lücke, Professor of Theology at Gottingen, in his work ... upon the Revelation of St. John was indeed published in 1832 ... Subsequently, viz in 1833, Dr. A.G. Hoffman, Professor of Theology at Jena, translated into German the first fifty-five chapters of Enoch, and published them with a complete analysis<sup>210</sup> (emphasis mine).

Laurence also cites Edward Murray's *Enoch Restitutus* (1833). Lyman Abbott, an American theologian, reinforces the point in the introduction to the 1883 edition of Laurence's work,

---

<sup>208</sup> *Ibid*, xxxvii, 19

<sup>209</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 106-7

<sup>210</sup> Richard Laurence, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet* (Oxford: Printed by S. Collingwood, 1838), iii

The scarcity of Archbishop Laurence's translation ... produced an impression in Germany that the work had been suppressed by its author; but this report is contradicted in the preface to the third edition, issued in 1838, in response to a large order from America.<sup>211</sup>

This large order suggests knowledge of Laurence's work in America that is contrary to Nibley's assertion that Laurence's work was suppressed. Also, given the existing book trade, such a large order seems possible. It soon becomes clear from the fast response to Laurence's work that it was far from obscure. In fact from 1821 to 1830 at least six works emerge in response to the groundbreaking work by Laurence: 1) 1822 John Overton and Richard Laurence produce *Inquiry into the Truth and Use of the Book of Enoch as to its Prophecies, Visions, etc.*; 2) In the same year the earlier translator of Bruce's third Ethiopic manuscript, which he deposited in the Paris Library, de Sacy, produced a review of Laurence's book in the *Journal De Savans*; 3) In 1825 Thomas Hartwell Horne's work *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of Holy Scriptures* offers a few pages recounting details of the BE; 4) In 1827 the Rev. John Marten Butt published *The Genuineness of the Book of Enoch Investigated*; 5) In 1828 Algernon Herbert's *Nimrod: Discourse on Certain Passages of History and Fable* includes at least forty pages dealing directly with the BE; and 6) In 1829 George Cornelius Gorham published *An Historical and Critical Examination of an Apocryphal Production Denominated the Book of Enoch*. The interest in Enoch continued well into the next decade.

From 1830-1840 at least a further seven works were added to the BE dialogue. First, Laurence published two more editions of his translation in 1832 ('enlarged and corrected' and published again in 1833) and 1838 (which included a preface). Second, was Edward Murray's *Enoch Restitutus* in 1833. Third, German Scholar Andreas Hoffmann produced *Das Buch Henoch* in 1833, published again 1838. Fourth, in 1838 A. Pichard published *Le Livre d'Hénoch l'Amitié*. Fifth, in 1840 B.E. Pote's *The Ethiopians: Apocryphal books of Isaiah and Enoch* was published. Sixth, American scholar Moses Stuart produced his works *Christology of the Book of Enoch* and *Future Punishment, as Exhibited in the Book of Enoch*. Seventh, also in 1840, Mormon Church elder Parley P. Pratt included an extract from *The Apocryphal Book of Enoch MS 1* in a Mormon journal in England. These seven works in response to 1En establish an interest beyond what Nibley suggests, and indicate that knowledge of Laurence's 1En was not 'scarce.'

---

<sup>211</sup> Richard Laurence, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet*, Introduction by the Author [Lyman Abbott] of *The Evolution of Christianity*, (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883), viii

However, Nibley's second point is difficult to dismiss as he does not define what he means by "learned world." Given the highly literate society in America it is not improbable that an American scholar knew of Laurence's 1En prior to Smith writing his EPE. Certainly, therefore, Nibley's second point that "nobody in the learned world paid much attention to Laurence's Enoch"<sup>212</sup> is simply false.

### 2.3 *The Disdainful Church*

Nibley's next point is long and hence will be separated into smaller parts for response. Nibley states:

More to the point, the Christian ministry of all denominations neither liked Laurence's Enoch nor wanted it. It was not circulated by them but suppressed.<sup>213</sup>

From this point on Nibley confusingly oscillates between the contempt of the BE by the Christian ministry of Laurence's time and the contempt of the ancient Christian church. Nibley also cites two of Laurence's contemporaries, Algernon Herbert and Moses Stuart, whom Nibley misrepresents. Nibley suggests that both arguments (Herbert's and Stuart's) speak to both the reaction of their own time and that of the ancient church. Nibley quotes Algernon Herbert as follows:

... so it was assumed from the first that the book of Enoch could only be full of 'incantations and bestialities.' In 1828 the very learned Algernon Herbert observed, 'It has been supposed that the authour of that epistle [Jude] received and cited, as a holy scripture, that which is called the Book of Enoch, being an ignorant and ridiculous effusion ... The book in question is so monstrously absurd, that no person citing it, ... could have obtained credit with Tertullian ... A man so profoundly ignorant of criticism, as to receive the said book for divine revelation, and so nearly allied to the errors of Gnosticism, as to believe in its contents,' could, he avers, never have written the Epistle of Jude.<sup>214</sup>

Because of the manner in which Nibley quotes Herbert, the reader is uncertain of who is being quoted and of what time. Herbert's own writings on Enoch do not represent the entire church, nor are they as entirely contemptible of the BE as Nibley would have us believe.

---

<sup>212</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 106

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid*, 107

<sup>214</sup> *Ibid*, 107, citing Algernon Herbert, *Nimrod: Discourse on Certain Passages of History and Fable* (London: Printed for Richard Priestley, 1828), 1:36



Though Herbert finds hardly any redeemable aspects of the BE, his dispute is with those “objects of the offensive volume which has been tacked on to the prophecy of Enoch.”<sup>215</sup> Clearly, Herbert is not denying all aspects of the BE. Furthermore, Herbert himself notes that there is ‘at least’ one other member of the church who he calls an advocate of the BE. Herbert states, “It [the BE] has two [advocates] at least; in the person of a Mr. Overton; and in that of the Rev. J.M. Butt, M.A., vicar of East Garston, Berks!”<sup>216</sup> If the BE was despised by all denominations, as Nibley states, then how is it Herbert is able to find advocates for the BE? Furthermore, Herbert states:

But the prophecy of Enoch, of which the memory was never extinct even among the heathens, was handed down to the days of St. Jude, and from them down to ours. It is comprised in the six first chapters of the Æthiopian book of Enoch; and I shall presently show that it is the genuine effusion of the prophet who hath not seen death.<sup>217</sup>

It is hardly conceivable that Herbert chose to show that the Ethiopic BE was in fact the ‘genuine effusion’ (or expression) of Enoch (‘the prophet who hath not seen death’) if Herbert was entirely disdainful of the work to begin with. Hence, although Herbert may reflect upon the disdain of the early church and partake in it to a point, he is not without clarity as to the degree of that disdain.

Second, Nibley goes on to discuss Moses Stuart (whom he mistakenly calls ‘Michael’):

One of the best studies ever made on the book of Enoch was written way back in 1840 by Michael [*sic*] Stuart, professor of sacred literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover College, where in 1882 the first and only translation of the Ethiopian Enoch to appear in America was to be published.<sup>218</sup> He was excited by the discovery, but for the message of the book of Enoch he had only contempt: ‘to what purpose is an appeal to a book confessedly *apocryphal*, and therefore of *no authority*? ... I have not the most distant intention to refer to the book of Enoch, as a book of *authority*.

He [Stuart] recognizes the gulf between the book of Enoch and the doctors of the Church who condemned it, noting that what is found in *their* writings is ‘less repugnant to sound reason and philosophy, than what is found in the book of Enoch.’ ‘No one now pretends that the

---

<sup>215</sup> Herbert, *Nimrod*, 1:77

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid*, 1:77

<sup>217</sup> *Ibid*, 1:44

<sup>218</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 107 citing George H. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch Translated from the Ethiopic with Introduction and Notes* (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1882)

book of Enoch is an inspired book,' he insists, though admitting that 'time was, when individuals probably thought so.'<sup>219</sup>

To read Moses Stuart's two articles, *Christology of the Book of Enoch* and *Future Punishment, as Exhibited in the Book of Enoch*, in the 1840 *American Biblical Repository* is to agree that Nibley over simplified Stuart's work. Stuart may show contempt for the BE but he also lavishes it and the author, with praise. Regarding demons, astrology and natural philosophy Stuart says of the BE, that "we are compelled to regard some of his views as even childish—is no good reason why we may not receive his testimony about plain matters of fact within his cognisance."<sup>220</sup> Regarding future punishment Stuart says, "Let any one read it attentively, I should rather say, *study* it, and he will easily perceive, that it is no part of the writer's plan to maintain a *disputed* doctrine"<sup>221</sup> (emphasis original). Stuart speaks highly of the author and says that the BE, "was written by a serious man, and for serious purposes"<sup>222</sup> and "the testimony which he gives, in this indirect way, is in its nature more convincing and satisfactory, than if we had found him to be disputing in order to maintain the doctrine of endless punishment."<sup>223</sup> In Stuart's first article, *Christology of the Book of Enoch*, he says regarding the argument for why Jude may have quoted the BE (or as Stuart suggests shared a common antediluvian source) he states, "A heathen book may have much truth in it, which an apostle might sanction. And yet it would contain many other things for which he would by no means vouch. And so it may be with the Book of Enoch."<sup>224</sup> Regarding the BE's view of the messiah and his dignity Stuart states, "that no writer on the New Testament can justify himself for neglecting the sources of illustration which it discloses."<sup>225</sup>

Nibley's point is ultimately that "the Catholic clergy of Joseph Smith's day fully shared the scorn of Protestants and Jews for the new discovery."<sup>226</sup> Unfortunately, Nibley offers no proof for this statement. Which Churches? When did these Churches discover the BE? What is the extent of this scorn if the BE was scarce in America? Nibley's third point raises more questions than answers and contradicts his earlier point.

---

<sup>219</sup> *Ibid*, 107-108, citing Moses Stuart, "Future Punishment, as Exhibited in the Book of Enoch," *The American Biblical Repository*, 2<sup>nd</sup> series, 4 (July 1840), 11

<sup>220</sup> Stuart, *Future Punishment*, 11

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid*, 11

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid*, 5

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid*, 12

<sup>224</sup> *Ibid*, 135

<sup>225</sup> Moses Stuart, 'Christology in the Book of Enoch,' in *The American Biblical Repository*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Series, 3 (January 1840), 134

<sup>226</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 108

## 2.4 *American Libraries and Freethinkers*

As for the issue of literacy and philosophy, Nibley writes:

Freethinkers might have exploited the so-called absurdities of Enoch against the Christians, but the latter had beaten them to the punch by promptly and vigorously disowning the book. Who, then, would have an interest in the book of Enoch? One might expect it to appeal to Masons or Rosicrucians, but it did not; Enoch is not found among the books favored by mystic or Gnostic groups, and his name does not occur in their lists of inspired prophets. No library in America had a more representative collection of the works of the ancients than that of Thomas Jefferson, ‘for in his book-collecting no subject was overlooked by him.’ Book No. 1 in Jefferson’s library was ‘Ancient History, Antwerp, including texts of Berossus, Manetho, etc.,’ and the books that follow show an equal concern for getting at the truth and the whole truth where the ancients were concerned. The collection was systematically and diligently continued, with careful concern for the latest and best information, up until 1826. If one expected to find a copy of Laurence’s 1821 Enoch anywhere in America it would be in this library; but it is not. It was simply unknown in America.<sup>227</sup>

Those ‘freethinkers’ who exploited the absurdities against the Christian Church are not specified by Nibley and are thus unknown. In any event it is an ancillary point. Ultimately, Nibley is making a case for poor access to books generally and, by suggesting Jefferson housed the greatest library in America without the BE in his collection, Nibley implies that the book could not have otherwise been available in America. Further, Nibley’s assessment of Masons (Freemasons) not holding Enoch up as an inspired prophet, is meant to further support his claim that America knew nothing of Enoch (or the BE). I will address Nibley’s quote in three parts 2.4.1) Freemasons and the Legend of Enoch, 2.4.2) Jefferson’s Library and, 2.4.3) Enoch in other early American Libraries.

### 2.4.1 *Freemasons and the Legend of Enoch*

The degree to which Freemasons knew of ancient Enoch from writings of antiquity is disputed. However, it is clear that the Legend of Enoch occurs in Freemasonry almost a half century prior to the publication of James Bruce’s travels. Historian John L. Brooke notes:

---

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid*, 109-10

But after 1583 [John] Dee sought patronage in the Continent [of Europe], and here, it has been argued, he laid the ground work for Rosicrucianism, the international hermetic movement that would formatively influence Freemasonry.<sup>228</sup>

Modern Freemasonry originates in the practices of medieval stonemasons, although it frequently asserts far more ancient roots. Freemasonry, or the craft (a reference to craftsman), refers to modern members as *speculative* masons, as they are “building” the self, compared with medieval *operative* stonemasons, who actually constructed buildings. Freemasonic Historian, Albert Gallatin Mackey, suggests that as “Legends of peculiar character,”<sup>229</sup> that formed no part of the original Freemasonic legend, the Legend of Enoch may have been known to Medieval Masons who provided a foundation for later Speculative Freemasons of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Mackey states, “Enoch is first introduced to the Craft as one of the founders of Geometry and Masonry, by Anderson, in the year 1723 ...”<sup>230</sup> Mackey believes that Anderson’s introduction of Enoch was merely a suggestion and that the Legend of Enoch developed greatly thereafter. Prior to Anderson, Mackey is “inclined conjecturally to assign its [the Legend of Enoch] invention to the fertile genius of Chevalier Ramsay” who Mackey believes was very learned and fully aware of the numerous cultural traditions in which Enoch had long existed.<sup>231</sup> Whatever the Legend of Enoch’s origins, it is clear that this legend existed prior to James Bruce’s discovery of 1En in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. The Freemasonic Legend of Enoch, which shares similarities with Mormon accounts, is in many ways separate from that tradition which informs Laurence’s 1En. Mackey states:

Enoch, being inspired by the Most High, and in obedience to a vision, constructed underground, in the bosom of Mount Moriah, an edifice consisting of nine brick vaults situated perpendicularly beneath each other and communicating by apertures left in the arch of each vault ... He then caused a triangular plate of gold to be made ... and deposited the whole within the ninth or innermost vault ... When this subterranean building was completed, Enoch made a slab or door of stone ... he placed it over with soil that the opening could not easily be discovered ... on his death or translation all knowledge of this building and of sacred treasure which it contained was lost until in succeeding ages it was accidentally discovered ... on the same mountain.<sup>232</sup>

---

<sup>228</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner’s Fire*, 17

<sup>229</sup> Albert Gallatin Mackey, *The History of Freemasonry, Its Legends and Traditions, Its Chronological History*, Vol. 2, (New York and London: The Masonic History Company, 1898 & 1905), 396

<sup>230</sup> *Ibid*, 399-400

<sup>231</sup> *Ibid*, 406

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid*, 398

Having finished the construction, Enoch, fearing the information he had just buried would be lost in the flood, built two pillars above ground, made of marble and brass to resist fire and water, on which, “he inscribed in hieroglyphic characters”<sup>233</sup> information about the treasure in the vault below. Brooke notes that, “this version of Masonic mythology embedded the tale of Enoch burying engraved texts of the mysteries in an arched vault, to be discovered by Solomon, in a long history of dyadic segmentation and declension,”<sup>234</sup> and that “most obviously, the story of their discovery in a stone vault on a hilltop echoed the Enoch myth of Royal Arch Freemasonry ...”<sup>235</sup> This is echoed by Smith in 1828, when he tells of Moroni, then human, inspired by the Most High, to record history on plates of gold and to bury them in the ground so they would not be discovered. After Moroni’s death, all knowledge of the plates was lost, until much later when he returned as an angel to Smith and revealed the location of the plates in the Hill Cumorah. The striking parallels between Masonic mythology and the accounts of Smith and Mormon traditions are supported by the evidently large impact of Freemasonry on Smith, his family and friends.

According to Behrens, “Joseph Smith Sr. also seems to have taken an interest in Freemasonry and possibly even named his second son, Hyrum, after the principal characters in the masonic myth, Hiram the king of Tyre and Hiram Abiff his principal architect.”<sup>236</sup> Brooke’s also notes this connection between Smith’s family and Freemasonry, he states, “Masonic fraternity was a dominant feature of the cultural landscape in Joseph Smith’s Ontario County.”<sup>237</sup> In fact, Joseph Smith Sr.’s relatives were accepted into the Randolph Lodge, from which Smith Sr. was rejected.<sup>238</sup> This influence of Freemasonry is evident in Mormonism as a result, Brooke argues:

Smith’s story of his discoveries got more elaborate with time, and in June 1829 he promised Oliver Cowdery, David Whitmer, and Martin Harris that they would see not only the plates but other marvelous artifacts: the Urim and Thummim attached to a priestly breastplate, the ‘sword of Laban,’ and miraculous directors.’ Oliver Cowdery and Lucy Mack Smith later described three of four small pillars holding up the plates. All of these artifacts had Masonic analogues. Swords were carried in the Templar rituals, and the third, or Master Mason, degree told a story of a sword being used to behead a sleeping enemy, as the sword of Laban

---

<sup>233</sup> *Ibid*, 402

<sup>234</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner’s Fire*, 165

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid*, 157

<sup>236</sup> Behrens, *Dreams, Visions*, 171-72

<sup>237</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner’s Fire*, 157

<sup>238</sup> Behrens, *Dreams, Visions*, 172

was used in the *Book of Mormon*. The Royal Arch priests wore breastplates covered with symbolic jewels, and a version of the Royal Arch myth told of three Masons finding a translating ‘key’ in the Ark of the Covenant, analogous to the Urim and Thummim. Smith claimed to have worn the priestly breastplate with the Urim and Thummim attached while he translated a part of the Book of Mormon. Smith’s directors were modelled on metal balls attached to the top of Enoch’s pillars; these balls were engraved with maps and acted as mystic oracles.<sup>239</sup>

This quote is important for two reasons; first, it shows that Smith derived some BoM ideas from outside sources, although these could just as easily have been Biblical allusions as Freemasonic ones, and second, it points out that “Smith’s sources for these Masonic symbols were close at hand” including but not limited to, Oliver Cowdery whose father and brother were Royal Arch initiates, the “Masonic Smith relatives in Vermont,” and Hyrum Smith who was a member of the Mount Moriah Lodge.<sup>240</sup>

Nibley remained unconvinced of the connection to Freemasonry and argued that Enoch did not appeal to Freemasons. It should be noted that the Royal Arch Degree, the fourth degree in Freemasonry, related specifically to the Legend of Enoch and was introduced by Grand Lodge Freemasonry sometime around the second half of the eighteenth-century.<sup>241</sup> The fourth degree was developed by a Scot, Andrew Michael Ramsey, and it emphasised lost scripture from the Bible associated with Enoch and the pillars of knowledge. Furthermore, given the strong parallels between Freemasonic accounts of Enoch and many of the accounts of Enoch found in the BE, one might conclude that a new translation of 1En would be precisely the type of material Freemasons favoured.

Clyde R. Forsberg makes note of an ongoing dispute within Freemasonic circles toward an emphasis on the constructions of Freemasonry between ancient Royal Arch Freemasons and modern London Grand Lodge Freemasons.<sup>242</sup> In America, this dispute favoured the ancient Masons resulting in an inclusion of less elite, more common members; not what Ramsey, a noble, had envisioned. The victory by ancient Freemasons helped inject into American culture a healthy respect and interest in such antediluvian matters. Forsberg states:

---

<sup>239</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner’s Fire*, 157-58

<sup>240</sup> *Ibid.*, 158

<sup>241</sup> The first three (initially two) degrees began sometime around the official formation of the Grand Lodge in London in 1717. Clyde R. Forsberg, Jr., *Equal Rites: The Book of Mormon, Masonry, Gender, and American Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004), 6

<sup>242</sup> Ironically, the London Grand Lodge Masons were in fact older and more ‘ancient’ than the ancient Masons. Forsberg, *Equal Rites*, 8; 14

... in Palmyra, a New Yorker unlikely to gain entrance to the lodge through the regular channels would follow his own star, publishing a Masonic monitor and discreetly calling it the Book of Mormon ... Of New England stock and Masonic pedigree, he would not be denied his birthright as an American male and took the necessary steps to correct this—going over heads and crossing both ocean and channel, going not to the Jerusalem Lodge in London for his charter but to Jerusalem itself and the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and ultimately, the Son of God for permission to start anew.<sup>243</sup>

Therefore, Nibley's statement that "one might expect it [the BE] to appeal to Masons or Rosicrucians, but it did not"<sup>244</sup> is false. As not only are the Freemasons deeply knowledgeable about the BE, they also have extensive and undeniable links to Mormonism and Smith.

#### 2.4.2 Jefferson's Library

Turning now to the matter of Nibley on Jefferson's library, he states:

No library in America had a more representative collection of the works of the ancients than that of Thomas Jefferson, "for in his book-collecting no subject was overlooked by him." Book No. 1 in Jefferson's library was "Ancient History, Antwerp, including texts of Berosus, Manetho, etc.," and the books that follow show an equal concern for getting at the truth and the whole truth where the ancients were concerned. The collection was systematically and diligently continued, with careful concern for the latest and best information, up until 1826. If one expected to find a copy of Laurence's 1821 Enoch anywhere in America it would be in this library; but it is not. It was simply unknown in America.<sup>245</sup>

According to Jefferson scholar Douglas L. Wilson the 'Jefferson's library' can refer to at least three different libraries,

Jefferson is usually said to have had three libraries: the one that was destroyed by the fire of 1770 (estimated at 400 volumes), the one that he assembled between 1815 and the time of his death in 1826 (about 1,000 volumes), and the great library, the one he sold to Congress in 1815 (about 6,500 volumes).<sup>246</sup>

---

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid*, 22

<sup>244</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 109-10

<sup>245</sup> *Ibid*, 109-10

<sup>246</sup> Douglas L. Wilson, "Sowerby Revisited: The Unfinished Catalogue of Thomas Jefferson's Library," in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Oct., 1984), 617-18

Wilson notes that Jefferson's possessions of 1770, if entirely replicated by his second 1815 collection, still does not account for all the books Jefferson may have owned. Wilson states that "Jefferson was a willing source of books for his family, his friends, and his neighbors, and we have ample indication that the number of books he gave away or failed to reclaim from borrowers was substantial."<sup>247</sup> Given this fact, Nibley cannot make a definitive claim as to what Jefferson owned, and certainly Jefferson's "latest and best information up until 1826" is not representative of all American books published and all British and European books imported to the states prior to 1826. Furthermore, the 1815 Catalogue of the Library of the United States –a catalogue of books which Jefferson sold to the Library of Congress for \$23,950<sup>248</sup> after the country's initial Library of Congress was burned down in the War of 1812 –there are included two books which *do* in fact relate to Enoch. First, Johann Albert Fabricius's *Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (earlier noted as the culmination to date on the Book(s) of Enoch),<sup>249</sup> and second, Johan Ernest Grabe's *Spicilegium SS Patrum* (which included an excerpt of Syncellus's BE with parallel Latin translations and notes), and finally, William Whiston's *Primitive Christianity* was listed, which in and of itself says nothing on Enoch, however, Whiston had produced "the most extensive treatment yet on the subject [of the BE] in English" in his work from 1727.<sup>250</sup> One may never fully know the contents of Jefferson's Library, but what is known is that he did in fact have books on Enoch.

#### 2.4.3 Enoch in other American Libraries

When discussing the relevant libraries of Smith's time, Bushman states:

Books of all kinds were in circulation in his immediate environment, but he was not bookish; Joseph was no Abraham Lincoln borrowing books and reading when he finished plowing a furrow.<sup>251</sup>

Bushman has condemned the occurrence of book borrowing which was far more common than one might believe given the numerous libraries available in early America and available from the time of Smith right through to Lincoln.

---

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid*, 618

<sup>248</sup> 'The Library of Congress Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009, <http://www.loc.gov/r/rarebook/coll/130.html>

<sup>249</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 40

<sup>250</sup> *Ibid*, 40

<sup>251</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 128



Jefferson's Library is well known because it becomes the Library of Congress. However, less well known is the Library Company of Philadelphia (L.C.P.). Initially founded by a group of gentleman (including Benjamin Franklin) who began making monetary donations to form a collective borrowing library (which later became the L.C.P.), the purpose was to provide a library from which members and borrow books for their leisurely perusal.<sup>252</sup> As the membership increased, so did the donation of money and books and by 1836, members totalled 836 and the number of books totalled over 43,000 volumes (compared with Jefferson's roughly 8,000 volumes).<sup>253</sup> Certainly, this library, more than Jefferson's had a representative collection of ancient texts if for no other reason than sheer volume. The L.C.P. published three catalogues of the collection in 1789, 1807 and 1836, with some revised and extended editions (e.g. the 1813 extended edition of the 1807 publishing). The 1813 edition notes having a copy of,

*Bruce*, 1456, Q. Account of the Life and Writings of James Bruce, of Kinnaird, Esq. By Alexander Murray. Edinburgh 1808.<sup>254</sup>

As noted in Chapter One, this account mentions in some detail Ethiopic manuscripts discovered by Bruce, one of which would provide Laurence with his 1821 translation. By the 1836 catalogue, the L.C.P. had acquired an original 1790 edition of Bruce's publication,<sup>255</sup> an abridged edition by Samuel Shaw, and a later edition of Bruce's work from Glasgow.

There is no indication that Smith or his companions were in anyway affiliated with this particular library. However, the L.C.P. does stand as further evidence that in America, prior to 1820, there existed books related to the BE which were accessible to Americans.

---

<sup>252</sup> By the Library Company of Philadelphia, *A Catalogue of the Books Belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia; to which is prefixed, a short account of the institution, with the Charter, Laws, and Regulations*, Vol. I, (Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Co. Printers, 1835), ix

<sup>253</sup> Monumental given that the donations by Jefferson, which made up the National Library of Congress, were less than a fifth of the volumes of the L.C.P.

<sup>254</sup> By the Library Company of Philadelphia, *A Catalogue of Books, Belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia*, Vol. II-Part I, (Philadelphia; Printed by Thomas T. Stiles, 1813), 18

<sup>255</sup> It is noted as a 'gift of Robert Barclay of London,' further proof that older books travelled from Britain to America, including those pertaining to Enoch. LCP, *A Catalogue of Books* (1836), 703

## 2.5 A Later Appearance

Although the reference is far too long to quote here, Nibley suggests that Moses Stuart's 1840 work *Christology of the Book of Enoch* is crucial to understanding the response to the BE in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Nibley states:

This [fact that the BE is unknown in America] is thoroughly borne out in Michael [*sic*] Stuart's long and careful study of 1840. The text Stuart uses is the 1838 edition of Laurence, whose work comes to him, nineteen years after the first version, as a novelty. Indeed his aim in writing his long studies is to make American clergymen aware for the first time of the existence of the book: "The possession of this work, in our country, is *rare*; and our public so far from being acquainted with the contents of the work are in general not at all aware, as I have reason to believe, that the book has even been recovered and published to the world." If this applies to the larger and far more widely publicized edition of 1838, who would have known anything of the 1821 edition, which Stuart does not even mention, and which went unremarked even in Europe by all but a few specialists?<sup>256</sup>

This is, in my view, Nibley's strongest point as he considers the account of a contemporary of Laurence and Smith. However, Stuart fails to consider the possibility that the fervent pitch which has gripped Europe, according to Laurence in his preface to the 1838 edition, was simultaneously occurring in America.<sup>257</sup> Unfortunately, Mormon scholars persist in suggesting the possibility as unlikely. Bushman marks the appearance of Laurence's work prior to Smith's writings as, "a curiosity"<sup>258</sup> after stating that "Bible readers had always been curious about Enoch and the city transported into heaven."<sup>259</sup> For Nibley, "after 1821 no translation [of Enoch] was available to the public [in America] until 1833, when Joseph Smith's 'Book of Enoch' was already three years old."<sup>260</sup> Bushman further states, "It is scarcely conceivable that Joseph Smith knew of Laurence's Enoch translation." However, Quinn puts these points to rest simply by noting, "Laurence's 1821 translation had another printing in 1828 just in America."<sup>261</sup>

This point is so important that it bears immediate repeating, in America in 1828, according to the *National Union Catalog of Pre-1956 Imprints* another edition of Laurence's 1821

<sup>256</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 110

<sup>257</sup> Laurence, *The Book of Enoch* (1838), iii

<sup>258</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone Rolling*, 138

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid*, 138

<sup>260</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 106

<sup>261</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 191

translation was printed in America. This 1828 printing indicates an interest beyond Nibley's assessment, which was strong enough to warrant another printing for Americans. Such an undertaking would not be worth the publisher's time and money if there were no demand for the book and thus little chance for the endeavour to have been profitable. Although little is known about this edition, Quinn was able to trace the last remaining copy of the 1828 printing to the New York Public Library. Quinn also notes that by January of 1840 Parley P. Pratt owned a copy of Laurence's Enoch translation, which Pratt reviews for a Mormon publication later that year whilst on a missionary trip in England (more on this in Chapter Four).<sup>262</sup> Although this occurs after the EPE is written, it suggests that far more was known about 1En by Mormons than Nibley argues.

## 2.6 *Stressing the Point*

Following on, Nibley summarises:

This laboring of the only too obvious point, that Joseph Smith could not have used or known about the 1821 edition of Laurence's book of Enoch, has been very necessary because: (a) that was the only translation of any ancient Enoch text available to anyone at the time he dictated Moses chapters 6 and 7, and (b) the two books are full of most significant parallels. If such parallels are to have any significance as evidence supporting the Prophet's claims, we must of course rule out his use of the Laurence text.

Aside from the astronomical remoteness of such a probability, we have some useful positive "controls" that definitely show that such parallels are not dependent on the Laurence text. For many other manuscripts of the book of Enoch have come forth in various ancient languages since 1830, adding a great deal to the standard text that is *not* found in the 1821 version but that is found in the Joseph Smith Enoch. One of the most remarkable parallels, for example is between some verses of Moses 7 and chapter 11 of the Ethiopians book of Enoch; yet that particular chapter was not included in the Laurence translation, and so could have been known to no one at the time.<sup>263</sup>

As Nibley offers a summary of his finer points, this section will reiterate the response of this thesis to each point.

---

<sup>262</sup> *Ibid.*, 224

<sup>263</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 112-13

First, Nibley incorrectly concludes “that Joseph Smith could not have used or known about the 1821 edition of Laurence’s,” however, there was an 1828 printing of Laurence’s 1En in America and access through an extensive book trade. Furthermore, D. Michael Quinn effectively argues that Smith could have known about Laurence’s 1En through the work of Thomas Hartwell Horne. Horne was a gifted scholar who was well known in the Americas and published *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*. Quinn establishes several ways in which Horne’s work may have been known to Smith. The Palmyra’s newspaper, the *Wayne Sentinel*,<sup>264</sup> ran a series of three advertisements for Horne’s book beginning April 6, 1825 and lasting for three weeks.<sup>265</sup> Just five years earlier in 1820, nearby Canandaigua (just over 12 miles from Palmyra), had advertised, through a local bookstore, “a short-title reference to Horne’s first edition that was published in London in 1818” and the listing also advertised the sale of Robert Lowth’s study on the Book of Isaiah. Quinn highlights the fact that Horne’s book was known to locals in Palmyra and Canandaigua as early as 1820, although obviously the edition known in 1820 would not have had information about Laurence’s 1821 translation. However after 1821 Horne’s study, which included the Enoch passage, was advertised in Canandaigua’s newspaper until 1827. Additional advertisements for Horne’s study of the Book of Psalms in a local bookstore in 1831 indicate “that his biblical studies were on sale continually in the Palmyra area from 1820 through 1830.”<sup>266</sup> It is clear that Horne’s book was repeatedly advertised in western New York. Finally, Quinn says that Laurence’s *The Ascension of Isaiah* (1819) “would have immediately drawn the attention of young Joseph Smith.”<sup>267</sup> It is not hard to imagine Smith having had a similar interest in Horne’s book or 1En. I believe Quinn has shown that Smith had knowledge of a book containing information on 1En. And as Quinn states, if Laurence’s earlier work *The Ascension of Isaiah* (1819) would have immediately drawn Smith’s attention, would not 1En also do so?

Second, Nibley incorrectly states that Laurence’s 1En was “the only translation of any ancient Enoch text available to anyone.” As Chapter One indicated, Johan Ernest Grabe produced an English translation of the BE in 1715; Johann Albert Fabricius produced a translation with commentary in Latin between 1713-23; William Whiston produced an English translation in 1727; James Bruce (and the editor of later editions of Bruce’s books)

---

<sup>264</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 191

<sup>265</sup> *Ibid*, 191

<sup>266</sup> *Ibid*, 191

<sup>267</sup> *Ibid*, 191

produced partial translations in English in 1790 (and 1813); Antoine Isaac de Sacy produced a partial French Translation in 1800; and F.T. Rink produced a German Translation in 1801, all prior to Laurence. Furthermore, this list of translations of Enoch only represents the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century until 1821 and does not consider those texts on Enoch which were in circulation in Britain and Europe prior to 1700.

Third, Nibley notes that:

One of the most remarkable parallels, for example is between some verses of Moses 7 and chapter 11 of the Ethiopians book of Enoch; yet that particular chapter was not included in the Laurence translation, and so could have been known to no one at the time.

In fact, Laurence states in his 1821 edition (and 1838 edition) that there is “No CHAP. XI\*,”<sup>268</sup> however, in his footnote Laurence clarifies this point by stating that “The Paris Manuscript makes the last two verses of the preceding chapter, the xi chapter.” Many modern translations of 1En (including translations by R.H. Charles, Daniel Olson, George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam) continue the form which the Paris manuscript used and include the last two verses of chapter ten as the full text for chapter eleven. Thus, Smith did in fact have access to chapter eleven of 1En.

The other points which Nibley stresses pertain to discussions about parallels between the BMo and 1En, which will be addressed in Chapter Three.

### *2.7 Ignorant No More*

Lastly, Nibley cites Smith’s inability to process the BE information. Nibley states:

Finally, even if Joseph Smith had had the rich apocryphal literature of our own day at his disposal, with the thousands of pages of Enoch, or even the 1821 text of Laurence, how would he have known how to handle the stuff? The Prophet’s book of Enoch is less than three chapters long; how was he to know from all that what to put in and what to leave out to produce a text that most nearly corresponds to what modern scholars view as the authentic original material of Enoch’s book? He did just that; he put together in a few hours the kind of

---

<sup>268</sup> Richard Laurence, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet* (Oxford: University Press, 1821), 12

text most closely corresponding to what specialists, after years of meticulous comparison of texts, come up with as the hypothetically essential text of Enoch.<sup>269</sup>

There is no consensus as to the ‘essential text of Enoch’ by Enoch scholars but any substantial similarities between the BE and Smith’s EPE will be responded to in Chapter Three.

### 3. Quinn Responds

Quinn improves upon Nibley’s argument by accepting that access to materials is likely but that it need not equate to influence. Quinn states:

Between the past’s indisputable facts its unknowable gaps in evidence, there is a vast terrain of the possible and the probable ... surviving documents and artefacts allow researchers to assess significant possibilities ... like detective work, the conclusions of historical research are similar to the legal requirements known as ‘preponderance of evidence,’ rather than ‘proof beyond the shadow of a doubt.’<sup>270</sup>

Quinn’s bias rarely plays out in his text and although he states his belief in Mormonism at the outset, he seeks to engage with the truth of his faith throughout his work, rather than simply the truth of those claims made about his faith. Stephen E. Robinson notes:

It’s one thing to say that Joseph was influenced by his nineteenth century environment, and quite another to say that influence contaminated the revelations to the point that they are robbed of their normative power.<sup>271</sup>

Such a perspective is indefensible, and one which Quinn quickly acknowledges he does not share. In one sentence Robinson has accepted that influence of some kind occurred, yet immediately denies its impact, thus failing to acknowledge that, by definition, influence has an effect.<sup>272</sup> Quinn similarly states:

---

<sup>269</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 113

<sup>270</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, xxxii

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid*, 190 citing Stephen E. Robinson, untitled review in *Review of Books on the Book of Mormon: Foundation for Ancient Research and Mormon Studies* 3 (1991):316-317.

<sup>272</sup> With respect to revelation, I find this idea is somewhat analogous to the concept of clean water (God’s revelation) passing through a dirty spout (humanity) into a glass and somehow remaining pure and uncontaminated.

Parallels to literature widely available in Joseph Smith's generation do not necessarily require dependence on the earlier literature, since 'dependence' involves conscious borrowing.<sup>273</sup>

Quinn instead suggests that 'independent discovery' (the idea that coincidental development of the same or similar idea can occur from separate persons or groups unaware of the other's work) is the best possible explanation for the argument for parallels. However, this is an equally difficult argument to posit when the parallel evidence is coupled with possible access.

Quinn's use of the concept of independent discovery and his concern for conscious borrowing are the result of the limitations set by his faith. Although Quinn supports the likelihood that access to 1En was possible, he limits what he says about the influence of that access to the above quote. Yet Quinn argues five ways in which knowledge of 1En were made accessible to Smith: 1) an advertisement for Horne's book in a Palmyra paper; 2) another advertisement for Horne's book in a nearby Canandaigua bookstore; 3) yet another advertisement indicating Horne's book was continuously on sale in Canandaigua; 4) Horne's book told Palmyra's residents that the BE was important; and 5) an American Printing of Laurence's 1En in 1828. Quinn concludes that, "Nibley understated the access of Palmyra's residents in the mid 1820s to information about the pseudeupigraphic Enoch."<sup>274</sup> But still Quinn considers independent discovery a possibility.

The entirety of Quinn's book, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View* suggests a strong relationship between "pseudeupigraphic teachings with magic traditions and the occult sciences" as the normative view during Smith's time. Quinn further states:

Smith's revision of Genesis (The Book of Moses) ... presented new and disturbing extra-biblical doctrines to traditional Christianity, but it fit comfortably within various occult traditions. Beyond its references to the origins of sorcery ... [the BMo] touched on familiar magic traditions about the creation of the earth, the nature of the unseen world, and the importance of patriarchs Adam and Enoch.<sup>275</sup>

Given this relationship between magic, the occult and pseudeupigraphic teachings evident in the BMo and as a result of Smith's environment the 19<sup>th</sup> century, it is difficult at the very least to deny that access was possible and that influence was probable.

---

<sup>273</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 190

<sup>274</sup> *Ibid*, 516

<sup>275</sup> *Ibid*, 212

#### 4. Conclusion

This chapter set out to establish that Nibley's assessment of Smith's access to Enoch materials was incorrect. According to Hessayon:

Far from being neglected, Enoch and the books under his name had preoccupied monks, chroniclers, rabbis, Kabbalists, Academicians, magicians, Catholic theologians, Protestant divines, Orientalists, sectarian and poets alike. So much so, that by the mid-eighteenth century the available evidence in Greek and Latin had been exhausted.<sup>276</sup>

This chapter has offered ample evidence that supports an argument for Smith having had knowledge of the BE. With proof that a flourishing book trade existed prior to the time of Smith, that that trade had access to materials like the variety of sources noted above (and discussed in Chapter One), that book peddlers made the movement of these books to rural areas far more likely, that advertisements on the BE were pervasive throughout the areas in which Smith lived, and that Laurence's 1En was so desired in early America that in 1828 (two years prior to Smith's EPE) an American printing of 1En was made, is all proof of Smith's access. The extent of that access and possible use is the focus of Chapter Three.

Furthermore, the variety of other forms of transmission, the inclusion of Enochic traditions in Freemasonic accounts and other movements requires a more in depth investigation. The possibility that Smith's companions may have known about these materials and somehow informed Smith is an approach that has yet to receive any attention. Finally, the relevance of this access is moot, if in fact Smith's work shows no substantial similarities with BE material.

---

<sup>276</sup> Hessayon, *Og King of Bashan*, 40



### CHAPTER THREE

## SUBSTANTIAL SIMILARITIES AND INFLUENCE

*Strong parallels, from whatever [time] period, will enrich our understanding of the Book of Mormon. –Compton<sup>277</sup>*

Nibley's argument for comparison begins and ends with parallels and some similarities.<sup>278</sup> However, he limits what methods can be used. Nibley states:

So it was with the book of Enoch, transmitted to us by Joseph as it was given to him. Though his work was far more demanding and probably required far more concentration and sheer mental effort than we can even imagine, that task did not include searching for a lost manuscript or working out a translation.

So we are forced back on the one and only really valid test of authenticity of an ancient record, which does not depend on the writing materials used, nor the language in which it was written, nor the method of translation, but simply asks the question, 'How does it compare with other records known to be authentic?'<sup>279</sup>

To understand the problem with Nibley's comparisons requires defining the terms. Parallels, as Nibley employs them and for our purposes here, refer to passages from two separate works which contain parallel ideas. Parallels alone, however, do not define the authenticity of a piece of scripture, even when that scripture is the product of revelation. Similarity, which is more difficult to prove, refers to a similar expression of parallel ideas. An example of a parallel is that both the BE and EPE mention a person named Enoch. An example of a similarity is that both the BE and EPE mention a person named Enoch who prophesied about the end times coming as the result of a flood. Both examples might suggest that influence

<sup>277</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 190

<sup>278</sup> Nibley's assumption of divine intervention only works if access is denied and parallels are affirmed.

<sup>279</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 93-94

occurred, but neither can do so definitively (although a similarity is far more compelling than a parallel). However, a substantial similarity is a legal method for proving copyright infringement in which one work is copied from another. Furthermore, when proving a substantial similarity in a legal case, parallel ideas and similar expressions of that idea are assumed, as they are here. Hence, this chapter will offer three examples of substantial similarities that are beyond mere parallel or similarity. Legally, one wins a case for copyright infringement either by proving substantial similarities occurred and access was available or by proving that the substantial similarity is beyond dispute (in such a case access is assumed). To prove here that substantial similarities are beyond dispute, I have limited the examples to content that was only evident in either the BE or EPE. Therefore, if access and substantial similarities are evident then, influence occurred (as divine revelation is not being considered here).

### **1. Nibley's Poor Comparisons**

Nibley's comparisons of Mormon writings and ancient scripture are poor for a variety of reasons. This section will address this in four critical points. The first is that he does not limit his comparisons, which are mostly parallels and on occasion similarities, to materials on Enoch. Of Nibley's roughly 275 comparisons, only a third of those have to do with 1En and the EPE (chapters 6:23-8:3 in the BMo). The remaining comparisons include, but are not limited to, the remaining chapters in the BMo, *the Apocalypse of Abraham*, *the Apocalypse of Adam*, *the Apocalypse of Elijah*, *the Combat of Adam and Eve*, a French Dictionary on Apocrypha (1856), and a Jewish Encyclopedia (1904). In addition to employing a variety of fragments, recensions, and manuscripts related to 1, 2, and 3 Enoch, Nibley also includes scholarly translations by Black (1970), Bonner (1937), Charles (1913), Morfill (1896) and Vaillant (1952); as if each varied translation, correct or incorrect, provides a fuller account of Enoch.

The second reason Nibley's comparisons are poor is that he assumes all Enochic traditions can be read as a singular BE from which to draw his comparisons. Stated differently, the evolution, or in some cases devolution, of a group of texts on Enoch can be rendered and read as a singular text and then used to authenticate the EPE. Nibley states:

Apocalyptic in general, and the writings attributed to Enoch in particular ... give us what purports to be a much fuller account of what happened. In the Bible we have only two or three verses about Enoch. But these parts that have been thrown out of the Bible (anciently they were a part of it) give us a much fuller picture.<sup>280</sup>

In a single paragraph, he shifts from suggesting that the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha “purport” to offer a fuller account to then stating without support and with certainty that they not only give a fuller account but were once part of the Bible. Nibley assumes that all of the ancient texts are companion pieces, meant to provide a foundation for authenticating Mormon scripture when read together. This is simply not the case, as many of these texts are recensions of earlier accounts, poor or mistranslated versions, the result of subtle nuances of language, and contingent upon writing materials used and methods of translation. This allows Nibley to draw false comparisons between the EPE and a non-Enoch related text and attempt to suggest they are valid parallels. Therefore, Nibley’s belief that many of these texts are part of the same continuum, in which ancient texts read forward and Mormon texts read back, provides the approach to comparisons with problems.

Third, many of Nibley’s poor comparisons are organized by topic. This topic oriented approach removes these comparisons from their context (as Nibley does when reading the BE tradition as a singular story). If Nibley is allowed to extract passages as they relate to one topic (for instance, mountains 159, shaming Satan 161, weeping 189-90, God in sorrow and the Devil laughing 190) then he can read into them a degree of uniformity which does not exist. This type of exegetical approach fails to consider the history and origins of the texts, the author’s intention, the type of language used in the original, the context of each topic, and its implicit meaning and explicit expression as part of the larger narrative.

Fourth, Nibley’s poor comparisons are written so as to appear similar. By abbreviating his quotes, Nibley is able to make it appear as if two passages are more similar than they actually are if quoted in full.

For example, Nibley draws false parallels between the BMo 1:40 and 1En 82:1. The BMo 1:40 states:

And now, Moses, my son, I will speak unto thee concerning this earth upon which thou standest; and thou shalt write the things which I shall speak.

---

<sup>280</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 4

And 1En 82:1 states:

... my son Methuselah, I am recounting to you and writing down for you all of these things. I have shown you and given you written accounts of all these things. My son preserve the writings from the hands of your father, so that you may pass them on to the generations of the world.<sup>281</sup>

For Nibley, the parallels are that both accounts discuss a book, are written by an antediluvian patriarch, are written for the same person(s), and are both a revelation from God. This is false. In the BMo the discussion is regarding a book, in 1En this may be a book or a series of holy tablets; in the BMo the account is written by the Moses, in 1En by Enoch; in the BMo the writings are for the children of men, in 1En they are for Methuselah and the generations of the world; and in the BMo the revelation is from God to Moses and in 1En from God to Enoch to Methuselah. Furthermore, all four critical points are exhibited here. First, Nibley is comparing an account of Moses, not from the EPE, with 1En. Second, Nibley is assuming that the account of Moses can be read as part of a larger, singular account on Enoch he states, “So Joseph Smith is quite right in having Adam’s book come down through Enoch to Abraham, Moses, and us.”<sup>282</sup> Third, he introduces these quotes as a topic, in this case a book from Adam. Fourth, his quotes are abbreviated to support his conclusion Nibley quotes BMo 1:40 as “Moses, my son, ... thou shalt write the things which I shall speak” and 1En 82:1 as “preserve, my son Methuselah, the books from thy father’s hand.”<sup>283</sup> There is no doubt that these accounts have parallels and similarities, but it is the differences which invalidate his comparison.

In another example, Nibley believes that he is comparing speeches in which God describes His own glory as described by the EPE and 1En.<sup>284</sup> The BMo states:

**7:29** And Enoch said unto the Lord: How is it that thou canst weep, seeing thou art holy, and from all eternity to eternity? **30** And were it possible that man could number the particles of the earth, yea, millions of earths like this, it would not be a beginning to the number of thy creations; and thy curtains are stretched out still; and yet thou art there, and thy bosom is there; and also thou art just; thou art merciful and kind forever; **31** And thou has taken Zion to thine own bosom, from all thy creations, from all eternity to all eternity; and naught but

---

<sup>281</sup> Olson, *Enoch*, 177

<sup>282</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 146

<sup>283</sup> *Ibid*, 146

<sup>284</sup> *Ibid*, 191

peace, justice, and truth is the habitation of thy throne and mercy shall go before thy face and have no end; how is it thou canst weep?<sup>285</sup>

Compared with 1En:

**71:14** Then that one approached me and spoke a greeting, and he said: ‘You are the Son of Man who is born to righteousness, and righteousness has remained with you. The righteousness of the Antecedent of Days will not forsake you.’ **15** ‘He also said to me: “He summons forth peace for you in the name of the world to come; for since the creation of the world, peace has come from there, and therefore it will be yours forever, and forever and ever. **16** And everyone will walk in your ways, since righteousness never forsakes you; their dwelling places will be with you, and with you will be their inheritance; and they will never part from you, forever and ever.’<sup>286</sup>

The BMo account is of Enoch speaking to God about his glory, the account from 1En is Enoch arguably speaking about himself as the Son of Man.<sup>287</sup> This comparison merely shares the same subject, namely Enoch, but this is not a poor similarity and not a speech from God about His own glory as Nibley states.

Nibley provides many more similar comparisons: he notes that active wilfulness brings destruction in BMo 6:29 and 1En 63:9 but is unclear about much else;<sup>288</sup> He further states that there is wickedness in Enoch’s world in BMo 5:29-30 and 1En 69:13-14 but although both texts share wickedness, neither shares the same type of wickedness;<sup>289</sup> Nibley goes on to note that there are two references to tent dwelling tribes in BMo 7:5-6 and 1En 56:5 but fails to mention that tents are the only thing which these tribes have in common.<sup>290</sup> The list goes on, but in each of these examples further investigation uncovers a false comparison, which although shows a parallel, hardly shows a similarity or a substantial similarity and in some cases indicates a poor reading of the material by Nibley.

It would seem that for Nibley the real value in his comparisons is the sheer number of them (roughly 275). It is as if the substance of these comparisons does not warrant stricter standards for drawing conclusions.

---

<sup>285</sup> BMo, 7:29-31

<sup>286</sup> 1En, 71:14-16

<sup>287</sup> Olson, *Enoch*, 134

<sup>288</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 186-87

<sup>289</sup> *Ibid*, 182

<sup>290</sup> *Ibid*, 197

Finally, this chapter will continue to refer to the BE unless speaking specifically about a text within that corpus. Furthermore, although 1En is the primary source for the following comparisons, one should not assume that the Ethiopic Enoch (1En) is the only possible source for Smith's influence. For instance, Laurence's preliminary dissertation of his translation of 1En he concludes:

Having thus considered the source from which the present translation was derived, I shall have little occasion to dwell upon the proof, that the Ethiopic version of the Book of Enoch contains precisely the same work as the Greek version, which was known to the fathers.<sup>291</sup>

There are subtle and obvious distinctions which a trained linguist can discern in comparing Smith's passages with either a Greek or Ethiopic version of the BE. However, an investigation that can indicate which version of the BE (Greek or Ethiopic) is more likely related to Smith's EPE is beyond the scope of this work. Suffice it to say that the distinction would limit the sources which might have been available and allow a more thorough comparison to occur. That said, Chapter One clearly shows that both the Ethiopic accounts and many of the Greek fragments related to the First Book of Enoch were available in Britain and America in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Scotsman James Bruce's travel books published in the late 18<sup>th</sup> century included brief notes of the Ethiopic account of Enoch and was available in Scotland and Scotland is where Campbellite founders Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander (the former mentor of Sidney Rigdon) resided prior to their migration stateside. The Greek accounts, one of which was published in London, were all available prior to 1830 and may have been shipped stateside as part of the massive book trade (noted in Chapter Two). In any event, it is not inconceivable that Smith may have had knowledge of both versions.

## **2. An Argument for Substantial Similarities**

The following substantial similarities will exhibit three criteria parallel ideas, similar expressions of those ideas, and are limited to examples which were only available in the BE at the time Smith wrote his EPE. The choice to include comparisons which exhibit each of these criteria decreases the number of comparisons that can be made, but increases the likelihood that these comparisons prove substantial similarities between the BE and EPE

---

<sup>291</sup> Laurence, *Book of Enoch* (1821), xi (xix in the 1832, and 1838 editions)

which are beyond dispute. This section will include comparisons of, 2.1) The Son of Man motif in the Old and New Testaments, 1En and the EPE, 2.2) the relationship between Enoch and Noah in the BE and EPE, and, 2.3) Mahujah, Mahijah and Mahaway and the giants in the Book of Giants and the EPE.

### *2.1. Son of Man*

Using the earliest accounts of the son of man in the OT and 1En to the evolved and transformed accounts in the NT and EPE, this section will argue that knowledge of the Son of Man motif expressed in the EPE was only known to exist in 1En. Further still this section will proceed chronologically, 2.2.1) will look at the son of man in the OT, 2.2.2) how the son of man differs in the Book of Parables (BP) chapters 37-71 in the 1En, 2.2.3) the Son of Man in the NT and, 2.2.4) will emphasize the use of this motif in the EPE as being indicative of Smith's knowledge of the BE and influence by it.

#### *2.1.1 The Son of Man in the OT*

According to Enoch scholar George W.E. Nickelsburg, the term son of man is “a Semitic expression that typically individualizes a noun for humanity in general by prefacing it with ‘son’ ... its meaning can be as indefinite as ‘someone’ or ‘a certain person.’”<sup>292</sup> The term can then be grouped into two categories, according to Brother Sabino Chialà:

There are those for whom ‘Son of Man’ is a Christological title, the fruit of a particular interpretation of the book of Daniel or another text. On the other hand, for quite a few scholars the expression ‘son of man’ is simply a redundant substitute for a personal pronoun or for the noun ‘man.’<sup>293</sup>

The OT accounts of the ‘son of man’ in Numbers 23:19; Isaiah 56:2; Jeremiah 49:18, 33; 50:40; 51:43; Psalms 8:5; and Job 16:21; 25:6; 35:8 use the term as simply synonymous with man.<sup>294</sup> Accordingly, “‘Man’ and ‘son of man’ are meant to be synonyms, and when placed

<sup>292</sup> George W.E. Nickelsburg, ‘Son of Man,’ in David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. vi, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 137

<sup>293</sup> Sabino Chialà, ‘The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,’ in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.) *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 153

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid*, 154-55

in sequence, the second embellishes and accentuates the first.”<sup>295</sup> Chialà differentiates between the books above and the accounts of the term in Ezekiel, where ‘son of man’ appears more than one hundred times and is only ever used by God or his messengers when addressing Ezekiel exclusively. The motif differs even more so in the Book of Daniel, in which the term ‘son of man’ is somewhat transformed. Chialà states:

The expressions ‘one who looked like a man’ and ‘in the image of a son of man’ do not indicate a symbolic figure, as in chap. 7, but a real one; and from Daniel’s reactions we can deduce that the figure or figures in question are of a higher, probably angelic nature. Thus, even though the two expressions cited above are meant simply to emphasize that these are figures who reveal themselves in *human form*, both expressions designate real beings who belong to a higher order than that of the prophet.<sup>296</sup>

In Daniel, chapter 7, the ‘son of man’ is no longer a literary tool used to accentuate or embellish, but rather:

‘Son of Man’ is not a formal title, but a designation used in simile (*‘one like a son of man’*), quite possibly to contrast the cloud-borne figure with the beasts. But although this figure has the appearance of a human being, it is, in fact, a heavenly figure ...<sup>297</sup>

In other words, a shift occurs from the generic application of the term to designate humanity prior to Daniel, to its rather more specific use in Daniel to identify a particular figure who is heavenly with a human appearance. There are few clues about who this character may be, even though Christians have often tried to read into the text an early allusion to Christ), and generally this character remains an abstract concept.

### 2.1.2 The Son of Man in 1En

The Book of Parables (BP) refers to 1En chapters 37-71, although occasionally it is still referred to as the Similitudes of Enoch. The BP is thought to have been the product of Jewish authors in the first century CE and the BP materials differ from the remaining four books of 1En (Book of Watchers, Astronomical Book, Book of Dreams, Epistle of Enoch). According to VanderKam, the text differs in four ways; in the biography of Enoch, the eschatological

<sup>295</sup> This is also evident in some examples found in the Book of Enoch, the Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, the Testament of Abraham, Pseudo-Philo, and the Gospel of Mark (amongst others). *Ibid*, 155

<sup>296</sup> *Ibid*, 158

<sup>297</sup> Nickelsburg, ‘Son of Man,’ in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 138



foes, the use of God's name and, important to our purposes here, in its "extended focus on the eschatological leader."<sup>298</sup> According to VanderKam, this leader in the BP, identified by titles like 'Chosen One' and 'Son of Man' is a dominant character who does not appear in the other four books.

According to Nickelsburg, the BP is a "crucial step in the development of the tradition in Daniel 7."<sup>299</sup> The BP reworks material from the BE chapters 1-36, but is unique in its depiction of a series of events in which a transcendent figure, 'the son of man,' is featured prominently. Drawing on Daniel 7, Psalm 2, and Isaiah 11, 42, 49 and 52-53, the son of man is "a composite figure whom he [the author] considers to be the referent in texts about the heavenly one like a son of man, the Davidic king, and Second Isaiah's servant of the Lord."<sup>300</sup> This movement from an indefinite figure in the OT to one which is full of characteristics and qualities in the BP is the beginning of a shift in how the son of man is understood.

### 2.1.3 The Son of Man in the NT

The Son of Man is understood to be Jesus and as such the motif becomes more specific. Nickelsburg states:

The term 'son of man'; occurs in the NT, with four exceptions (Acts 7, Hebrew 2, and Revelation 1, 14), only in the gospels [at least eighty times], and there always on the lips of Jesus. With one exception (John 5:27), the gospels always use the definite article ('the son of man'), thus introducing the term as a known quantity, even in contexts where it has not been previously defined.<sup>301</sup>

According to Nickelsburg, philological questions persist regarding Jesus' use of the term 'Son of Man' and whether he simply meant 'I', 'me' or rather 'this man.' Jesus' use of the term assumes foreknowledge of the subject and relates to a series of familiar characteristics to which he would add more.<sup>302</sup> The complexity of the term and its use in the NT requires more space than can be given here. Suffice it to say, in Mark the Son of Man already exists

<sup>298</sup> James C. VanderKam, 'The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.) *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 81-82

<sup>299</sup> Nickelsburg, 'Son of Man,' in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 138

<sup>300</sup> *Ibid*, 138

<sup>301</sup> *Ibid*, 142

<sup>302</sup> Chialà, 'The Son of Man,' 163

and Jesus identifies with him and as him, when he says the Son of Man “must die and then rise from the dead” and carry out justification and redemption on earth.<sup>303</sup> In Luke, according to Chialà, the Son of Man “will come first and foremost to put an end to history and inaugurate the kingdom.”<sup>304</sup> This reinterpretation of Mark’s eschatology has ‘superficial’ links to Daniel. Matthew’s account enhances the ability and eschatological role of the Son of Man even further than Mark and Luke, giving him the power to forgive sins, and “more than the other Synoptics, Matthew was undoubtedly influenced by the content of the Parables.”<sup>305</sup> However, it should again be noted that this parallel is not made explicit and furthermore that in the account in Matthew, according to Chialà, the Daniel language is entirely absent. The point being that there is little evidence to support the claim that the understanding of the Son of Man in the NT is supplied by Daniel’s account, or any others, in the OT. Therefore, to assume that knowledge of the Son of Man was made available by Jesus to the authors of the gospels, independent of any other materials is incorrect. The NT heavily relies upon the BP to produce its extensive Son of Man motif.

#### 2.1.4 The Son of Man in the EPE

Moses Stuart suggested that the author of 1En was a Christian Jew, well versed in Jewish traditions but a convert to Christian ideas. Chialà on the other hand states:

What wonder then, with an imperfect knowledge of Christianity, and with the Old Testament predictions respecting the messiah in his eye, the writer of the Book of Enoch should present the *Son of Man* to his readers, as judge and Lord of the world, rather than in any other point of view? It was a natural affect of his condition and of his design.<sup>306</sup>

Stuart’s attempt to justify a ‘Son of Man’ motif related to Jesus in the BE, (a link which is non-existent) resulted in arguing that the author of the BE was formerly a Jew who recently converted to Christianity and who wrote his account during the latter half of the first century CE. Scholars now know both points to be false. Enoch scholar Daniel Olson’s refutation of Stuart resolves any further ideas that the BP was authored by Christians. Olson states:

---

<sup>303</sup> *Ibid*, 165

<sup>304</sup> *Ibid*, 166

<sup>305</sup> *Ibid*, 167

<sup>306</sup> Stuart, *Christology*, 133

... if the ‘Parables’ is a Christian composition inspired by the Gospels, why is there no mention of the earthly life, death, or resurrection of the ‘Son of Man’ figure? The book’s few historical allusions and clues point to ... other Jewish literature of the first and early second centuries CE [and] indicate that the book was being used by Jewish writers during that time—unthinkable if the book were a Christian composition. Finally, it appears that chapter 71 identifies Enoch himself as the ‘Son of Man.’ It is hard to imagine a Christian writing such a thing.<sup>307</sup>

Stuart highlights the fact that although the ‘Son of Man’ motif in the BE may have been inspired by Daniel 7, and influenced the NT accounts, there are distinct differences. However, the use of the term ‘son of man’ in the NT does not denote title, and Stuart’s knowledge of these differences is the result of his having read the BP. How then does one account for Joseph Smith’s knowledge of these differences, as evidenced by his use of the phrase, ‘son of man’ without having read the BE? According to Nibley:

Aside from these occurrences, the title ‘Son of Man’ ‘is never used as a title in the intertestamental literature *except* in the Similitudes of Enoch.’ Here is a very neat test for Joseph Smith: the ‘Son of Man’ title does not occur once in the Book of Mormon, either, and in the Pearl of Great Price it is confined to one brief section of the Book of Enoch where it is used no fewer than seven times—again the Prophet is right on target.<sup>308</sup>

The prophet is right on target, as is Nibley for pointing it out. Smith associated two things that might seem obvious to modern scholars. However, there is no account in canonical scripture that explicitly expresses a link between Enoch and the title ‘Son of Man.’ Hence, Smith’s knowledge of this fact is evidence of some knowledge of the BP found of course in 1En. Additionally, parallels between the EPE and BP offer further controls for testing Smith’s bona fides. The EPE has eight passages which reference the ‘Son of Man’ (BMo 6:57; 7:24, 47, 54, 55, 56, 59, and 65). All eight are a direct reference to the Son of Man as another title for Christ: he is the only begotten (6:57); resides in the bosom of the father (7:24); he cometh in the flesh (7:47, 54); is lifted up on the cross (7:55); crowns saints with glory (7:56); ascends to the Father (7:59); and dwells in righteousness on the earth for a thousand years (7:65).<sup>309</sup> Quinn notes that:

---

<sup>307</sup> Olson, *Enoch*, 8

<sup>308</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 37 citing Campbell Bonner, *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* (London: Christophers, 1937), 22

<sup>309</sup> The D&C contain at least an additional 14 references to the Son of Man, unrelated to Enoch explicitly (as they are not on the lips of Enoch).

... another common criticism of the *Book of Mormon* relates to its unusually extensive pre-Christian knowledge of Jesus Christ. This foreknowledge was far more explicit than the messianic prophecies in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>310</sup>

The application of the ‘Son of Man’ motif to Christ is evident in the NT and easily conceived of as an allusion to Christ by Christians. However, it is precisely this explicit use of the ‘Son of Man’ motif, which Smith place’s on the lips of Enoch when he speaks about Christ that indicates knowledge of the Book of Parables accounts of Enoch and the Son of Man. How else is one meant to explain the use of the term ‘Son of Man’ by Enoch in Smith’s EPE?

Nowhere else is this Enoch/Son of Man relationship exhibited; not in the OT and not in the NT. The OT stands alone with a less explicit eschatology and a definition of the Son of Man that is unlike that which is found in the EPE. 1En, and specifically the BP, expand on the OT and include ‘Son of Man’ motifs unseen before, related through Enoch (and in one instance, related about Enoch as he is believed to be the bearer of the title, 1En 71:14). The NT relies heavily upon the BP and uses the motif extensively in discussions of the Son of Man, without once indicating that knowledge of the Son of Man is in anyway attributable to, or can be associated with, Enoch and/or Enochic materials. Yet Smith’s EPE exhibits a relationship between Enoch and the ‘Son of Man’ motif otherwise unknown to those reading only the Old and New Testaments. Smith recounts Enoch discussing the Son of Man a total of seven times. Could this be a mere coincidence? Of all the prophets in the BoM, the PGP, and the D&C, why Enoch?

## 2.2. *Enoch and Noah*

The relationship between Enoch and Noah has always been interesting. In Genesis, Enoch and Noah are listed in a genealogy together where Enoch is listed as Noah’s great grandfather (Enoch begat Methuselah, who begat Lamech, who begat Noah). In addition, Enoch and Noah separately both walked with God (Gen. 5:22 and 6:9) something which no other person in the Bible does. Enoch, in fact, was translated (as he did not die) sixty-nine years before Noah was born. Genesis provides no further reason to relate Enoch and Noah.

---

<sup>310</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 210

The relationship of these two figures in the BMo, however, is far more extensive. First, whilst speaking with God, Enoch is given visions of past and future events (this accounts for a majority of the EPE narrative). The BMo states:

7:42 And Enoch also saw Noah, and his family ...

7:43 Wherefore Enoch saw that Noah built an ark ...

7:45 And it came to pass that Enoch looked; and from Noah, he beheld all the families of the earth ...

7:49 And when Enoch heard the earth mourn, he wept, and cried unto the Lord ... that thou wilt have mercy upon Noah and his seed.

These passages indicate that Enoch is somehow watching Noah and can observe him without interacting with him. This odd relationship continues:

7:51 And the Lord could not withhold; and he covenanted with Enoch, and sware unto him with an oath, that he would stay the floods; that he would call upon the children of Noah ...

7:60 And the Lord said unto Enoch: As I live, even so will I come in the last days; in the days of wickedness and vengeance, to fulfil the oath which I have made unto you concerning the children of Noah.

8:2 And it came to pass that Methuselah, the son of Enoch, was not taken, that the covenants of the Lord might be fulfilled, which he made to Enoch; for he truly covenanted with Enoch that Noah should be the fruit of his loins.

Most interesting in the BMo is not the idea of covenant (which is evident throughout the Bible), nor the account of the flood (again hardly new), but rather is the view of God's traditional covenant, with Noah in the Biblical account (Gen 6:18), instead being made with Enoch (BMo 7:51). Smith's account of the flood shifts God's command to save humanity from Noah to Enoch, and tells Noah's flood story through visions first given to Enoch. It is difficult to conceive of any relationship between Enoch and Noah in the OT, yet, in the BMo, Smith's account of these two men becomes far more dynamic. An account of a dynamic relationship between Enoch and Noah does exist in the BE however.

Present in the final chapters of 1En (106:1-107:3) is a story often called the *Birth of Noah*. As the story goes, Enoch had been translated (to where is difficult to say) and Enoch's grandson Lamech watched his wife give birth to a child who did not appear human (1En

106:2) but rather angelic. Lamech fled to his father Methuselah, who in turn went to the ends of the earth to seek guidance from his own translated father Enoch, who tells Methuselah in 1En:

106:13 ... the Lord will accomplish new things on the earth, and this I have already seen in a vision and have announced to you.<sup>311</sup>

Enoch then recounts the fallen and their children as he continues:

106:15 And there will be a great destruction over the whole earth, and there will be a flood and a great destruction for one year.<sup>312</sup>

106:16 But this son who has been born to you, he will remain on the earth, and his three children will be saved with him; when all human beings are upon the earth die, he and his children will be saved.<sup>313</sup>

1En gives an account of an extended relationship between Enoch and Noah that has substantial similarities to Smith's own account in the BMo.

These substantial similarities continue as the author(s) of 1En apply anthropomorphic language to the earth in the flood account. This is a unique idea not seen in the OT, an idea that limits the earth to a place *on which* corruption and flooding occurs. 1En states:

106:17*b* And on the earth there will be a great punishment, and the earth will be cleansed from all corruption.<sup>314</sup>

107:3*b* And he called the name of the son 'Noah', for he will bring joy [sometimes translated as Noah will comfort] to the earth from all its destruction.<sup>315</sup>

Loren T. Stuckenbruck notes that the Greek version of this passage, differs from the Ethiopic except for its "mention of 'corruption' in relation to 'the earth'"<sup>316</sup> furthers this anthropomorphic idea. The Greek version says "and he [Noah] will tame the earth from the corruption which is in it."<sup>317</sup> The Greek version provides an anthropomorphic view of the earth that implies it must be tamed and that the corruption is not the result of persons on the earth, but rather of the earth itself.

<sup>311</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 663

<sup>312</sup> *Ibid.*, 668

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, 669

<sup>314</sup> *Ibid.*, 670

<sup>315</sup> *Ibid.*, 688 Cf. Olson notes the variation in translation. Olson, *Enoch*, 255

<sup>316</sup> *Ibid.*, 670

<sup>317</sup> *Ibid.*, 670

A similarly anthropomorphic earth is evident in the BMo, which states:

6:49 ... O Lord, wilt thou not have compassion upon the earth?

6:58 And again Enoch wept and cried unto the Lord, saying: when shall the earth rest?

6:55 And he [Enoch] heard a loud voice; and the heavens were veiled; ... and the earth groaned

7:48 And it came to pass that Enoch looked upon the earth; and he heard a voice from the bowels thereof, saying: Wo, wo is me, the mother of men; I am pained, I am weary, because of the wickedness of my children. When shall I rest, and be cleansed from the filthiness which is gone forth out of me? When will my creator sanctify me that I may rest, and righteousness for a season abide upon my face?

A human-like earth is not a new idea. An expression of earth as human-like in an account related to Enoch and Noah together, however, is beyond parallels. This is a substantial similarity that cannot be explained away as mere coincidence. In the EPE and in 1En: A) Enoch has a vision of the impending flood (1En 91:5; BMo 7:43); B) Enoch sees Noah and his posterity survive (1En 106:18; BMo 7:43; 52); C) Enoch knows Noah's future through an eschatological vision directed by God (1En 106:13-18; BMo 7:44-45; 51); and, D) an anthropomorphised earth suffers only to be healed by Noah (1En 107:3; BMo 7:48-50). It is not difficult to consider that 1En and the BMo might share the idea of Enoch and Noah having had a relationship. It is the substantial similarities of the expression of this idea that provide overwhelming cause for consideration.

### 2.3. *Mahujah, Mahijah, and Mahaway*

In the 1970's Hugh Nibley was visited by Enoch scholar Matthew Black. Father J.T. Milik with Black had just completed and published *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments* on the Dead Sea Scroll fragments related to Enoch. The book sparked in Nibley an interest in the relationship between Mahujah and Mahijah, from the EPE, and Mahaway, mentioned in Milik and Black's book. This relationship would come to provide Nibley with the ultimate proof of the authenticity (refer to Nibley's standards for "tests of authenticity" in Chapter Two) of the BMo. Nibley recounts in his meeting with Black:

Matthew Black came here [to BYU] the week it [Milik and Black's book] came out. He sent me a letter before he came and said, 'Is there anything you would like me to discuss about Enoch when I get there.' I said, 'Yes, the story of Mahujah and Mahijah.'<sup>318</sup>

... As I said, Matthew Black was coming. He had just got this work out. I said, 'How about this? Joseph Smith has this story, and nobody else has it. Where did he get it from?' He wouldn't talk about it (absolutely nothing). When he came from the airport, he had it in his pocket. He said, 'Here's your letter here.' I said, 'All right, how about Mahijah and Mahujah?' Nothing. I had one four-hour conversation with him, and he never let out a peep about it. That's when we went to a concert together. But he did let this out. Walking along, he said, 'Well, someday we will find out the source that Joseph Smith used. Someday we'll find it; we'll find it, don't worry.' Well, just what are the chances of Joseph Smith (living in Kirtland, Ohio, in 1830) getting hold of any of these sources or anything else? Of course, none of this was there. But when you get things like this, they are awfully hard to explain. It is really quite remarkable.<sup>319</sup>

There are two quite remarkable instances in this account by Nibley. First, Black considered Smith's account of Mahijah and Mahujah unoriginal and assumes it came from a source. Second, Black's assumption that Smith was influenced by an unrecovered source led Nibley to argue why this is false (Smith had no access), rather than considering how it may be true. However, Nibley does argue for the parallels between Smith's account of Mahijah and Mahujah and the account of Mahaway in the Book of Giant (believed to have once been part of the Enochic corpus) as follows:

What always impressed me as the oddest detail of the Joseph Smith account of Enoch was the appearance out of the blue of the name of the only nonbiblical individual named in the whole book—Mahijah. (Moses 6:40.) Mahijah is the one who asks Enoch searching questions, and in answer is told about the place Mahujah, where Enoch began this particular phase of his mission. (Moses 7:2.) It was therefore with a distinct shock of recognition that, after having looked through all but the last of the Aramaic Enoch fragments without finding anything particularly new, and coming to those very last little fragments, I found the name Mahujah leaping out of the pages again and again. ... Could this be our Mahujah or Mahijah? As a matter of fact it could be either, not only because the semi-vowels *w* and *y* are written very much alike in Aramaic script and are sometimes confused by scribes, but also because the

<sup>318</sup> 'LDS Books,' Accessed 11 June 2009 <http://ldsbooks.narod.ru/books/Ancient-Documents-and-the-Pearl-of-Great-Price-by-Hugh-Nibley.html> Hugh Nibley, *Ancient Documents and the Pearl of Great Price*

<sup>319</sup> 'The Mormon Curtain,' Accessed 11 June 2009 [http://www.mormoncurtain.com/topic\\_thepearlofgreatprice.html](http://www.mormoncurtain.com/topic_thepearlofgreatprice.html) Hugh Nibley, *Ancient Documents and the Pearl of Great Price*



name as written in 4QEn, MHWY, is the same as the MHWY-EL who appears in Genesis 4:18 as the grandfather of Enoch, transliterated in the King James Bible as *Mehuja-el*, which name also appears in the Greek Septuagint as *Mai-el* and in the Latin Vulgate as *Mavia-el*, showing that Mahujah and Mahijah were the same name, since *Mai* (the Greek had no internal 'h') could only come from Mahi-.<sup>320</sup>

Forsberg notes that Hebrew is not a vocalized language and hence the vowels are absent.<sup>321</sup> Therefore, Hebrew names may be rendered in several ways simply by inserting different vowels. For instance, MHWY may be rendered Mahaway or Mahawai. Hence, Nibley can make a valid case for Mahujah or Mahijah being rendered in a similar way to Mahaway.

Mahaway is the name of a giant in the pseudepigraphic Book of Giants (BG). Father Milik (amongst others) suggested that the BG might once have belonged to the BE.<sup>322</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, a prominent Enoch and Pseudepigrapha scholar, has written a key work in the discussion on the BG.<sup>323</sup> In it, Stuckenbruck notes that although initially thought to have been a Manichaean work whose composition was attributed to Mani (a third century CE Persian prophet) the Huguenot scholar, Isaac de Beausobre made a case for its earlier existence.<sup>324</sup> 20<sup>th</sup> century scholarship has since placed the composition of the BG within the time of the Second Temple period.<sup>325</sup> Fabled to have been discovered in a field by Noah's great grandson after the flood, the BG is obscure in western history with the exception of its brief mention by Syncellus.<sup>326</sup> The BG is simply a further development in detail, of the first part of the Ethiopic account of Enoch (1En 1-36).<sup>327</sup> For instance, 1En 12-16 is composed of Enoch's announcements of punishment to the Watchers, but the BG tells how the giants come to learn about their doom. Stuckenbruck states:

It remains, however, that this dependence should not be allowed to detract from the presence of several details unparalleled in other early Jewish literature. Most conspicuous is the fact that in BG the giants are given names (e.g. 'Ohyah, Hahyah, Mahaway, Gilgamesh, Hobabish). In turn, these characters seem to have been assigned specific roles in the story:

---

<sup>320</sup> Nibley, *Enoch the Prophet*, 278

<sup>321</sup> Forsberg, *Equal Rites*, 34-35

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, 34-35

<sup>323</sup> Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)

<sup>324</sup> *Ibid.*, vii

<sup>325</sup> *Ibid.*, vii

<sup>326</sup> *Ibid.*, vii

<sup>327</sup> Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 298

for instance, Mahaway acts as a mediary who is sent to Enoch by the giants and who returns with Enoch's interpretations of their dreams ...<sup>328</sup>

Stuckenbruck makes several critical distinctions here that serve this thesis well. First, the BG expands on the Genesis accounts (much like the BE) and would be incomprehensible without such knowledge. Second, this dependence on 1En 12-16 does not imply that the BG had no independent content of its own which was, 'unparalleled in other Jewish literature.' Third, that the most conspicuously independent content is the names of the giants, including Mahaway. Fourth, that Mahaway acts as a mediary who seeks Enoch to have him interpret the giant's dreams.<sup>329</sup>

The name Mahaway in the BG and the names Mahujah and Mahijah in the BMo represent the strongest similarity between the EPE and BE (specifically the BG). Mah[i]jah and Mah[u]jah, separated only by a single vowel, are according to Mormon commentary a reference to a person (Mahijah) and a place (Mahujah). But I disagree. The next section will show that contrary to Mormon belief of Mahijah and Mahujah referring to a person and a place respectively, these two names actually refer to a single person. It should be noted that although this last point is not necessary to prove substantial similarities between the EPE and the BE, if correct it may offer further proof of the substantial similarities of expression.

The rest of this section will 2.3.1) argue that a simple mistranslation of the original BMo text resulted in a misappropriation of the role and function of Mahujah, 2.3.2) an argument for coincidence and, 2.3.3) an argument for substantial similarities between Mahujah, Mahijah and Mahaway.

### 2.3.1 A Discrepancy in the Text?

Although this thesis has employed the current Mormon Church scripture for quotes, the current BMo is not a direct copy of either of the original transcripts noted in Chapter One (OT1 or OT2). The first copy (second manuscript, OT2) of the original transcriptions (OT1) is the primary source material for the contemporary edition of the BMo.<sup>330</sup> Mormon Kent P.

<sup>328</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 27

<sup>329</sup> In 1En, Enoch similarly arbitrates between the angels and God, as Mahaway mediates between Enoch and the giants in the BG.

<sup>330</sup> As further revelations were written on OT2 rather than returning to OT1 (although some corrections were later made to OT1 as well). Jackson, *The Book of Moses*, 7

Jackson states, “OT2 shows signs of subsequent correcting, editing and amending.”<sup>331</sup> There are also corrections done to “copying errors or errors made when the prophet was dictating from his Bible and his eyes skipped from one line to the next, resulting in omitted material.”<sup>332</sup> Jackson offers a detailed accounting of changes, omissions, a list of grammatical corrections for the copy produced by John Whitmer (OT2 from OT1), and the Rigdon corrections with correlating Bible passages.<sup>333</sup> According to Jackson, “In general, Joseph Smith’s scribes wrote without using punctuation, which sometimes makes it difficult to interpret the intended meaning of his words.”<sup>334</sup> Smith’s intended meaning is further complicated by copies fraught with errors and the omission of key words. It is those errors provide proof of a misreading of the name of Mahujah as a place.

The inclusion of the word ‘I’ in the Book of Moses 7:2 is particularly important to understanding the name Mahujah in its proper context as a person, not a place. The BMo states:

---

<sup>331</sup> *Ibid*, 7

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid*, 7

<sup>333</sup> All of these corrections beg the question, at what point do corrections to scripture diminish or remove entirely divine inspiration?

<sup>334</sup>

7:2 And from that time forth Enoch began to prophesy, saying unto the people, that: As I was journeying, and stood upon the place Mahujah, and cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of heaven, saying—Turn ye, and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

7:2 And, from that time forth Enoch began to prophesy, saying unto the people, that, as I was Journeying And stood in the place Mahujah, and I cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of Heaven, Saying, turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

7:2 And from that time forth, Enoch began to prophesy, saying unto the people that: “As I was journeying and stood in the place Mahujah and cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of heaven, saying: ‘Turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

From left to right: the first column is copied from current Mormon Scripture (2007 publishing of the 1981 edition);<sup>335</sup> the second column is copied from OT2 (the first copy of the original manuscript);<sup>336</sup> and the third column is copied from OT1 (the original transcript),<sup>337</sup> I will retain this column format throughout, unless otherwise noted. Note the differences in punctuation particularly the comma which follows the name Mahujah in the first and second column and its absence in the right column this will be discussed in detail later. Also, in the second column Jackson has opted to strike through the letter ‘I.’ According to Jackson’s legend, this indicates, “cancelled text, whether written over or removed through erasure or strikeout ... ”<sup>338</sup> and he notes that this deletion of ‘I’ is the result of a ‘scribe undetermined.’ The differences are slight, but the implications are considerable.

The following three points are important considerations that offer perspective on the text and allow for possible readings of this case. First, in column one the phrase “stood upon the place” differs from the column three original “stood in the place.” In fact, both OT1 and OT2 use “in the place.” The column one modern version, however, assumes Mahujah is the place, hence making sense for Enoch (as he is speaking about himself) to stand “upon” a place. However, one must ask why Smith would choose to say “stood in,” when “stood upon” makes more sense and is used more frequently, including in the very next verse (BMo 7:3) of the three translations above, when he writes:

<sup>335</sup> 2007 printing of the 1981 edition of the BoM

<sup>336</sup> Jackson, *The Book of Moses*, 117 (OT2)

<sup>337</sup> *Ibid*, 164 (OT1)

<sup>338</sup> *Ibid*, 54

7:3 And it came to pass that I turned and went up on the mount; and as I stood upon the mount, I beheld the heavens open, and I was clothed upon with glory;	7:3 And it came to pass, that I turned and went upon the mount; And, as I stood upon the mount, I beheld the Heavens open, and I was clothed upon with glory,	7:3 And it came to pass that I turned and went upon the mount. And as I stood upon the mount, I beheld the heavens open, and I was clothed upon with glory.
--	---	---

Smith knows how to use the term ‘upon.’ He does so in the next passage and yet chooses not to do so when speaking about Mahujah.<sup>339</sup> The significance of this difference is either the result of real intention (i.e. Smith had something specific in mind when writing the passage in such a way), or it is simply a discrepancy having to do with the transmission of the work. Whether intentionally different or a mistake in transmission, the use of the phrase ‘stood in’ stands in stark contrast to the heavily used ‘stood upon.’

Second, according to Old English, the etymology for ‘ye’ was governed by one simple rule: ‘thou’ addressed one person, and ‘ye’ addressed more than one. This implies Enoch is not alone, and indicates that there is a second person present in the narrative. This is perfectly clear as the BMo states in 7:1 “And it came to pass that Enoch continued his speech, saying: Behold ... ,” and in 7:2, “And from that time forth Enoch began to prophesy ... [and] there came a voice out of heaven, saying: Turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon.”<sup>340</sup>

The narrator makes it clear that Enoch is amongst others. He is speaking and prophesying to the people. Clearly he is not alone.

The third important consideration is that Enoch is quoted throughout these verses as speaking in the first person. He does so often in verses 7:2-3 when he states quite emphatically that, “I was journeying and stood ... ,” “I turned and went ... ,” “I stood ... ,” “I beheld ... ,” and “I was clothed ...” His use of the first person is consistent, and thus is conspicuously absent from his having ‘cried unto the Lord’ (7:2). If Enoch is listing these occurrences then the name Mahujah fits. Enoch would then be saying ‘as I was journeying, *and* [I] stood in the place, Mahujah *and* cried unto the Lord ...’

However, this argument that Mahujah is Enoch’s companion and not a place on which Enoch stands requires more proof. That proof is found in OT1. Kent P. Jackson provides an image

---

<sup>339</sup> Jackson notes that the modern version separates ‘upon’ to read ‘up on’ (this is consistent with the 1921, 1902, 1888, and 1878 editions).

<sup>340</sup> BMo, 7:1-2

of OT1 (the original manuscript) that differs from his translation of the passage.<sup>341</sup> Jackson is not the first to make the mistake of mistranslating OT1. This mistranslation was made as early as 1832 in a publication of the EPE in *The Evening and Morning Star*. On page five Jackson includes an image of “*Old Testament Manuscript 1, page 15, December 1830; handwriting of John Whitmer (to bracket in line 16) and Sidney Rigdon; Moses 6:64-7:10*”<sup>342</sup> and on page thirteen an image of the “*‘Extract from the Prophecy of Enoch,’ The Evening and the Morning Star, August 1832, page 2 (top of page), Independence, Missouri; first publication of an excerpt from the New Translation; Moses 7:111, 32-44.*”<sup>343</sup> Following from left to right: the first column is Jackson’s copy of OT1; the second column is from the copied image of the 1832 publication in *The Evening and Morning Star*; the third column is from the copied image of OT1, the first ever writings.

---

<sup>341</sup> Obviously, gaining access to the actual OT1 manuscript is extremely difficult and so I was forced to rely on the images provided in Jackson’s book.

<sup>342</sup> Jackson, *Book of Moses*, 15

<sup>343</sup> *Ibid*, 2

7:2 And from that time forth, Enoch began to prophesy, saying unto the people that: “As I was journeying and stood in the place Mahujah and cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of heaven, saying: ‘Turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

7:2 And from that time forth Enoch began to prophesy, saying unto the people, That, as I was journeying and stood upon the place Mahujah, and I cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of heaven, saying, Turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

7:2 and from that time ~~fourth~~ forth Enoch began to prophecy saying unto the people,[\*] that as I was journ[ey]ing and stood in the place [\*\*] Mahujah and I cried unto the Lord there came a voice out of heaven saying turn ye and get ye upon the mount Simeon....

Note that the earliest accounts, the second column from the 1832 published article and the third column from the December 1830 original manuscript, both include ‘I’ in their account.<sup>344</sup> Interestingly enough, it is the 1832 publication that inserts a comma after Mahujah, although no such comma appears in the original. Although unclear, in the image, there is in the original either a comma or period [\*] after “people,” and a large space [\*\*] between “place” and the name “Mahujah.” One can only speculate as to whether this space was intended or not. It could have been a pause which Smith indicated to Rigdon during his translation, or an assumed pause by Rigdon, or merely a space with no implications whatsoever. Otherwise, there are no other differences between the second and third columns. One need not speculate as to the inclusion of ‘I’ in the original transcript. It was included.

Therefore, Smith’s inclusion of ‘I’ in his original manuscript, in addition to its inclusion in the first publication in 1832 is a sign of intent, not a discrepancy. Furthermore, the context, the inconsistency of form compared with the next verse (and the use of the phrase ‘mount Simeon’), the use of ‘stood in’ rather than ‘upon,’ the further use of the plural phrase ‘ye’ that suggests God is speaking to Enoch and a companion rather than Enoch alone and, finally the position of ‘I’ all indicate that Mahujah was not intended to be the name of a place, but rather of a person.

This inaccuracy may be the fault of Smith’s revelation, rather than a mistranslation. James R. Harris notes, “if the divine communication is to be transmitted to others, the prophet must represent the concepts given him in the thought symbols at his command. The concepts are divine, but the language is still human.”<sup>345</sup> Given the argument above and according to the

<sup>344</sup> The middle and far right columns have images of the original works in question. *Ibid*, 5, 13

<sup>345</sup> Harris, *Changes in the Book of Moses*, 12

image of 7:2 found in Jackson's book, I believe Smith's original December 1830 manuscript should read,

As I was journeying and stood in the place, Mahujah and I cried unto the Lord, there came a voice out of heaven, saying—Turn ye, and get ye upon the mount Simeon.

This passage makes sense given what we know about Enoch (in the Book of Moses) standing upon the hills, prophesying to the people, Mahijah coming to Enoch to ask him a question, Enoch answering questions and prophesying some more (6:41-6:48) and Enoch continuing his speech and standing *with* Mahijah, not *on* Mahujah.

This reading begs the question, why are the two names written differently? It is possible that this was a simple mistake, as these two passages were written by two different scribes at two different times (Emma Smith having transcribed 6:40 and Sidney Rigdon, 7:2). Either Rigdon or Emma Smith, or both, may have misheard or simply misspelled the name. It is also possible that Joseph Smith misspoke the name or did not say it clearly. In any event, Harris' statement that "the concepts given to a prophet were and are divine; the words with which he transmitted them are and were human"<sup>346</sup> is not inconsistent with the argument presented here.

Finally, the passages leading up to 7:2 are meant to frame the vision Enoch receives in 7:2-69. As such, an immediate shift occurs in the narrative, from a response by Enoch to a question from Mahijah (6:40-7:1) to a vision by Enoch which includes Mahujah (7:2-69). It is with the above narrative shift that my argument for Mahujah and Mahijah being one person makes sense.

### 2.3.2 A Coincidence?

Yet unconsidered is the possibility that Smith simply melded together two words or made up a name that coincidentally has similarities with Mahaway. D. Michael Quinn notes of the name Nephi:

The name 'Nephi' appears in some of the most important sections of doctrine and history in the *Book of Mormon*. In the Apocrypha, Nephi was a geographic name. Nephi was also the first part of two names in the King James Bible, 'Nephish' and 'Nephishesim' (1 Chron. 5:19;

---

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid*, 15



Neh. 7:52). Publications before 1830 specified that ‘Nephilim’ (translated ‘giants’ in LXX Gen. 6:4) was the term for the offspring of intercourse between angels and humans.<sup>347</sup>

Like Mahijah/Mahujah, Nephi is associated with giants and a geographic location, and is noted by Quinn as having been the prefix for countless names included in Gnosticism, magic circles contemporary to Smith, and published works advertised in and around Smith’s home.<sup>348</sup> In fact, in 1839 Smith’s official church history noted that it was Nephi, not Moroni, who appeared to him three times on that fateful night in 1823. This inaccuracy is often downplayed as a ‘clerical error,’ yet, when given the chance to correct it in 1842, Smith himself did not.<sup>349</sup> It later becomes clear that Smith was using Nephi as a substitute name for Moroni (substitute names will be further discussed in Chapter Four).<sup>350</sup> The point of this is to illustrate the importance of names to Smith. Moroni, for instance, is associated with geographic locations,<sup>351</sup> but is also the product of a conflation of names. Raphael, another name prominent in the Apocrypha and unknown in traditional Biblical sources, was somehow used in a Smith family parchment.<sup>352</sup> Smith even employed codenames for himself and other church elders (discussed in Chapter Four). Given Smith’s interest in and use of names of conflated or difficult origin (i.e. all of the names of the prophets in the Book of Mormon), it is not difficult to conceive of Mahijah/Mahujah as the name of a geographic location and person, or simply as a person as I have argued, that shares no relation to Mahaway. However, Nibley does not believe this is the case and hence the next section will consider whether or not substantial similarities exist. Suffice it to say, if substantial similarities do exist, Smith’s use of names will only stand to be illuminated, rather than irrelevant.

### 2.3.3 A Substantial Similarity?

Two similar yet independent ideas, like Mahujah/Mahijah and Mahaway, do not necessarily indicate a substantial similarity. A similar expression of those two ideas does indicate substantial similarities. However, considering how Mahijah/Mahujah function within the narrative may indicate a substantial similarity.

---

<sup>347</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 198

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid*, 198

<sup>349</sup> *Ibid*, 199

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid*, 199

<sup>351</sup> *Ibid*, 155

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid*, 113

The extract of the prophecy of Enoch begins with the story of Enoch's calling and mission. The EPE continues to note that there were preachers before the flood who taught repentance; and the spirit of God descended upon Enoch and asked him to prophesy unto the people as well. Given this decree Enoch goes forth to teach. He begins to testify against the works of the people and they leave their tents behind to come and see him (623-6:38). The narration continues:

6:39 And it came to pass when they heard him, no man laid hands on him; for fear came on all them that heard him; for he walked with God.

6:40 And there came a man unto him [Enoch], whose name was Mahijah, and said unto him: Tell us plainly who thou art, and from whence thou comest?

The story then shifts to a speech by Enoch. One Mormon commentator on doctrine notes that the fear of Enoch prevented men from laying hands upon him (6:39) and that this fear is embodied by Mahijah who asks Enoch, 'Who are you?'<sup>353</sup> From this account we know little about the 'tent' people generally and know even less about the enigmatic figure of Mahijah. What we do know is that Mahijah left the people and went up the hill and high places to where Enoch to ask him a question. Enoch responds in a long speech about God's plan of salvation through the flood to Mahijah and his people. The speech begins in verse 6:41 and ends in 7:1.

Mahaway begins a similar journey to ask Enoch a question in the BG. Dead Sea Scroll fragment 4Q530 (from the BG) states in 1:21-24:

... they summoned Mahaway. And he came ... and they sent him to Enoch the [scribe of interpretation.] And they said to him, 'go [to Enoch, because knowledge of] the location and height are yours (and) because [you know and] have heard his voice. And speak to him so that he sha[ll] explain [to] you the interpretation of the dreams ...'<sup>354</sup>

The emphasis that the Smith places on Mahijah's travel to Enoch is eerily similar to the account of Mahaway to Enoch in the BG. Like Mahijah, Mahaway travels to Enoch to ask him a question at which point the narrative shifts and Enoch responds in a vision or speech. This journey however is not unique to the BG, it is also found (and likely based on) the

<sup>353</sup> Draper, *The Pearl of Great Price*, 96

<sup>354</sup> Brackets and parentheses indicate missing and/or distorted pieces. An allusion to 1En 106:6-8 in which Enoch's son Methuselah partakes in a similar journey. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants*, 126

journey of Methuselah in 1En (*The Birth of Noah*).<sup>355</sup> At the behest of his son Lamech, Methuselah journey's to Enoch to ask him a question, to which Enoch responds in a vision or speech. This format, for one person journeying to Enoch to question him, is evident once more in 1En (*The Apocalypse of Noah*).<sup>356</sup> Noah, having noticed that the earth's destruction was near, journey's to Enoch to ask him about what was taking place, Enoch responds in a vision or speech. Individually these parallels may appear small, but when viewed together and added to the variety of other parallels and substantial similarities, and taken within context, a clear case for influence begins to emerge.

### 3. Re-Assessing Authorship

Forsberg notes a view held by Mormons and non-Mormons alike:

A Manuscript copy of the Book of Mormon with someone else's name on it has yet to be discovered. Until such time, it makes sense to presume that Smith is the book's author.<sup>357</sup>

Forsberg's point is viable, yet fails to account for access, the nature of substantial similarities and the role of quantitative analysis like stylometry. A recent study by Matthew L. Jockers and a team at Stanford University will provide a clear case for stylometry. Jockers and his team utilised the program "'Delta' commonly used to determine probable authorship and 'nearest shrunken centroid' (NSC), a more generally applicable classifier."<sup>358</sup> According to Jockers the 'Delta' technique is a well known and documented method of computational linguistics (that warranted no further description), and "NSC is a statistical technique for classification in high dimensional settings."<sup>359</sup> Although this study does not consider Enoch, the EPE or the BE, it does give an argument for influence having occurred in the Book of Mormon, which indirectly supports any argument that suggests Smith was influenced.

The use of stylometric technologies on Mormon scripture and other religious material is not new. The Stanford team recounted two such test cases in particular that related to Mormon studies.

---

<sup>355</sup> 1En, 106:1-107:3

<sup>356</sup> 1En, 65:1-68:1 (or it is sometimes suggested it ends in 69:25). Olson, *Enoch*, 120

<sup>357</sup> Forsberg, *Equal Rites*, 32

<sup>358</sup> Matthew L. Jockers, Daniela M. Witten, Craig S. Criddle, 'Reassessing authorship of the Book of Mormon using delta and nearest shrunken centroid classification' (Oxford University Press, 2009), 1

<sup>359</sup> Jockers, *Reassessing*, 6

The first, a 1980 test by Wayne Larsen and the team at Brigham Young University, set out to test whether the BoM was the product of a single or multiple author(s). It concluded that Smith was neither the author nor a contributor, and that multiple authors were probably responsible for the BoM. But several problems are now known to have occurred in Larsen's test that obstructed its accuracy, including incorrect clusters of characters (i.e. grouping together persons without affiliation in the texts) and reliance upon context sensitive words (i.e. 'forth,' 'behold,' 'lest,' etc.). For these reasons and others, Jockers states, "even sympathetic scholars such as statistician D. James Croft (1981) caution against reading too much into Larsen's results."<sup>360</sup>

The second case, published in 1988 by John L. Hilton's team, claimed to have improved upon Larsen's 1980 findings and yet reached a similar conclusion. Once more, Jockers notes a similarly faulty form of character clustering, and additionally using "a composite compilation of selections from four sources based upon what he [Croft] and his team judged to be the oldest,"<sup>361</sup> rather than using a single manuscript, or the 1830 BoM as their primary source.

Jockers and the team at Stanford took a new approach. They examined, "the entire 1830 *Book of Mormon* without any *a priori* assumptions, modifications or pre selections,"<sup>362</sup> by using a mathematical "process to define the features of the author samples,"<sup>363</sup> by employing two techniques Delta and NSC, and by using "prominent period-authors who were added as controls."<sup>364</sup> The seven potential authors included in the test were: 1) Oliver Cowdery (cousin to Smith and scribe on the BMo); 2) Parley P. Pratt (disciple of Sidney Rigdon and an early elder of the Mormon Church); 3) Sidney Rigdon (Smith's consultant, Church elder and sometimes scribe); 4) Solomon Spaulding (author of '*Manuscript Found*,' which is believed by some to have been the inspiration for the BoM); 5) the author of Isaiah-Malachi (from the Bible); 6) Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, a prominent author and Joseph Smith contemporary, and 7) Joel Barlow, also a prominent author during Smith's time. Longfellow and Barlow were added to the list as test controls as neither author was in a position to have contributed to the BoM. To ensure accuracy for testing, Longfellow and Barlow must consistently rank as 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> least likely of the list of names, to have made contributions to the BoM. This ranking acts as proof that testing works. The test required a sample of works

---

<sup>360</sup> *Ibid*, 4

<sup>361</sup> *Ibid*, 4

<sup>362</sup> *Ibid*, 5

<sup>363</sup> *Ibid*, 6

<sup>364</sup> *Ibid*, 6

outside of the BoM from each of the seven potential authors. These works provided a comparison text from which Jockers and his team would produce a series of rankings from 1<sup>st</sup> or most likely to have contributed to 7<sup>th</sup>, least likely to have contributed. The Stanford study concluded that:

The NSC results are consistent with the Spalding-Rigdon theory of authorship. ... the presence of a dominant Rigdon signal in most theological sections and a strong Spalding signal in the more secular, narrative sections. Our findings are consistent with historical scholarship indicating a central role for Rigdon in securing and modifying a now-missing Spalding manuscript. The high number of Spalding-Rigdon pairings in first and second place strongly suggests that Spalding and Rigdon were responsible for a large part of the text. ...

Based on this evidence, we find the original claims of Howe (1834, 1977) and the more recent assertions of Cowdery and co-workers quite plausible; it seems likely that the 1830 version of the *Book of Mormon* was the creation of Sidney Rigdon, a Reformed Baptist Preacher, who had motives, means, and opportunity to carry out the project (Cowdery *et al.*, 2005).<sup>365</sup>

In Rigdon's case, all the sampled prose used in the Stanford study was written after 1830 leaving open the possibility that the BoM had influenced Rigdon and not that Rigdon had influenced the BoM. The study also found that:

Prior exposure to the Book of Mormon most certainly did not influence Solomon Spalding who died fourteen years before it was published. Yet our data strongly support the historical claim that a lost Spalding manuscript served as a source text for the backbone narrative of the *Book of Mormon*.<sup>366</sup>

Spaulding's sample was 'Manuscript Story' also known as the 'Oberlin Manuscript.' Jocker's team noted that the Spaulding-Rigdon theory relies on the existence of other works by Spaulding, which, to date have not been found. The study continues:

Of course, we have not considered every possible candidate-author who may have influenced the composition of the Book of Mormon. We have, however, selected from among the most likely candidates, excepting perhaps Joseph Smith. In the case of Joseph Smith, we had no reliable samples of prose to test. When reliably identified materials become available, their

---

<sup>365</sup> *Ibid*, 18

<sup>366</sup> *Ibid*, 18

addition to this analysis would be worth considering. An effort to compile such writings is currently underway.<sup>367</sup>

The Stanford study is clear in its findings. Not only does it conclude that influence occurred it argues that much of the BoM was written by others (including Rigdon, a scribe on the BMo).

#### **4. Conclusion**

Substantial similarities and influence as argued by the Stanford study both support this thesis' larger argument that Joseph Smith's EPE was influenced by the BE. Hugh Nibley's assumption that Smith's EPE was the result of independent and wholly divine revelation is not viable. There is clear evidence which favours access by Smith to materials related to the BE and, as this chapter has shown, there exists a degree of substantial similarities not easily dismissed as coincidence. The use of the Son of Man motif, the relationship of Enoch and Noah, and the accounts of the journey's to question Enoch between Mahijah, Mahaway, Methuselah and Noah, all establish enough substantial similarity to argue that Smith was influenced. That each of these ideas and there expressions was only available in the BE accounts at the time of Smith's writing is proof positive that influence did occur. The BE's influence and impact on Mormonism and how it provides a better understanding of Joseph Smith is the focus of the next chapter.

---

<sup>367</sup> *Ibid*, 19

*CHAPTER FOUR*

**BEYOND NIBLEY**

*Among twentieth-century Christians, only the Ethiopian Church and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints consider the Enochic writings to be authoritative. Otherwise, to the extent they are even known, they are viewed at best as a curiosity.*

–Nickelsburg<sup>368</sup>

On March 7, 1831 the extract of the prophecy of Enoch was completed, however, Joseph Smith's interest in Enoch continued to impact Mormonism long after.<sup>369</sup> Smith's initial interest in Enoch resulted in the BE influencing his EPE and his continued interest in Enoch resulted in Enoch impacting Mormonism in a variety of ways. Smith's interest in Enoch after the EPE provided a further impact on Mormonism.

This continued influence, beyond Nibley's argument and after the EPE is the focus of this chapter. There are three examples of this continued influence. First, Smith used the codename Baurak Ale for himself in the D&C. Second, Smith also used the codename Enoch in the D&C and begins to embody Enoch in life and in scripture. Third, Smith attempts to create a New Jerusalem for Mormons based on Enoch's Zion in the EPE. Although not all of these accounts support the argument that Smith was influenced by the BE, the great interest in Enoch by Smith and early Mormons makes the idea of Smith seeking out Enochic accounts far more likely.

---

<sup>368</sup> George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 82

<sup>369</sup> Officially this end date (March 7<sup>th</sup> 1831) marks the point at which Smith is commanded to begin working on a new revelation for the New Testament. Draper, *The Pearl of Great Price*, 12-17

## 1. Smith, Codename Baurak Ale

In 1835 Smith received seven revelations for the D&C pertaining to Church property. In these revelations key members of the Church were given pseudonyms and codenames in an effort to protect their identity and guard against persecution. Many key members had more than one codename and Smith was no exception. Smith's three codenames were Gazalem, Baurak Ale and Enoch, however, only the last two names are important for our purposes here. Gazalem is defined, in the index to the Mormon scripture, as a "name given to [a] servant of God" and although relevant to Smith, the name is irrelevant to a discussion on Enoch.

Baurak Ale, however, is extremely relevant to Smith's interest in Enoch, as Baurak Ale is the father of Mahaway in the Book of Giants. The BG states:

... and Mahaway said to 'Ohy]ah, 'Baraq'el my father was with me.' ... Mahaway had not [fi]inished tell[ing] what Baraq'el had shown him ...<sup>370</sup>

Not only does the use of the name provide proof of Smith's interest in Enochic materials after his EPE is completed, but this particular use of the name also shows influence occurred. D. Michael Quinn argues that Smith's use of the name indicates knowledge of Laurence's Book of Enoch. He States:

Prior to Joseph Smith's use of 'Baurak Ale,' Laurence's Book of Enoch was apparently the only English-language book which transliterated the Hebrew into that phonetic sound, rather than the more common Barchiel or 'Barkayal.' As previously noted, Horne's summary of Laurence's book was on sale in Palmyra from 1825 onward, but direct reading of Laurence would be necessary to see his transliteration 'Barakel.'<sup>371</sup>

Not only is a clear interest in 1En evident according to Quinn's argument, but equally important is access to Laurence's book. Quinn then notes that the Mormon apostle, and Smith's contemporary, Parley Parker Pratt returned from England in 1843 with a copy of Laurence's 1En. Obviously Pratt's copy of 1En arrived far too late to have influenced Smith's 1835 use of the codename Baurak Ale in the D&C. The 1821 British printing and 1828 American printing of Laurence's book would have provided Smith with all the necessary information and time to produce the name Baurak Ale for his 1835 revelations. The use of the name is an argument for Smith's continued interest in Enoch and the way in

<sup>370</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Book of Giants*, 197

<sup>371</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 224



which Enochic materials continued to influence and impact Mormonism after the EPE was complete.

## 2. Smith, Codename Enoch

The use of the name Enoch as a codename for Smith is an obvious sign of Smith's interest in Enoch. Less obvious, but more compelling, is the way in which Smith began to mimic and even embody Enoch. There are at least three ways in which Smith embodies Enoch in his life and scripture. First, Smith becomes a prophet like Enoch and, also like Enoch, receives the Melchizedek priesthood. Second, Smith was portrayed, and arguably portrayed himself as an unlearned lad transformed by revelation, like Enoch. Third, Smith is ordained at age 25 like Enoch. Each of these points is not enough to show interest alone yet, when combined with the argument for influence and access in the previous chapters, Smith's use of Enoch as a codename and his need to embody Enoch is important.

### 2.1 *Smith the Prophet and Priest*

The extent to which Smith desired to be like Enoch has been recognised by numerous Mormon and non-Mormon scholars alike. John L. Brooke states, "Smith announced in 1832 that he himself was the prophet Enoch."<sup>372</sup> Clyde R. Forsberg suggests this desire of Smith's to be like Enoch is the result of Smith's Masonic ties. Forsberg states, "In Royal Arch Masonry, Enoch (not unlike Smith) is said to have 'a vision'"<sup>373</sup> and "Enoch is one of the codenames he [Smith] went by—which is Masonic itself."<sup>374</sup> Richard L. Bushman states:

Enoch's story merits close attention because, like the vision of Moses, it bears on Joseph's prophetic identity. Later, when Joseph disguised his identity to elude his enemies, he took the name of Enoch as a pseudonym. As he was a modern Moses, so was he a modern Enoch.<sup>375</sup>

Although Bushman would deny that any influence occurred between the accounts in the BE and Smith's EPE, he is here clearly conceding how much Smith's prophetic identity is influenced by Enoch.

---

<sup>372</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner's Fire*, 166

<sup>373</sup> Forsberg, *Equal Rites*, 62

<sup>374</sup> *Ibid*, 50

<sup>375</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 138-39

Smith's efforts to embody Enoch resulted in Smith's desire to share the Melchizedek priesthood which Enoch had received. In the Old Testament Melchizedek is the king of Salem and a contemporary of Abraham. Often referred to as the "priest of God Most High,"<sup>376</sup> Melchizedek becomes the inspiration for an order of high priests. It was this idea of being "a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedek"<sup>377</sup> that inspired Smith's extended translation of the Genesis account,<sup>378</sup> the Joseph Smith Translation (JST) of Genesis states:

**14:27** And thus, [Melchizedek] having been approved of God, he was ordained a high priest after the order of the covenant which God made with Enoch ... **30** For God having sworn unto Enoch and unto his seed with an oath by himself; that every one being ordained after his order and calling should have power, by faith ...<sup>379</sup>

Smith's addition to the Genesis account, which ends at verse 24 in the Bible, obviously highlights a new link to Enoch, not stated or implied in the original Genesis. It is this link between Enoch and Melchizedek which offers Smith another way to establish a bond with Enoch and continues to show Smith's interest in Enoch. Bushman states that like Enoch, "Joseph Smith himself was ordained to this 'high priesthood' ..."<sup>380</sup> though there is some dispute as to when this ordination occurred for Smith. Smith's interest in Enoch continues to inform his work, even after the completion of the EPE.

## 2.2 *Smith Transformed*

As has been discussed consistently throughout this thesis, the Mormon view of Smith is that he was uneducated and unintelligent prior to being transformed by Gods revelation. Many scholars have suggested that this view of Smith is inaccurate and some have even suggested that this view was a conscious construction by Smith himself. According to Klaus J. Hansen, "in order to strengthen the argument for divine inspiration, Smith and his early followers emphasized the notion that he was an unlearned lad who could not possibly have written the

---

<sup>376</sup> Genesis, 4:18

<sup>377</sup> Hebrews, 7:17

<sup>378</sup> Although Fawn M. Brodie argues that Smith's Melchizedek revelations were actually inspired by a book on Melchizedek which was contemporary to Smith. Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 159

<sup>379</sup> 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 19 August 2009 <http://scriptures.lds.org/en/jst/4> Joseph Smith Translation, Genesis, 14:25-40

<sup>380</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 158

book on his own.”<sup>381</sup> Even the idea that Smith was an unlearned lad like Enoch is similar to accounts from *The Book of Jubilees* an ancient pseudepigraphal work with heavy influences from 1En. It states:

**4:17** And he was the first among men that are born on earth who learnt writing and knowledge and wisdom and who wrote down the signs of heaven ... **18** And he was the first to write a testimony.<sup>382</sup>

It is clear from this passage that the men who come before Enoch, writing, knowledge and wisdom were unknown. However, in *the Book of Jubilees* Enoch is transformed by visions of the past and future, and is able to write down the signs of heaven and produce a testimony for the generations of the world. Smith further suggests Enoch’s initial ignorance in the BMo. Smith states:

**6:31** And when Enoch had heard these words, he bowed himself to the earth, before the Lord, and spake before the Lord, saying: Why is it that I have found favor in thy sight, and am but a lad, and all the people hate me: for I am slow of speech; wherefore am I thy servant?<sup>383</sup>

Both Enoch and Smith are portrayed as ignorant before either is touched by the hand of God. The later emphasis on the abilities of Smith and Enoch become a tribute to God’s blessings and as they are transformed rather than developed. This theme of transformation over development has been embedded in Mormon apologetics and scholarship since the beginning. Mormon Charles Mackay in 1852, comparing Smith with Isaiah in the Bible notes that:

Mr. Smith; though unlearned in every language but his own mother tongue ... was commanded to read or translate the Book. Feeling his own incapacity to read such a book, he said to the Lord, in the words of Isaiah, ‘I am not learned.’<sup>384</sup>

Mormon John Andres Widtsoe states of Smith in 1908 that, “he was transformed from a humble country lad to a leader among men.”<sup>385</sup> Elder Neal A. Maxwell states, “From Joseph Smith, one unlearned and untrained in theology, more printed pages of scripture have come

---

<sup>381</sup> *Ibid*, 10

<sup>382</sup> R.H. Charles, ‘The Book of Jubilees,’ in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. II, (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1968), 18

<sup>383</sup> BMo, 7:31

<sup>384</sup> Charles Mackay, *The Mormons: or Latter-Day Saints*, Third Edition, (London: Published at 227 Strand, 1852), 274; cf. the Book of Isaiah, 11-13

<sup>385</sup> John Andreas Widtsoe, *Joseph Smith as Scientist: A Contribution to Mormon Philosophy* (Salt Lake City, Utah: The General Board Young Men’s Mutual Improvement Associations, 1908), 144

down to us than from any mortal ...”<sup>386</sup> According to Bushman, “the unlearned Joseph’s revelations, rather than Sidney’s eloquent speeches, formed the foundation of Mormon belief.”<sup>387</sup> Smith yet again establishes a connection between himself and Enoch, and further indicates his great interest in Enoch, by becoming the unlearned lad who was transformed by God for his people.

### 2.3 Smith Ordained

As noted earlier, there is an ongoing debate in Mormonism as to when Smith received the Melchizedek priesthood. According to the D&C: formal revelation on priesthood was

Revelation on priesthood, given through Joseph Smith the Prophet, at Kirtland, Ohio, dated March 28, 1835 ... Although portions of this section were received in the date named, the historical records affirm that various parts were received at sundry times, some as early as November 1831.<sup>388</sup>

In November of 1831, Smith was one month shy of his 26<sup>th</sup> birthday. It is important for various parts to have been received at sundry times so as to allow for the possibility by Smith, that he received the Melchizedek priesthood at the age of 25. It states in the D&C that, “Enoch was twenty-five years old when he was ordained under the hand of Adam; and he was sixty-five and Adam blessed him.”<sup>389</sup> For Smith, the beginning of the reception of the Melchizedek priesthood had to occur at the same age at which Enoch had received it. Again Smith’s desire to embody Enoch assumes a degree of interest which makes the prospect of Smith seeking Enochic information more likely.

### 3. Smith’s New Jerusalem, Enoch’s Zion

Outside of the extract of the prophecy of Enoch, Enoch’s greatest legacy in Mormonism is found in his account of Zion. According to Bushman:

---

<sup>386</sup> ‘LDS.org,’ Accessed August 23 2009

<http://www.lds.org/ldsorg/v/index.jsp?vgnextoid=2354fccf2b7db010VgnVCM1000004d82620aRCRD&locale=0&sourceId=b422ef960417b010VgnVCM1000004d82620a> &hideNav=1 Neal A. Maxwell, *Ensign*, (1986), 6

<sup>387</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 171

<sup>388</sup> D&C, 107

<sup>389</sup> D&C, 107:48

The Enoch in Smith's translation builds a holy city of Zion that is carried into heaven. Later Enoch sees the history of the world down to the last times, when another holy city will be built up on earth to meet the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven. At this point, the Enoch story converges with the history of the latter-day church. The Latter-day Saint Zion, the text said, will someday meet the Zion of Enoch, and the two cities will rejoice. 'They shall see us; and we will fall upon their necks, and they shall fall upon our necks, and we will kiss each other' (Moses 7:63).<sup>390</sup>

Smith's interest in Enoch is most evident in the formation of Zion. The following section will explore Joseph Smith's Zion and emphasise the extent to which Enoch provided the inspiration for Smith's city. The following section will 3.1) define Zion and establish its Enochic roots, 3.2) will include a brief history of the attempt to create Zion in early America and provide an account of how Mormons are living the ideals of Zion as they are expressed in the EPE and, 3.3) will consider how Enoch inspired the conquest of death in Mormonism.

### *3.1 Zion Defined*

Mormons aspire to be a unified people, a society and a church.<sup>391</sup> Their sense of community moves beyond belief and inhabits shared experiences, work, school and business. This communal approach toward daily living is the by-product of doctrine and organization. Bushman notes:

It was evident within a year after the Church's organization in April 1830 that Smith wanted to create a society that was more than congregations of worshippers ... In the fall of 1830, he began to receive revelations about the construction of a 'New Jerusalem' ... the city, which the Mormons also called the City of Zion or just Zion, was to be a godly society worthy of Christ at his coming.<sup>392</sup>

According to A.D. Sorensen in *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, Zion is a "place or land appointed by the Lord for the gathering of those who accept his gospel."<sup>393</sup> Smith's Zion, as defined by Bushman and Sorensen, is similar to two separate passages in the Bible. The first passage is found in the Book of Revelation and provides Smith with the term "New

<sup>390</sup> Richard L. Bushman, *Mormonism: A Very Short Introduction* (USA: Oxford University Press, 2008), 68

<sup>391</sup> *Ibid*, 36-37

<sup>392</sup> *Ibid*, 36

<sup>393</sup> A. D. Sorensen, 'Zion,' in *The Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, 1624, citing D&C 101:16-22; 3; Nephi 20-22.

Jerusalem” and the basis for the descent of Enoch’s Zion when the Holy City Jerusalem comes down out of heaven from God.<sup>394</sup> The second passage which inspired Smith’s Zion is found in Genesis which states, “Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch; and he built a city, and named it Enoch after his son Enoch.”<sup>395</sup> Although an account of Enoch’s city also exists in the pseudeupigraphic *Book of Jubilees* given the brevity of both the Genesis and pseudeupigraphic account, determining which source Smith used is impossible. In any event, the use of either obscure passage, in Genesis and *the Book of Jubilees*, is sufficient to support the claim of Smith’s ongoing interest.

### 3.2 Zion and Living in America

The idea of Zion is difficult to relate as it embodies both a physical and non-physical reality. For Mormons, Zion is a spiritual reality and an earthly hope, and it is this earthly hope that is the emphasis of this section.

According to H. Michael Marquardt, the idea of a New Jerusalem existed during the religious revivals of the 1820s, prior to the formation of Smith’s church.<sup>396</sup> The BoM has an account of Christ commanding the Native Americans to restore Jerusalem in the new world.<sup>397</sup> In September 1830, Mormon Hiram Page had revelations, which Smith later denied as not having come from God, that called for the building of Zion.<sup>398</sup> However, it was not until after the Mormon Church moved its headquarters from Fayette, New York to Kirtland, Ohio that Smith began having revelations about building Zion.<sup>399</sup> The D&C states:

**42:35** And for the purpose of purchasing lands for the public benefit of the Church, and building houses of worship, and building up of the New Jerusalem which is hereafter to be revealed—**36** That my covenant people may be gathered in one in that day when I shall come to my temple. And this I do for the salvation of my people.<sup>400</sup>

In June 1831, Smith and other Mormon elders travelled to Independence, Missouri.<sup>401</sup> It was revealed to Smith on July 20, 1831 that Independence, Missouri was to be “the place of the

<sup>394</sup> Book of Revelation, 21:10

<sup>395</sup> Genesis, 4:17

<sup>396</sup> Marquardt, *The Rise of Mormonism*, 253

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid*, 253; cf. 3 Nephi and the Book of Ether

<sup>398</sup> *Ibid*, 254

<sup>399</sup> *Ibid*, 265

<sup>400</sup> D&C, 42:35-36

<sup>401</sup> Marquardt, *The Rise of Mormonism*, 263

city of Zion and the gathering.”<sup>402</sup> Many plans were made, buildings designed, money collected and revelations received over the next two years. Marquardt states:

After settling in various locations in Jackson County, Missouri the saints were forced out of the county in November 1833. Their plans to establish the New Jerusalem were shattered but they hoped that eventually they would complete the vision of Joseph Smith in constructing the city of peace ... they were told that it was because of their transgressions that Zion was lost for a little season ... the dream of having an everlasting inheritance in the city of Zion upon the Missouri land of promise was never realized during their lifetime.<sup>403</sup>

For these early Mormons, their urgency was partly to do with their millenarian views. For many Christians during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, Christ’s return was imminent. According to Bushman, Zion was to be a city of refuge for Mormons<sup>404</sup> and the temporary congregations built in other places were meant only as a stopping place until converts could gather to Zion.<sup>405</sup>

Zion would become a hope unrealised for Smith. However, Bushman notes that Zion, as it was expressed in the EPE, became the model for modern Mormons. The BMo states:

**7:18** And the Lord called his people ZION, because they were of one heart and one mind and dwelt in righteousness; and there was no poor among them.<sup>406</sup>

The last line “and there was no poor among them” would become a primary principle in the construction of Zion.

Joseph Smith had been concerned with finances from a young age. Brooke suggests that Joseph Smith Sr. had been swindled prior to his son’s birth and that this swindling financially crippled the family and was enough to ensure they never recovered.<sup>407</sup> For Joseph Smith Jr., the impact of this continuous financial struggle throughout his formative years would persist well into the envisioning and development of Mormon finance. Smith’s financial history lay behind his 1831 revelation at Kirtland that it was ‘forbidden to get into debt to thine enemies.’ Smith established united orders to combat financial difficulties in his young

---

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid*, 264

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid*, 272

<sup>404</sup> Bushman, *Mormonism*, 38

<sup>405</sup> *Ibid*, 38

<sup>406</sup> BMo, 7:18

<sup>407</sup> Brooke, *The Refiner’s Fire*, 135

Church. These united orders practiced self-reliance, industry, and cooperation and emphasised the unity evident in Enoch's Zion.<sup>408</sup>

For Brigham Young, the leader of the Mormon Church after the murder of Smith, the Order of Enoch continued, in 1874, as a step toward the order of Heaven.<sup>409</sup> In all, about 150 United Orders were established and varied in size and type. The orders functioned like cooperatives, where all members of the order would deed their holdings to the order. The net income of the order would in turn pay back the members according to the percentage at which they initially contributed. Brigham Young stated:

I want you to be united. If we should build up and organize a community, we would have to do it on the principle of oneness, and it is one of the simplest things I know of. A city of one hundred thousand or a million people could be united into a perfect family, and they could work together as beautifully as the different parts of the carding machine work together. Why, we could organize millions into a family under the order of Enoch.<sup>410</sup>

For years after their arrival in Utah the Mormons sought to build their Zion. Young, hoped to establish a unified Church that was entirely self-contained.<sup>411</sup> With the success of the cooperative movement in one city of the new Mormon settlement in Utah, Young aimed for “an even higher law of economic oneness, the United Order of Enoch,” by which to live.<sup>412</sup> Leonard J. Arrington, author of *Brigham Young: American Moses* notes that economic unity had been Young's goal since 1844.<sup>413</sup> What the cooperative movement provided in Brigham City was a sustainable production of goods and resources for communal consumption and trade that was the envy of other towns (Mormon and non-Mormon). Young stated:

The Order of Enoch should be established, he decided, according to the Brigham City plan, that is, it should be done on a city-wide basis. Cooperatives must be instituted. People should get their pay in what they produce. Everything should be organized ... All residents should be economical and live as one big family.<sup>414</sup>

---

<sup>408</sup> James W. Lucas and Warner P. Woodworth, *Working Toward Zion: Principles of the United Order for the Modern World* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994), 46

<sup>409</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 128

<sup>410</sup> Leonard J. Arrington, *Brigham Young: American Moses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 363 citing *Journal of Discourses*, 16:170

<sup>411</sup> *Ibid*, 377

<sup>412</sup> *Ibid*, 377

<sup>413</sup> *Ibid*, 376

<sup>414</sup> *Ibid*, 378



Ultimately, Young's cooperative community failed, the result of both human and financial difficulties as "... they still preferred private stewardships to tightly organized cooperation."<sup>415</sup> Many of the ideals of Zion, however, were embedded in the community after the cooperatives were gone, including donating much of one's disposable income to the Church and "the injunctions to live 'like Enoch and his people'"<sup>416</sup> According to Mormon Hyrum L. Andrus, it was through teaching the higher principles of Zion that Enoch gathered true believers and built up Mount Zion.<sup>417</sup> And according to Sorensen, it was this attempt to attain a standard of living represented by Enoch's Zion which "inspires the labours and programs of the Church to this day."<sup>418</sup>

### 3.3 Zion and Death

In the Bible, Enoch is one of only two people who do not taste death; the other is Elijah. Genesis states, "Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, because God took him."<sup>419</sup> The phrase "was no more" is often rendered as "translated." According to John L. Brooke, Smith "laid claim to the authority of Enoch and Elijah, the biblical prophets who were carried bodily into heaven by divine power."<sup>420</sup> And according to former Mormon President John Taylor, like Enoch's Zion, Mormons who enter Smith's Zion do not face death and can act on behalf of Christ over other worlds.<sup>421</sup> The conquest of death in Mormonism is the result Smith's interest in Enoch's overcoming death.

The conquest of death was not a new concept when Mormonism began. Hansen details the evolution of thought that would allow the conquest of death to become a pervasive theme in early Mormonism. Through the sin of Adam all were doomed to death, yet by the sacrifice of Christ, life was restored in the hereafter. This theme played a persistent role in western European views of death that God was linked with mortality and death was pervasive. This European view was no different in the new world, where a decline in community, family ties,

---

<sup>415</sup> *Ibid*, 381

<sup>416</sup> *Ibid*, 381

<sup>417</sup> Hyrum L. Andrus, *Doctrinal Commentary on the Pearl of Great Price*, Revised Edition (USA: Deseret Book, 2003), 303

<sup>418</sup> Sorensen, 'Zion,' 1626

<sup>419</sup> Genesis, 5:24

<sup>420</sup> Brooke, *Refiner's Fire*, 3

<sup>421</sup> Andrus, *Doctrinal Commentary*, 309 citing John Taylor, *Mediation and Atonement* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1950), 76

and heightened anxieties about death persisted.<sup>422</sup> These ideas about death were based on real life. In fact, the infant mortality continued to be high in early America and sweeping epidemics of cholera and yellow fever left higher rates of death in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century than had been seen in the last decade of the previous century.<sup>423</sup> People ultimately believed that death was the will of God, taken at his liberty and on his own time. These views further evolved, establishing personal appeals to include an individual responsibility of God's will. This was not a denial of God but rather an expanded thought structure that allowed for the role of God and one's own role in life, death and the soul. This concept, coupled with the rise of modernity (particularly medicine), eventually produced a view that both the physical world and the human body could be controlled. Thus "Americans were less willing than their predecessors to accept the inevitability of death."<sup>424</sup> For Mormons this concept was expressed in tangible terms and evident in the life and translation of Enoch.

According to Hansen, Smith "seems to have realised that he had to do better than to admonish his followers that 'all flesh is subject to death.'"<sup>425</sup> As a result of this realisation, Smith began to incorporate a variety of ways in which Mormons would conquer death. Smith was primarily able to change his follower's minds about the nature of death and life by reconsidering the relationship between spiritual and physical. Hansen notes:

... Mormon theology tended to obliterate the distinction between the two [spiritual and physical]. Matters physical and spiritual blended into one another. God had a body of flesh and bone. The Holy Ghost, to be sure, was a spirit, but even spirit consisted of matter. No particle of the universe could be destroyed. Death was merely the transformation from one state of existence to another.<sup>426</sup>

For example, Mormon marriages are for eternity and as a result must be looked at as not a temporal bodily union but one which transcends death and continues in the hereafter. Mormon baptisms and the nature of eternal marriage provided early Mormons with some solace when children passed. Children were bound to their parents in eternity and although no longer of this physical world, were waiting for their parents on the other side. Healing the spirit was also integral to the concept of death conquests. And for early Mormons, healing

---

<sup>422</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 103

<sup>423</sup> *Ibid*, 87

<sup>424</sup> *Ibid*, 84-92

<sup>425</sup> *Ibid*, 101

<sup>426</sup> *Ibid*, 101

was considered a gift of the spirit and helped to create a view that would inevitably conclude that life without death was possible, Hansen states:

The promise that at least some of the faithful should not taste death was given scriptural support by the Book of Mormon, according to which three of Christ's Nephite disciples had not died and were to remain in mortality until the Second Coming, at which time they would be changed from mortality to immortality without suffering the agony of death.<sup>427</sup>

This scriptural support continued in the accounts of the BMo. Where Enoch's people, like Enoch himself in the Genesis account, do not taste death. The BMo states:

**7:69** And Enoch and all his people walked with God, and he dwelt in the midst of Zion; and it came to pass that Zion was not, for God received it up into his own bosom; and from thence went forth the saying, ZION IS FLED.<sup>428</sup>

The Joseph Smith Translation of Genesis states:

**32** And men having this faith, coming up unto this order of God, were translated and taken up into heaven. ... **34** And his people wrought righteousness, and obtained heaven, and sought for the city of Enoch which God had before taken, separating it from the earth, having reserved it unto the latter days, or the end of the world;<sup>429</sup>

And so through temple rituals, church doctrine and divine revelation, Smith devised a way to overcome death and combat social ailments.<sup>430</sup> Hansen states that “although even the Mormons seem to have perceived this larger legacy only dimly, there can be no doubt that the vitality of Mormonism derived to a large extent from its unique confrontation of that seemingly greatest enemy of mankind, death.”<sup>431</sup> Hansen attributes this assessment to hindsight, but the role of Enoch in early Mormonism suggests that Smith was well aware of the impact of conquering death through his newly formed church and that such action was not merely an afterthought, but an intended goal, though one for which even Smith may not have had a full grasp.

---

<sup>427</sup> *Ibid*, 92

<sup>428</sup> BMo, 7:69

<sup>429</sup> JST Genesis, 14:32-34

<sup>430</sup> Hansen, *Mormonism*, 105

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid*, 105

#### **4. Conclusion**

Each of these points shows the extent to which Smith was interested in Enoch. Although not all points show a direct influence from the BE, all accounts show that Enochic influence on Mormonism continued long after the EPE was completed. Smith's codenames Baurak Ale and Enoch are further proof that not only was Smith knowledgeable about Enoch and Enochic materials, but that Smith revered Enoch enough to want to be associated with him by name in the D&C. Furthermore, Smith's New Jerusalem is shaped in many ways by Smith's account of Enoch in the EPE and has had a profound impact on Mormon living, history and economy. It is precisely this interest in Enoch, which when coupled with access and proof of substantial similarities, provides the final aspect for arguing influence occurred.

*CONCLUSION*

ENOCH IN MORMONISM EXPLORED

*When do seeming coincidences of evidence exceed the probability of coincidence and move toward circumstantial proof? –Quinn*<sup>432</sup>

The value of Joseph Smith is not diminished by evidence that he was influenced. In fact, Smith's value increases when scholars are willing to concede that Smith, with access to a vast array of materials, was able to synthesize and produce a work with such extraordinary impact as to inform and become the foundation for a Church. Bushman states:

Joseph Smith is one of those large Americans who like Abraham Lincoln came from nowhere. [And] yet in the fourteen years he headed the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Smith created a religious culture that survived his death, flourished in the most desolate regions of the United States, and continues to grow worldwide after more than a century and a half.<sup>433</sup>

Recognition of Joseph Smith's abilities must move beyond the limits of faith to consider how influence informed his world view. In Mormon scholarship, the once impossible idea that Smith's accounts of Enoch were influenced by the BE, may now be the foundation for further insight and analysis regarding Joseph Smith and Mormon ideas on Enoch. However, change takes time.

There was a time when the idea of Smith as a treasure digger was also an impossibility. Quinn states, "Prominent nineteenth-century LDS leaders winced at anti-Mormon use

---

<sup>432</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, xxxvi

<sup>433</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone Rolling*, xx

of Smith's treasure-digging but sometimes matter-of-factly affirmed it."<sup>434</sup> However, when affirmations of this treasure digging and seeking came from Mormons like Brigham Young, and Dale L. Morgan, the subject was reconsidered and eventually accepted as having been an aspect of Smith's life. Bushman states:

In Ohio, Joseph was free to start fresh in a new place. He was unable to put aside his treasure-seeker and glass-looker past completely; affidavits advertising those episodes would soon be published.<sup>435</sup>

Thus treasure digging and seeking is now part of the accepted history of Smith's life. A once impossible idea about Smith has evolved, as has scholarship, in an effort to better understand his life and times as they were, rather than as some may wish them to have been. The argument for Smith having been influenced by the Book of Enoch is a continuation of this evolution of thought about Smith.

### *This Thesis*

Although the argument for Smith having been influenced is not new, Hugh Nibley persisted in denying that influence. Nibley operated under the view that only a single source for Enoch was available during Smith's time, and thus he assumed that the BMo was the product of revelation. His argument has been proven unsuccessful as access is probable and substantial similarities evident.

First, Nibley failed to consider that Laurence's 1En was not the only account of the BE known to have been produced prior to 1830. In English, two further works on Enoch were published by Ernst Grabe in 1715 and William Whiston in 1727. Further, the accounts in English represent only a small amount of the Enochic materials that were available in French, German, Latin, Greek, Hebrew and other languages.

Second, Nibley failed to consider that Smith may have worked with assistance in his production of the BMo and more specifically the EPE. Hyrum Smith, after having attended Moor's academy, had an incalculable impact on young Joseph Smith. Oliver Cowdery, a man with a relatively unknown history, was one of Smith's earliest and

---

<sup>434</sup> Quinn, *Early Mormonism*, 63

<sup>435</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 126

closest companions. Finally, Sidney Rigdon, a charismatic speaker and religious fanatic, who had a full life before meeting Smith, becomes his council throughout the early years of Mormonism. Each of these men are scarcely mentioned by Nibley

Third, Nibley does not wish to recognize the degree of education and intelligence that was prevalent in the Smith family. Smith's father appears to have had numerous ties to Dartmouth College, enough to warrant his own son Hyrum attending the nearby boy's academy. Hyrum was privy to religious movements, languages, native youths and religious experiences and was in a position to school a young injured Joseph. Many of young Joseph's cousins also attended Moor's Academy. Finally, given his clear creativity, it is improbable that the view of an unintelligent Joseph Smith is correct. Yet Nibley disagrees.

Fourth, Nibley was either unaware or unwilling to acknowledge the book trade and peddling movement that allowed books to flourish and travel in early America. Libraries like Thomas Jefferson's and the Library Company of Philadelphia provide only a small sample of the books actually available in America prior to Smith writing his EPE. The book trade provided America with extensive British and European resources from past decades and centuries. Yet, it is an 1828 printing of 1En in America that serves as proof enough that Nibley's argument is no longer valid.

Fifth, substantial similarities between the EPE and BE are irrefutable proof of influence. The extensive relationship between Noah and Enoch and its expression in the EPE mimics many aspects of 1En. The concept of the Son of Man and its application in the EPE with Enoch is further proof that Smith had acquired knowledge of 1En. Nibley's own point that Mahujah and Mahijah from the EPE share their name with Mahaway in the BG is further evidence that influence occurred. And additional proof of Smith's knowledge of the BG is evidenced by his use of the codename Baurak Ale.

This thesis has proven that Nibley's assessment and argument against Enochic influence are invalid. Showing that access to materials was possible, that substantial similarities exist and that Smith had an evident interest in Enoch, I have successfully argued for Smith having been influenced by Enochic materials.

### *Future Considerations*

The argument for influence should not end here. Moving beyond Nibley's argument is the first step toward creating a dialogue between traditional Enochic accounts and Mormon views of Enoch. The second step is to discern the extent of that influence and consider all possible avenues that may have provided Smith with influence. The third step toward a fruitful dialogue will be to consider the value of the Mormon tradition in relating a culture of Enoch at play in a Christian group in the western world.

Given the limited space of this thesis and the vast array of research required to produce a full account of Smith's influences, it has been left to this conclusion to consider other areas of influence and ways in which this dialogue may proceed.

One interesting area while discussing other areas of influences is to consider how Enochic influence affects matters of faith. There exists in Mormonism an uneasy balance between that which is the result of divine intervention and that which is the product of human ingenuity. The dilemma is that any great shift toward human ingenuity is often heralded as the end of faith and as such prevents Mormons from accepting that which may provide a further catalyst for that shift. However, progress in favour of influence continues to be made in Mormonism.

Another important area in the discussion of new influences is Smith's level of intelligence. Given what Smith has accomplished in the formation of the Mormon Church, a discussion involving his intelligence needs to occur. It is important to discuss Smith's ability as it directly relates to his theology. Bushman states:

We can scarcely imagine him [Smith] steeping himself in Kabbalistic literature in Manchester and Harmony. More reasonable is Harold Bloom's conclusion that Joseph's desire for God's presence came out of his own religious experience and genius.<sup>436</sup>

Bushman is here denying one form of influence and has instead considered Bloom's argument which posits religious experience and genius. In assigning genius to Smith, Bloom is offering up for discussion a form of influence, one in which an aspect of

---

<sup>436</sup> Bushman, *Rough Stone*, 452 citing Harold Bloom JS Journal, May 4, 1842, in *PJS*, 2:380.



Smith's humanity impacts revelation. It is this humanity, Smith's genius in fact, which provides the basis for further discussions on influence. Smith was able to synthesize various materials and produce works with lasting appeal and relevance to the lives of millions of Mormons. To deny any possibility about Smith's level of intelligence is to deny the very thing which produced his theology. The assumption of any kind of influence immediately opens the door to additional types of influence.

Another area of influence, briefly alluded to in Chapter One, is the role of Dartmouth College in the shaping of young Smith's life. Access to Dartmouth College surely must amount to some influence, particularly given Dartmouth's close affiliation with Moor's Academy, where Joseph's brother Hyrum, many of Joseph's cousins, the doctors who would perform surgery on Joseph's leg and other Mormon notables had resided. Access to university students and staff from such a young age precludes arguments against influence. Had this university produced any scholars who would have known about Enoch?

When discussing other areas of influence one must consider that Smith was privy to one of the greatest religious revivals in American history. The Second Great Awakening (1790s-1840s) caused a swell of religious revivals and produced a series of other religious movements throughout the North Eastern region of America. Smith need not have even been directly involved to have been impacted by such an enormous occurrence. This Second Great Awakening produced a restorationist movement that may have provided Smith with his interest antediluvian history and ancient texts.

Likely the most important factor when discussing other areas of influence comes from the people in Smith's life. There are a plethora of interesting people who exist in close company with Smith and who may have influenced him.

Martin Harris was the financial sponsor of the initial publishing of the BoM, a scribe for parts of the BoM and the BMo, and a close companion of Smith's early on. In 1828 Harris, at the behest of Smith, goes to Columbia University to have the BoM characters (letters and numbers from an unknown language) deciphered by a Professor, Dr. Samuel L. Mitchell. Does Harris' access to this University provide any clues of Enochic influence being brought back to Smith prior to his beginning the EPE in late 1830?

Lemuel Durfee is an interesting Smith family neighbour in New York who purchased the Smith home when the Smith's were having financial troubles, and then it back to them. Durfee was a Quaker and according to Ariel Hessayon, Quaker's were heavily influenced by the BE. Had this neighbour provided Smith with his initial interest in Enoch?

It has been argued by Wayne L. Cowdery, Howard A. Davis and Arthur Vanick in their book, *Who Really Wrote the Book of Mormon?* that Oliver Cowdery was a book peddler. The merit of this argument was supported by the findings of the Stanford Study and the implications for this claim are astounding. Given Cowdery's access as a book peddler and his role in the formation of the BoM, the BMo and the Mormon Church itself, is it any wonder that Smith's degree of access was likely far better than most other people?

Sidney Rigdon is yet another important person in the formation of the early Church and its texts. Converted in just over two weeks and having moved to Fayette, New York immediately, Rigdon was just in time to assist Smith with his production of the EPE. Prior to his time with Smith, Rigdon was a well travelled man who was knowledgeable in the ways of the Bible and had access to numerous libraries and books. In fact, Rigdon is arguably the most likely person to have had access to the BE. Rigdon's religious mentor Alexander Campbell attended the University at Glasgow in Scotland after Scotsman James Bruce had already discovered a copy of 1En in Ethiopic and had published his findings. Bruce was a well regarded Scotsman and his travel books were well known in his home country. In fact, Mormon Zion includes communitarian ideas that are similar to what Rigdon would have learned from Alexander Campbell. The expression of communitarian ideas in Zion begs the question to what extent was Smith influenced by Rigdon?

Rigdon's former disciple Parley Parker Pratt must also be included in any further discussion of Enoch. Pratt is the only early Mormon who 'officially' owned a copy of Laurence's 1En. This copy was acquired in 1840, whilst Pratt was on a missionary trip in England. Pratt included an extract of Laurence's 1En in a Mormon journal in July of that year. However, Pratt's commentary in that journal seems to lack any real interest in 1En, even with its great similarities to the EPE. It is as if Pratt already knew of 1En.

Interestingly, Pratt was one of the Mormon missionaries who converted Rigdon, his former pastor, just prior to Rigdon's work on the EPE with Smith. How much Pratt knew about Enoch prior to 1830 may offer further interesting insights into Smith's influence by the BE.

Further, a greater knowledge of Smith's life and times will allow for insight into his influences. An investigation of Smith's local libraries, the collections and education of his neighbours, consideration for publications sold in areas in and around his homes, the tracing of organizations like the Freemasons, and various other places of influence will contribute greatly to a fuller understanding of this subject.

Fortunately, academic advancements have allowed our knowledge of what once was to grow. No longer does the argument for influence need to be as rigid a standard as Orson Pratt once set for determining the validity of the BoM:

This book must be either true or false. If true, it is one of the most important messages ever sent from God ... If false, it is one of the most cunning, wicked, bold, deep-laid impositions ever palmed upon the world, calculated to deceive and ruin millions.<sup>437</sup>

Although speaking about the Book of Mormon, this rigidity has been applied by some to the extract of the prophecy of Enoch. Again it is important to note that the value of Joseph Smith and his writings need not be limited by the way in which those writings were produced. An argument for influence must consider Joseph Smith's gifts and abilities. An argument for influence must recognise that divine revelation is not the only way to account for a history that cannot be verified. An argument for influence cannot be restricted to that which is acceptable by the standards of faith. Finally, an argument for influence can restore our understanding of the actual events which brought together Joseph Smith, Mormonism and Enochic Tradition.

---

<sup>437</sup> Orson Pratt, *Works: Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon* (Liverpool, 1851), 1-2

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books/Journals

- Adler, William, 'Chapter One: Introduction,' in VanderKam, James C. and Adler, William (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Van Gorcum, Assen: Fortress Press, 1996), 33-101
- Adler, William, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography From Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989)
- Alexander, P., '3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in James Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1983), 223-315
- Andersen, Francis I., '2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. I, (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1983), 91-221
- Andersen, Francis I., 'Second Book of Enoch,' in David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. II, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 516-522
- Anderson, Lavina Fielding (ed.), *Lucy's Book: A Critical Edition of Lucy Mack Smith's Family Memoir* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 2001)
- Anderson, Richard Lloyd, 'Oliver Cowdery,' in Daniel H. Ludlow (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Scripture, Doctrine, and Procedure of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Vol. 2 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), 335-40
- Andrus, Hyrum L., & Andrus, Helen Mae, *They Knew the Prophet: Personal Accounts From Over 100 People Who Knew Joseph Smith* (USA: Covenant Communications, Inc., 2004)
- Andrus, Hyrum L., *Doctrinal Commentary on the Pearl of Great Price, Revised Edition* (USA: Deseret Book Company, 2003)
- Aristeas, *History of the Seventy Two Interpreters: to which is added, the history of the angels, and their gallantry with the daughters of men, written by Enoch the Patriarch.* Published in Greek by Dr. Grabe made English by Ed Lewis of C.C.C. (Oxford, 1712) Quite possibly the work, written by Flavius Josephus and attributed to the Green God Aristaeus
- Arrington, Leonard J., *Brigham Young: American Moses* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 113-65
- Athay, R. Grant, 'Worlds without Number: The Astronomy of Enoch, Abraham, and Moses,' in *BYU Studies* 8, No. 3 (1968)
- Bautch, Kelley Coublentz, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* (Leiden; Brill, 2003)
- Bayly, William, *The Life of Enoch Again Revived: in which Abel's offering is accepted, and Cain's mark known, and he rejected, through the opening of the inward mystery of creation, by ... God : (to which is annexed) the travel of the bowels of Sion.*, (1662)
- Beck, Martha, *Leaving the Saints: How I Lost the Mormons and Found My Faith* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2005)

- Behrens, Richard K., 'Dartmouth Arminianism and Its Impact on Hyrum Smith and The Smith Family' in *John Whitmer Historical Association*, Vol. 26, (2006), 166-184
- Behrens, Richard K., 'Dreams, Visions, and Visitations: The Genesis of Mormonism' in *John Whitmer Historical Association*, Vol. 27, (2007), 170-183
- Bennett, John C., *The History of the Saints or, an Expose of Joe Smith and Mormonism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois, 2000)
- Black, Matthew, 'The Origin of the Name Metatron', in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 1, Fasc. 3 (Jul., 1951), 217-219
- Black, Matthew, with James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Enoch; or, 1 Enoch* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985)
- Box, G.H., review of '3 Enoch: or, The Hebrew book of Enoch' (Cambridge: University Press, 1928) Hugo Odeberg, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Jul., 1929), 77-85
- Brooke, John L., *The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology, 1644-1844* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Bruce, James and Murray, Alexander, *Account of the Life and Writings of James Bruce, of Kinnaird: Author of Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile, in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, & 1773* (Edinburgh: A. Constable and Company, 1808)
- Bruce, James, *An Interesting Narrative of the Travels of James Bruce Esq. Into Abyssinia, to Discover the Source of the Nile. Abridged from the Original Work By Samuel Shaw, Esq'*, (London: H. D. Symonds, 1790)
- Bruce, James, *Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, and 1773.*, The Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged, Vol. II, (Edinburgh: Printed by George Ramsay and Company, 1813), 393-426
- Buerger, David John, *The Mysteries of Godliness: A History of Mormon Temple Worship* (USA: Signature Books, 1994)
- Bushman, Richard L., 'The Mysteries of Mormonism,' in *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 15, No. 3, Special Issue on Gender in the Early Republic (Autumn, 1995), 501-508
- Bushman, Richard L., *Joseph Smith and the Beginnings of Mormonism* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 79-113; 179-88
- Bushman, Richard L., *Joseph Smith: Rough Stone Rolling* (New York: Vintage Books, 2007)
- Bushman, Richard L., *Mormonism: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)
- Butt, Rev. John Marten, *The Genuineness of the Book of Enoch Investigated* (Printed for L.B. Seeley and Son, Fleet Street, London. 1827)
- Ceserani, Giovanna, in 'Narrative, Interpretation, and Plagiarism in Mr. Robertson's 1778 "History of Ancient Greece"', in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 66, No. 3 (Jul., 2005), 413-436

- Charles, Robert Henry, and Box, G.H., & Oesterley, W.O.E., *The Book of Enoch* (London: S.P.C.K., 1917)
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893)
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Book of Enoch: Or 1 Enoch*; Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited with the Introduction, Notes and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast, Enlarged and Rewritten, Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912)
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Book of Enoch: Or 1 Enoch*; Translated from the Editor's Ethiopic Text and Edited with the Introduction, Notes and Indexes of the First Edition Wholly Recast, Enlarged and Rewritten, Together with a Reprint from the Editor's Text of the Greek Fragments (Mokelumne Hill, Calif.: Health Research, 1964)
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906)
- Chialà, Sabino, 'The Son of Man: The Evolution of an Expression,' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.) *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 153-78
- Cohen, Charles L., review of 'The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology, 1644-1844,' by John L. Brooke, in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 53, No. 1, Material Culture in Early America (Jan., 1996), 213-215
- Colman, Benjamin, *The holy walk and glorious translation of blessed Enoch: A sermon preached at the lecture in Boston, two days after the death of the Reverend and learned Cotton Mather, D.D. & F.R.S. Who departed this life, February 13 1728.*, (1728)
- Cowdery, Wayne L. and Davis, Howard A. & Vanick, Arthur, *Who Really Wrote the Book of Mormon?: The Spalding Enigma* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2005)
- Davies, Douglas J., *The Mormon Culture of Salvation: Force, Grace and Glory* (Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2003)
- Dimant, Devorah, 'The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch', in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. 33, Fasc. 1 (Jan., 1983), 14-29
- Draper, Richard D., et al, *The Pearl of Great Price: A Verse By Verse Commentary* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book, 2005)
- Forsberg Jr., Clyde R., *Equal Rites: The Book of Mormon, Masonry, Gender, and American Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004)
- Freke, William, *A full enquiry into the power of faith, the nature of prophecy, the translation of Enoch and Elias, and the resurrection of Christ* (1693)
- Gilmore, William J., 'Peddlers and the Dissemination of Printed Material in Northern New England, 1780-1840,' in Peter Benes (ed.), *Itinerancy in New England and New York: The Dublin Seminar for New England Folklife Annual Proceedings 1984* (Boston: Boston university press, 1986), 80

- Givens, Terryl L., *By the Hand of Mormon: The American Scripture that Launched a New World Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- Givens, Terryl L., *People of Paradox: A History of Mormon Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007)
- Gorham, George Cornelius, 'An Historical and Critical Examination of an Apocryphal Production Denominated the Book of Enoch,' *Extracted from The Christian Observer for July and August 1829*. (Ellerton and Henderson, Printers, Gough Square, London)
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Stone, Michael E., 'The Books of Enoch and the Traditions of Enoch', in *Numen*, Vol. 26, Fasc. 1 (Jun., 1979), 89-103
- Halperin, David J., 'Sabbatai Zevi, Metatron, and Mehmed: Myth and History in Seventeenth-Century Judaism,' in Breslauer, S. Daniel (ed.), *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 271-308
- Hansen, Klaus J., *Mormonism and the American Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981)
- Harris, James R., 'Changes in the Book of Moses and Their Implications upon a Concept of Revelation,' in *BYU Studies* 8, No. 4 (1968)
- Heap, Norman L., *Adam, Enoch and Noah* (San Francisco: California Publishing Company, 1992)
- Herbert, Algernon, *Nimrod: Discourse on Certain Passages of History and Fable* (London: Printed for Richard Priestley, 1828)
- Hessayon, Ariel, 'Og King of Bashan, Enoch and the Books of Enoch: Extra-Canonical Texts and Interpretations of Genesis 6:1-4,' in Hessayon, Ariel and Keene, Nicholas (eds.) *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2006), 1-40
- Horne, George, *Considerations on the life and death of Abel; on the life and translation of Enoch; and on the life of Noah* (Published by Abel, 1812), Original from Oxford University Digitized Aug 15, 2006 [PDF Lithograph]
- Horne, Thomas Hartwell, *An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, Fifth Edition, Corrected, Vol. I. (T. Cadell, in the Strand and W. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1825), 637-41
- Hullinger, Robert N., *Joseph Smith's Response to Skepticism* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1992), 1-35; 99-120
- Isaac, Ephraim, '1(Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,' in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983-85)
- Jackson, Kent P., *The Book of Moses and the Joseph Smith Translation Manuscripts* (Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 2005)
- Jaffee, David, 'Peddlers of Progress and the Transformation of the Rural North, 1760-1860,' in *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 78, No. 2 (Sep., 1991), 511-535

- Jockers, Matthew L., Witten, Daniela M., and Criddle, Craig S., 'Reassessing authorship of the Book of Mormon using delta and nearest shrunken centroid classification' (Oxford University Press, February 17, 2009)
- Johnson, Curtis D., review of 'The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology, 1644-1844' (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) John L. Brooke, in *The Journal of American History*, Vol. 82, No. 2 (Sep., 1995), 684-685
- Jones, W.M., Joseph Smith: *Scripture-Maker. "Book of Moses" And "Prophecies of Enoch."* A Critical Study (Oakland, California: 1966)
- Knibb, Michael A., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, Vol. II, (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1978) Reprinted 1982
- Kvanvig, Helge S., *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (Neikirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988)
- Laurence, Richard, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet*. Translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library by the late Richard Laurence. The text now corrected from his latest notes with an Introduction by the Author [Lyman Abbott] of *The Evolution of Christianity* (London, Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883)
- Laurence, Richard, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet: an apocryphal production, supposed for ages to have been lost; but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia: now first translated from an Ethiopic ms. in the Bodleian library* (Oxford: at the University Press for the author: Sold by J. Parker; and by Messrs. Rivington, London. 1821)
- Laurence, Richard, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet: an apocryphal production, supposed for ages to have been lost; but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia: now first translated from an Ethiopic ms. in the Bodleian library*, Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged (Oxford: at the University Press, 1832)
- Laurence, Richard, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet: an apocryphal production, supposed for ages to have been lost; but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia : now first translated from an Ethiopic ms. in the Bodleian library*, second edition, corrected and enlarged (Oxford: J.H. Parker; J.G. and F. Rivington, London, 1833), [Includes (at least the version available at the British Library) what appear to be handwritten notes entitled "A Copy from the manuscript of D. Adeselas Professor of Hebrew, Remarks and Interpretation of the Names in the Book of the Prophet Enoch.]
- Laurence, Richard, *The Book of Enoch, the prophet: an apocryphal production, supposed for ages to have been lost; but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia: now first translated from an Ethiopic ms. in the Bodleian library*, Third Edition, Corrected and Enlarged (Oxford: printed by S. Collingwood, printer to the University, For John Henry Parker. Sold also by J.G. and F. Rivington, London. 1838)
- Lewis R. Church, Lewis R., 'Book of Enoch,' in Daniel H. Ludlow (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Scripture, Doctrine, and Procedure of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Vol.2 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), 460



- Linn, William Alexander, *The Story of the Mormons: From the Date of their Origin to the Year 1901* (London: Macmillan & Co., ltd. 1902)
- Livesay, Richard, with an introduction by Robert Ian Williams, *An Exposure of Mormonism: The First anti-Mormon Book printed outside of the United States* (Wrexham, United Kingdom: Ecclesia Press, 1997)
- Lucas, James W., and Woodworth Warner P., *Working Toward Zion: Principles of the United Order for the Modern World* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Aspen Books, 1996)
- Mackay, Charles, *The Mormons: or Latter-Day Saints*, Third Edition, (London: Published at 227 Strand, 1852), 270-80
- Mackey, Albert Gallatin, *The History of Freemasonry, Its Legends and Traditions, Its Chronological History*, Vol. 2 (New York and London: The Masonic History Company, 1898 & 1905), 396-432
- Marquardt, H. Michael, and Walters, Wesley P., *Inventing Mormonism: Tradition and the Historical Record* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1994)
- Marquardt, H. Michael, *The Rise of Mormonism: 1816-1844* (USA: Xulon Press, 2005)
- Marty, Myron A., review of 'The Refiner's Fire: The Making of Mormon Cosmology, 1644-1844,' by John L. Brooke in *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 76, No. 4 (Oct., 1996), 647-648
- Maxwell, Neal A., *The Enoch Letters* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Books, 2006)
- Milik, J. T. (ed.), with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976)
- Millet, Robert L. 'Enoch and His City (Moses 6, 7)' in *Studies in Scripture*, Vol. 2 (Salt Lake City, Utah: 1985), 131-44
- Moberly, R.W.L., *Prophecy and Discernment* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Morfill, W.R., with Charles, Robert Henry, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch: Translated from the Slavonic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896)
- Murray, Alexander, *Account of the Life and Writings of James Bruce of Kinnaird, Esq., F.R.S., Author of Travels to Discover the Source of the Nile, in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772 & 1773* (Printed by George Ramsay and Company: Edinburgh, 1808), 297-299 [PDF Lithograph]
- Murray, Edward, *Enoch Restitutus: Or an Attempt to Separate from the Books of Enoch, the Book Quoted by St. Jude: Also a Comparison of the Chronology of Enoch with the Hebrew Computation, and with the Periods Mentioned in the Book of Daniel and in the Apocalypse* (London: J. G. & F. Rivington, 1836) [PDF Lithograph]
- Nibley, Hugh, *Enoch the Prophet* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 1986)
- Nickelsburg, George W.E., 'Son of Man,' in David Noel Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. VI, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 137-50
- Nickelsburg, George W.E., *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001)

- Nickelsburg, George W.E., and VanderKam, James C., *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004)
- Odeberg, Hugo, *3 Enoch: or, The Hebrew book of Enoch* (Cambridge: University Press, 1928)
- Olson, Daniel C., *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills, Texas: Bibal Press, 2004)
- Orlov, Andrei A., *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism: Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha* (Boston, Massachusetts: Leiden, 2007), 103-148
- Overton, J., *Inquiry into the Truth and Use of the Book of Enoch, as to Its Prophecies, Visions, and Account of Fallen Angels* (Printed for the author, and sold by Simpkin and Marshall, Stationer's Court, 1822)
- Patricia L. Tenpenny, Patricia L., Keriazakos, Maria S., Lew, Gavin S. and Phelan, Thomas P., 'In Search of Inadvertent Plagiarism,' in *The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 111, No. 4 (University of Illinois Press, Winter, 1998), 529-559
- Paul, Robert, 'Joseph Smith and the Manchester (New York) Library,' in *BYU Studies* 22, No. 3 (1982), 1-26
- Pote, B.E., 'The Ethiopians. Apocryphal Books of Isaiah and Enoch,' in *The Foreign Quarterly Review*, No. XLVIII, (London: Printed by C. Roworth and Sons, Bell Yard, Temple Bar, 1840)
- Pratt, Orson, *Works: Divine Authenticity of the Book of Mormon* (Liverpool, 1851), 1-2
- Pratt, Parley P., (ed.) 'The Apocryphal Book of Enoch', in *The Latter-Day Saints Millennial Star*, No. 3, Vol. 1, (July 1840), 61-63
- Pratt, Parley P., (ed.) 'The Prophecy of Enoch', in *The Latter-Day Saints Millennial Star*, No. 5, Vol. 1, (September 1840), 109-13
- Quinn, D. Michael, *Early Mormonism and the Magic World View*, Revised and Enlarged Edition (USA: Signature Books, 1998)
- Randall, Marilyn, *Pragmatic Plagiarism: Authorship, Profit, and Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001)
- Raven, James, *The Business of Books: Booksellers and the English Book Trade 1450-1850* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007)
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005)
- Remer, Rosalind, 'Preachers, Peddlers, and Publishers: Philadelphia's Backcountry Book Trade, 1800-1830,' in *Journal of the Early Republic*, Vol. 14, No. 4 (Winter, 1994), 497-522
- Schmidt, Nathaniel, 'The Two Recensions of Slavonic Enoch,' in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 41 (1921), 307-312
- Schmidt, Nathaniel, 'Traces of Early Acquaintance in Europe with the Book of Enoch,' in *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 42 (1922), 44-52

- Schodde, George H., *The Book of Enoch Translated from the Ethiopic with Introduction and Notes* (Andover: Warren F. Draper, 1882)
- Schwartz, Howard, "The Mythology of Judaism," in Breslauer, S. Daniel (ed.), *The Seductiveness of Jewish Myth* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), 11-26
- Smith, Ethan, *View of the Hebrews* (Poultney: Smith and Shute, 1823) [PDF Lithograph]
- Smith, Joseph and Faulring, S.H., *An American Prophet's Record: The Diaries and Journals of Joseph Smith*, 2nd ed. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1989)
- Smith, Joseph, Dahl, L.E., and Cannon, D.Q., *Encyclopedia of Joseph Smith's Teachings* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Deseret Book Co., 2000)
- Smith, Lucy Mack, and Proctor, S.F., & Proctor, M.J., *The Revised and Enhanced History of Joseph Smith by His Mother* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1996).
- Sorensen, A.D., 'Zion,' in Daniel H. Ludlow (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Scripture, Doctrine, and Procedure of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Vol.4 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992), 1624-26
- Stuart, Moses, 'Christology in the Book of Enoch,' in *The American Biblical Repository*, 2nd Series, 3 (January 1840), 86-137
- Stuart, Moses, 'Future Punishment, as Exhibited in the Book of Enoch,' in *The American Biblical Repository*, 2nd Series, 7 (July 1840), 1-35
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha" in John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (eds.) *Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010)
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T., *1 Enoch 91-108* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007)
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T., *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997)
- Tanner, Jerald and Sandra, *The Case Against Mormonism*, Vol. 1, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1967)
- Tanner, Jerald and Sandra, *The Case Against Mormonism*, Vol. 2, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1968)
- Tanner, Jerald and Sandra, *The Case Against Mormonism*, Vol. 3, (Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah Lighthouse Ministry, 1971)
- UNKNOWN AUTHOR, *A full and exact account of Enoch the wonderful prophet: containing his Birth, Life, amazing Prophecies and Predictions [sic], his landing in this kingdom, also his miraculous manner or being conveyed from France to Portsmouth in one Night. Likewise how he prophesied the Destruction of the Turkish Empire by the Russians; also how he foretold the dreadful Inundations that have happened in the Northern Countries; and likewise what dreadful Inundations will happen this present year in every part of France, with many other most interesting Prophecies.* (London: Printed for the Running Stationers, 1772[?])

- UNKNOWN AUTHOR, *Elias and Enoch. A dialogue on the death of the Right Reverend, Alexander, late Lord Bishop of Edinburgh.*, (1720)
- Van Wagoner, Richard S., *Sidney Rigdon: A Portrait of Religious Excess* (Salt Lake City, Utah: Signature Books, 1994)
- VanderKam, James C., '1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature,' in James C. VanderKam and William Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Van Gorcum, Assen; Fortress Press, 1996), 33-101
- VanderKam, James C., 'The Book of Parables within the Enoch Tradition' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.) *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company), 81-99
- VanderKam, James C., *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984)
- VanderKam, James C., *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1995)
- Vogel, Dan, *Religious Seekers and the Advent of Mormonism* (Salt Lake City: Signature Books, 1988)
- Welch, John W. and Morris, Larry E. (eds.), *Oliver Cowdery: Scribe, Elder, Witness* (Provo, Utah: The Neal A. Maxwell Institute for Religious Scholarship, 2006)
- Whiston, William, 'Extracts out of the First Book of Enoch, Concerning The Egregori: [or Fallen Angels.],' in William Whiston, *A Collection of Authentick Records Belonging to the Old and New Testaments* (London: Printed for the Author, 1727), 260-293
- Whittaker, David J., 'Substituted Names on the Published Revelations of Joseph Smith,' in *BYU Studies* 23, no. 1 (1983), 103-12
- Widtsoe, John Andreas, *Joseph Smith as Scientist: A Contribution to Mormon Philosophy* (Salt Lake City, Utah: The General Board Young Men's Mutual Improvement Associations, 1908), 144
- Wilson, Douglas L., "Sowerby Revisited: The Unfinished Catalogue of Thomas Jefferson's Library," in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Oct., 1984), 615-28
- Woodworth, Jed L., 'Extra-Biblical Enoch Texts in Early American Culture,' in *Archive of Restoration Culture: Summer Fellows' Papers 1997-99* (Provo, Utah: Joseph Fielding Smith Institute, 2000), 185-93
- Zboray, Ronald J. and Zboray, Mary Saracino, 'Books, Reading, and the World of Goods in Antebellum New England,' in *American Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (The Johns Hopkins University Press, December, 1996), 587-622

## Reference

- Berrett, LaMar C. (ed.), *Sacred Places: New England and Eastern Canada, A Comprehensive Guide to Early LDS Historical Sites*, Vol. 1, (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1999)
- Berrett, LaMar C. (ed.), *Sacred Places: New York and Pennsylvania, A Comprehensive Guide to Early LDS Historical Sites*, Vol. 2, (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1999)
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. 1, Apocrypha (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1968) **[PDF Lithograph]**
- Charles, Robert Henry, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha (Great Britain: Oxford University Press, 1968) **[PDF Lithograph]**
- Charlesworth, James H., (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983)
- Freedman, David Noel, (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vols. I-VI, (New York: Doubleday, 1992)
- Grafton, Anthony, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, Vol. I Textual Criticism and Exegesis (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983)
- Grafton, Anthony, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, Vol. II Historical Chronology (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 544-45; 685-86
- Growoll, Adolph, *Book Trade Bibliography in the United States in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Sampson, Low, Marston & Co. Ltd., 1898)
- Kitto, John, (ed.) *A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 2, (New York: Mark II. Newman & Co., 1851), 793-798 **[PDF Lithograph]**
- By the Library Company of Philadelphia, *A Catalogue of Books, Belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia*, Vol. II-Part I, (Philadelphia: Printed by Thomas T. Stiles, 1813)
- By the Library Company of Philadelphia, *A Catalogue of the Books Belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia; to which is prefixed, a short account of the institution, with the Charter, Laws, and Regulations*, Vol. I, (Philadelphia: C. Sherman & Co. Printers, 1835)
- Ludlow, Daniel H., (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Mormonism: The History, Scripture, Doctrine, and Procedure of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, Vols.1-4 (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1992)
- NRSV, *The Holy Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- Rhees, William J., *Manual of Public Libraries, Institutions, and Societies in the United States and British Provinces of North America* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1859)
- Singerman, Robert, *Occasional Papers*, No. 203/204 (April 1996), American Library Book Catalogues, 1801-1875: A National Bibliography (USA: The Board of Trustees of The University of Illinois, 1996)

Vermes, Geza, (ed.) *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Allen Lane/Penguin Press, 1997)

**Websites**

1. 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009 [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:22
2. 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009, [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:9
3. 'LDS Scriptures Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009, [http://scriptures.lds.org/js\\_h/1](http://scriptures.lds.org/js_h/1) Joseph Smith History, 1:18
4. 'LDS.org,' Accessed August 23 2009  
<http://www.lds.org/ldsorg/v/index.jsp?vgnextoid=2354fccf2b7db010VgnVCM1000004d82620aRCRD&locale=0&sourceId=b422ef960417b010VgnVCM1000004d82620a&hideNav=1> Neal A. Maxwell, *Ensign*, (1986), 6
5. 'The Library of Congress Online,' Accessed 24 July 2009  
<http://www.loc.gov/rr/rarebook/coll/130.html>
6. 'The Mormon Curtain,' Accessed 11 June 2009  
[http://www.mormoncurtain.com/topic\\_thepearlofgreatprice.html](http://www.mormoncurtain.com/topic_thepearlofgreatprice.html) Hugh Nibley, *Ancient Documents and the Pearl of Great Price*
7. 'LDS Books,' Accessed 11 June 2009 <http://ldsbooks.narod.ru/books/Ancient-Documents-and-the-Pearl-of-Great-Price-by-Hugh-Nibley.html> Hugh Nibley, *Ancient Documents and the Pearl of Great Price*